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EDITORIAL

International Conference on the East Mediterranean and Cyprus regarding economic and political relations within the context of cooperation and integration from past to future took attraction from academic circles and media. However, it was just a beginning to see the prospects of cooperation in the region, which has been historically rich and problematic due to its location through which Asia, Europe and Africa meet around the Mediterranean Sea that is probably the most strategic basin of the world history and the history of civilizations.

Cyprus is situated at the center of the eastern part of this basin and has been one of the conflict areas since 1950s in the twentieth century. It is divided into Greek and Turkish states as well as into European and Turkish spheres of influences as a direct result of the Enosis politics of the Greek Cypriots and Greece. Near to Cyprus debate, Palestine has been another conflict area since 1880s when first Jewish migrations began. In addition, Lebanon experienced one of the most destructive civil wars of history and was divided many times into Maronite and Muslim communities, sects, guerilla factions. Moreover, other countries in the region too have been full of ethnic, religious and all sort of social conflicts, which have always global impacts and inclusions.

The region has core countries such as Turkey, Egypt and Iran, each of which tries to achieve a hegemonic position with their cultures, economies and diplomatic powers as well as their particular modernization projects. Disputes over Cyprus, Palestine and Lebanon can be resolved by their conscious and peaceful efforts. However, their cooperation and integration attempts have been weak until now. Instead, the USA, EU, UN, Soviets-Russia have had more say about the resolution of those conflicts and problems.

The conference naturally put so much emphasis on the Cyprus Dispute that the other regional problems should be taken into account far more in the next scientific gatherings in order to see the prospects of cooperation and integration as regards economic development, transportation, communication, democracy and liberties as well as collective security. Such a prospect can be grounded upon our common historical and geographical base: it is the Mediterranean Sea itself, and all Mediterranean civilizations to which Arabs, Iranians, Turks, Levantines, Helens, Venetians, Spaniards, French, Italians, Mores, Croatians, Berbers, and Jews, among others, have contributed so much.

The proceeding book unfortunately does not include two significant speeches delivered by Rauf Raif Dentaş, founder of the Turkish Republic of North Cyprus and Murat Karayalçın, former Minister of the Foreign Affairs of Turkey.

Meanwhile, readers should note that with the exceptions of minor technical corrections and editorial standardization made, all proceedings are published without any grammatical refinements as they were submitted by the participants.

It is hoped that this conference inspires new studies and will be followed by new conferences.

Ercan Gündoğan, 30 May 2011
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Geographical borders of a political economy analysis are not only national state borders. Each political economic unit is a sub-region of the global or as in the past, of international whole of the politics and economy. When we talk about the East Mediterranean, actually we refer to the western part of the Middle East, southern parts of Russia and the region eastward from Italy. However, the region under consideration covers in terms of nation-state borders, Italy, Greece, Croatia, Albania, Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Egypt and Libya, including the adjacent countries, Jordan, Iran, Iraq and Saudi Arabia, Bulgaria as well as Southern Caucasia. Nevertheless, the region has an outer circle composed of Turkey, Iran and Egypt and has a core or inner circle of Israel, Palestine, Lebanon and Iraq.

Common points as regards political economy analysis of the outer circle countries, that is, Iran, Turkey and Egypt, are that after 1950s, each tried to apply an import-substitution industrialization policies to develop their economic and political independence, each has the most populous countries, and each could introduce their national ideologies and figures and hence, national identities. Kemal Ataturk of Turkey, Abdul Nasser of Egypt and Pahlavies of Iran became found ing figures in the production of modernist, nationalist, independent and secular social and political system. Although Egypt chose to be a part of non-alignment movement, those countries had western-modern oriented regimes. However, the most common point of each is that they tried to and still try to be the hegemonic power of the region and hence, have a powerful army, ideology. Egypt was the regional hegemonic power of the region between 1950 and 1977 when Camp David “Peace” Process would isolate it from the Arab countries and deprive it of being the spokesman of the Palestine question. Turkey would become a potential model for the entire region although its secularist and Westernist orientation had not seemed to attract Muslim Arab countries before. Particularly, its integration to global political economy after 1980s still inspires all countries in the region. On the other hand, commonality disappears when we come to Iran whose counter-Islamic revolution of 1979 has isolated it from the USA and some European countries and made it one of the strongholds of anti-Americanism in Eurasia.

The other commonality of the outer circle countries is that superpowers of the cold war era or the big powers of the current period try to ally with any of them in order to control the region

---

1 Definition of outer and inner circles of the Middle East belongs to Tareq Y. Ismael, 2001, *Middle East Politics Today-Government and Civil Society*, University Press Florida, Gainesville
and its resources and positively or negatively affect Israel at the expense or in favor of the USA. Power and survival of Israel and hence, of the USA in the region has been possible only if at least one of those countries are made an ally of Israel and hence, of the USA. Egypt is a friend of Israel since 1977 and Turkey since the establishment of Israel in 1948, but Iran was so only until Iranian Islamic government declared it as an enemy to be destroyed and expelled from the region. For this reason, Iran has been under the threat of the US for three decades. This country is about to face a military operation in our days simply because of its anti-American and anti-Israeli attitudes, and its leaning towards the East, Russia and China in main as a survival strategy for itself. When Iran is leaning towards the East, as a reaction, Turkey’s foreign policy has just started to lean towards the region as if it tries to prevent Iran from leaning towards the East\(^2\). Such an orientation in Turkish foreign policy, which is called a neo-Ottomanist foreign policy, can be expected to deprive Iran of being a spokesman of Palestinian question. As known, the powerful spokesman of this question had been Egypt until Camp David Process of 1977. Such a vacuum has been filled by Iran’s Islamic governments in the eyes of Muslim people in the region. Current Turkish government nowadays tries to offer itself as a spokesman of Palestinian question and increase its appeal in the eyes of Muslim people. Such an alternative hegemonic search of Turkey is also related with the rising trade volume with the countries in the region. Furthermore, behind such a foreign policy orientation is the Islamic discourse used by the existing government and the need to alternative oil and natural gas resources which forces Turkey to create better relations with Iran. Moreover, a closer relation between Iran and Turkey can be considered as a strategy to integrate Iran to the west. Such a close relation took place between Syria and Turkey in the past and led into a close relation between Syria and the West. It is rather clear that as long as Iran does not want to integrate itself to the West and the USA, instead of Russia and China, current threats of war will turn into a real war. It can be predicted that without a new American war on Iran, Iran will remain an enemy of Israel, hence, of the US and its allies Saudi Arabia and Gulf States having enormous oil reserves as well as financial investments in the US financial markets.

Egypt and Turkey, in our outer circle, are already allies of the West and the USA as well as of Israel in the region. Those can be included oil reserve Arab counties and Jordan. Nonetheless, Israel is under the threat of Iran and scared of Iran’s nuclear aspiration and ideological propaganda. Another source of fear, which is common for Israel and its allies, is the possibility of Russia’s and China’s economic and political penetration to the region through Iran’s mediation. Hence, war threats against Iran should be seen as being against such a penetration, which seems to have been prevented temporary with the occupations of Iraq and Afghanistan.

\(^2\) Turkey’s foreign policy shift towards the East and the Middle East is closely related with the shift of Iran towards Russia and China. For this connection, see, Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya, “War and the Conquest of Eurasia: Iran’s “Green Wave” Opposition and its Ties to Global Geopolitics” in www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=21584: “The amicable relations Ankara has fostered with Iran and Syria can be used to: (1) explain what appears to be a Turkish shift in foreign policy and (2) the public chill in ties between Israel and Turkey. This, however, could be part of (3) a U.S. strategy to coax Iran and Syria into its orbit and away from Iran’s Russian and Chinese allies. The development of the so-called Iranian-Syrian-Turkish Axis should take place with caution, because things may end up being quite different than the establishment of a genuine regional alliance and bloc”. access 28/10/2010.
These two countries offer two geographical blocks and bases between those big powers and the region.

As for Israel’s survival and resistance strategy, we have to recall a common policy shared by the two main political parties in this country. As demonstrated well by Noam Chomsky, their strategy, nearly official, is to de-stabilize the neighboring countries through occupations, divisions, confrontation and threats. Israel has until now waged more than three regional wars, occupied Lebanon twice and have already non-declared nuclear as well as mass destruction weapons. Officially, it applies a holy strategy based on the biblical idea of “the promised lands”. At least within these “promised lands”, greater Israeli lands also cover the south Lebanon and all Palestinian lands from the Jordan River eastward. Occupied lands of the Palestinians, the West Bank and Gaza Strip, are not seen as temporary occupations as seen in ever extending Israeli settlements constructed there. Israel does not want to integrate those regions to itself since it tries to keep Israel as a Jewish state with a large Jewish population.

Prospects of an economic and political cooperation and integration in the region do not seem to be impacted by the ethnic and religious differences, but by Iran-Arab, Iran-Israel and Israel-Palestine relations. Iran’s hegemonic aspirations over the region, survival strategy of Israel under occupied lands, American interests over oil producing countries, seem to be the main drawbacks before integration and cooperation. However, the prospect of internal integration and cooperation becomes far more complicated given that rapidly growing China and India and Japan needs the oil resources of the region. In coming years, positions of Iran and Turkey will determine those of the US and hence Israel as well as Russia and China in the region.

Region is not only important for oil reserves and young labour and consumer markets for economically powerful countries and regions of the world. It is also a connection point between Indian Ocean, Mediterranean Sea, Atlantic Ocean, Caspian Sea and Red Sea. It is

4 Origin of the idea of promised land, or as called the Greater Israel, is an historical religious claim. According to first book (Genesis) of Torah 12-17, Abraham, in around 19 century B.C, receives a message from God (Rab) when he comes to Harran from Ur, who orders him to leave for Canaan country and will promise it to him and his descendants. See, Yusuf Besalel, 2003 (2nd. Edition), Yahudi Tarihi-Kronolojik Yahudi Tarihi-104 Dünya Yahudi Cemaati-Israel ve Türkiye-İsrail İlişkileri, (Jewish History-Chronological Jewish History) Gözlem Gazetecilik Basın ve Yayın A.Ş., p: 34.
5 Noam Chomsky, 1993, Kader Üçgeni (The Fateful Triangle, p: 222, for the borders of both left and right Sionist strategy, p: 208-211. for Ben Gurion’s dream, the Greater Israel included also the South Lebanon, South Syria, the present Jordan and Sinai Peninsula, p: 208.
6 In addition to the ideas or projects of the promised lands and the Greater Israel, Jewish aspirations refers to more than those and even could include Cyprus in history. Josef Nasi or Yasef Nasi (Jewish Mikas) wanted to become the King of Cyprus and create a Jewish colony there. See, Ferdinand Braudel, 1990, Akdeniz ve Akdeniz Dünyası, Volume 2, Trans: M.A. Kılıçbay, Eren Yayıncılık ve Kitapçılık, Istanbul, p: 284-5. About this influential banker, merchant, a close friend of the Sultan Suleiman the Lawgiver and the founder of Sionism long before Theodor Herzl, this site can be visited: http://www.ezberbozanbilgiler.com/bizim-tarih/item/264-osmanlida-cok-etkili-bir-yahudi-yasef-nassi.html. access 28.05.2011
bridge among Asia, Europe, Africa and America. In addition to this global geographical centrality, it is the his-torico-geographical center of the world. Even though main economic transactions are currently realized on the Northern part of the globe, that is, among the USA, Canada, Europe, Russia, India, China and Japan, countries and regions of this part of the globe can economically and politically compete with or eliminate each other, transport oil and gas, increase their respective spheres of influence with and through this region. Furthermore, the USA has become a state of the region after occupying Iraq and Afghanistan. Russia already controls the Caucasus Region and the Central Asia. The so-called Republic of Cyprus, in other words, the Greek Administration of Cyprus, represents the European interest in the region. For this reason, the US, Russia and European Union have to be included to the map of the de facto states in the region.

This presentation should be completed with the case of Cyprus and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. Republic of Cyprus was established as a collective bi-communal state of Greeks and Turks under the guarantorship of UK, Greece and Turkey and according to the Treaty of Alliance for four states in 1960. Greek Cypriot Archbishop Makarios, the then President of the Republic of Cyprus, demanded the unconditional self-determination right of the Republic of Cyprus. But ironically he just demanded this self-determination before and for ENOSIS, that is, the integration of Cyprus and Greece. For this purpose, his administration did drive the Turkish Cypriots from the Republic and led into a bloody civil war between 1963 and 1974. And Turkish Cypriots first formed their federal state government and at the end, declared their self-determination rights and establish their own republic in 1983. The so-called Republic of Cyprus and its allies do not now recognize the self-determination rights of Turkish Cypriots just as Israel does not Palestinian self-determination rights. Founding President of TRNC Rauf Denktaş always repeats this truth. As long as this truth and right of Turkish people in this island is not recognized, how an integration of the island into the region, into Europe, or into Asia, can be possible? Similarly, without recognizing the self-determination rights of the Palestinian people, how Middle East becomes really a region of cooperation is the most important question.

Religiously Christian, Judaist and Muslims and other faiths in number, nationally Turk, Iranian and Arab and other ethnic groups in number, can form their unique unity, which should be and can be different from sorts of pax-Romana or pax-Ottomana which is envisioned by the current Turkish government or Israeli politicians. Such a unity should be, and can be secular and anti-imperialist federation of the free, independent and self-determined republics and based on

---

7 For this strategy of Makarios, Greece and even the USA. See Makarios Drušotis, 2008, Kibris 1963-1964-İlk Bölümü, (Cyprus, First Break down) Trans: A. Çakıroğlu, Galeri Kültür Yayıncılık, Lefkoşa, Kıbrıs, for just examples see p: 286, and 230, 270, 283. This strategy is supported by the USA with Acheson Plan.
negotiations, invitations and mutual respect. Such a union, which has been previously suggested by Yalçın Küçük in a different context and seemingly for different purposes, can be initialized with a federative unionization of TRNC and Turkey, Northern Iraq, Syria and Azerbaijan. It can proceed towards a broader unionization with Egypt, Lebanon, Georgia and Iraq. Such subsequent unionizations can be alternatives to the European and Asian regionalization plans. Comparative advantages of those countries are countless. Secularist and modernist experience of Turkey, its industry, tourism and water sources can be combined to the oil of Azerbaijan and the Northern Iraq. Connections among Istanbul, Ankara, Beirut, Baku and Cairo, Girne, Damascus and Tiflis can be expected to attract later Greek Cypriots, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Israel provided that they solve their ideological and religious fanaticisms against their neighboring peoples and countries.

Having a young labour force, industrial capacity, oil, gas, water and other natural sources, secularist and modernist experiences, a geographical position between Indian Ocean and Atlantic, being the center between Asia, Africa and Europe, the East Mediterranean and its adjacent area can and should form a union as an alternative to the North America, Europe and Asian regionalization plans. Unfortunately, important oil producer countries and hence petrodollar earners of the region are Saudi Arabia, Gulf States, Iraq and Iran. First group of countries have rent oriented economies and the second group could not benefit from such a source for economic and political development. Rent oriented economies invest their petrodollars mainly to American financial assets, lucrative but superfluous and luxury projects in return of rent and interest. Second group has used such a resource for war industry at the expense of their people and the peace in the region. This wealth could be used for economic development of the region only within the regional context.

However, recognition of self-determination rights of Palestinian people and a federative union of Turkey and TRNC are two keys for a starting point of a regional unification or at least

---

9 A federation of different republics whose people have different religious faiths, as in the regions we deal with requires secularism as the first element of unionisation or integration. For this reason, neo-Ottomanism and islamism of the current Turkish government contradict each other. Actually, what is meant by neo-Ottomanism seems to be nothing but a new form of pan-Islamism, even more, referring mainly to a pan-Sunni Islamism.


11 See for United Arab Emirates’, Saudi Arabia’s and Kuwait’s “Sovereign Wealth Funds”, for instance; “A Sovereign Wealth Fund is a state-owned investment fund composed of financial assets such as stocks, bonds, real estate or other financial instruments funded by foreign exchange assets. The top three SWFs were created through oil exports: In the latest ranking, the Abu Dhabi Investment Authority tops the list at US$627 billion, followed by Norway's Government Pension Fund–Global (US$443 billion) and Saudi Arabia's SAMA Foreign Holdings (US$415 billion)”. [http://www.gfmag.com/tools/global-database/economic-data/10300-largest-sovereign-wealth-funds-swf-2010-ranking.html](http://www.gfmag.com/tools/global-database/economic-data/10300-largest-sovereign-wealth-funds-swf-2010-ranking.html), access 19/12/2010. These SWF investments also show the interdependency between those surplus holder countries and the USA’s economy.
integration\textsuperscript{12}. Not only currently weak intra-regional economy\textsuperscript{13} but also intra-regional politics can be developed after the realization of these first requirements.

We can conclude that in terms of our analyses of political economy and political geography, to say geopolitics, of the region, 1) conflict between American, Chinese and Russian’s interests over the region, 2) conflict between Iran’s and Turkey’s regional hegemonic aspirations and 3) Israel’s survival strategy based on the “religious” idea of the Greater Israel and the destabilization of the region, 4) Saudi Arabia and Gulf State’s close economic and military relations with the USA, 5) Iran’s shift towards Russia-China axis, 6) American existence in Iraq and Afghanistan, are expected to determine the region’s political economy and political geography. Apart from these key players and dynamics, Kurdish card seems to be another important factor for the strategy of all players. Kurdish aspirations can be exploited or mobilized for the interests, or at the expense, of the countries in the region. They can be considered either for a greater union or for a far more divided region. In this context, Turkey is the key player for the integration and stability of the region. All destabilization strategies over the region can be prevented by a union that must be different from neo-Ottomanism to be able to be established by Turkey, as I suggest above. Dispersion of Kurdish population into four countries, Turkey, Iran, Syria and Iraq, shows us that secessionism of this people from any of four countries divides all of them. To prevent such a catastrophe, Turkey can be suggested to integrate Kurdish region in Iraq to itself\textsuperscript{14}. Such a policy also prevents any strategy which is to be based on a Kurdish-Jewish alliance against Arab, Turkish and Iranian people and countries.

Current dangers before the prospects of any form of integration or union in the region are the possibility of an American-Israel War or confrontation with Iran and the Palestinian question regarding the survival strategy of Israel. Such a war can be expected to destroy Iran, dividing it to Azeri, Kurd, Beluch, Arab, Lori and Turcoman regions, leaving the Persian part isolated at the center of Iran. Even this unfortunate possibility will put back the integration problem to the center. For this reason, issues of political economic integration, cooperation and collective security strategy should be taken into account first as a survival strategy for all countries in the region.

\textsuperscript{12} Actually, political equality of Turkish and Greek Cypriots, seen as a success of Turkish side in Cyprus Dispute and negotiations by the former president of the so-called Republic of Cyprus, is recognized by UN. See Glafkos Klerides, 2008, \textit{Bir Dönemin Anıları-1993-2003 (Memoirs of A Period)}, trans: A. Çakıroğlu, Galeri Kültür Yayınları, Lefkoşa, Kıbrıs, p: 209-12. However, since the declaration of TRNC as an independent state has not been recognized by UN and upon its decisions by other countries other than Turkey.

\textsuperscript{13} The size of intra-regional trade is currently around 20\%. “Intra-regional trade in the Middle East has grown 28 per cent between 2000 and 2007 and now represents 19.3 per cent of all trade in the region” see \url{http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-198978443.html}, access 19/12/2010. Also for the regions’s shift to Asia and away from the US and Asia’s takeover of Europe in exports to the region, \url{http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-198978868.html}, Access 19/12/2010. See also endnote ii above, Turkey’s foreign policy shift towards the “East” in this context. At least Turkey’s orientation towards the “East” is related with this economic shift, Iran’s own shift towards East, hegemonic competition about Turkey and Iran in the region as well as with China’s and Russia’s aspiration towards the region.

\textsuperscript{14} For a similar connection and inspiration, See footnote 10 above
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Abstract

This paper defines the political boundaries of The Eastern Mediterranean region and analyzes the role and performance of major exchanges in this area. Furthermore, it explores the existence of bilateral agreements with a view to elaborating on the prospects for cooperation and/or integration opportunities in the area.
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1. Introduction

Financial markets are very important for the healthy growth of modern economies across the world. Their primary economic benefit lies in their expedition of economic transactions realized either through direct financing or mainly through indirect financing (intermediation). From an economic perspective, financial markets known as money markets are short-term markets facilitating the flow of funds to businesses for financing their short-term operational requirements. On the other hand, financial markets known as capital markets are long-term markets of paramount importance in the long-term financing of long-term business investment projects, essentially constituting the power stations of economic growth. While primary markets serve an important role in generating the long-term capital, secondary markets create suitable liquidity-providing platforms where trading occurs to change merely the ownership of securities which neccessitates the smooth functioning of capital markets. In this respect, both primary and secondary financial markets work harmoniously and complement each other towards one common goal; faster economic growth and possible maximum national income. Finally, at the heart of these financial concepts lie the “organized security exchanges” which assemble all the above mentioned aspects of financial markets in one location. This paper will analyze the role of organized exchanges of the Eastern Mediterranean region mainly from a regional perspective not a national perspective to shed light on the prospects and opportunities for establishing meaningful economic and financial relationships in this part of the world.

This region, historically known as the “Fertile Crescent” or “Levantine”, is geographically comprised of the following countries;¹

- Cyprus, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Jordan and Saudia Arabia.

However, currently this region for political considerations also includes the following countries;²

- Turkish Republic of North Cyprus (TRNC), Palestine, Egypt and Turkey.

Organized exchanges in this area, undoubtedly, play a crucial role in the economic development of not only the countries mentioned above but also in the development of the whole region. The organized exchanges of this region are listed below:

1. TRNC Stock Exchange (KKTC Menkul Kıymetler Borsası), Nicosia, Cyprus
2. Cyprus Stock Exchange (CSE), Nicosia, Cyprus
3. Damascus Securities Exchange (DSE), Damascus, Syria
4. Beirut Stock Exchange (BSE), Beirut, Lebanon
5. Tel Aviv Stock Exchange (TASE), Tel Aviv, Israel
6. Palestine Exchange (PEX), Nablus, Palestine
7. Amman Stock Exchange (ASE), Amman, Jordan
8. Saudi Stock Exchange (TADAWUL), Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
9. Egyptian Exchange (EGX), Cairo, Egypt, formerly Alexandria & Cairo Stock Exchange
10. Istanbul Stock Exchange (ISE), Istanbul, Turkey

All of the exchanges listed above are operational with the exception of TRNC Stock Exchange which was established by Law (40/1996) on September 23, 1996.³ Therefore, it is omitted in the foregoing analysis.


Market Capitalization indicates the total value of all the securities listed, whereas trading value refers to the total daily value of securities traded based on the volume of securities traded in an organized security exchange. In the foregoing analysis, the relevant specific values pertaining to the organized security exchanges of the region are summarized below as of Dec 9-10, 2010;

---

¹ http://www.natgeomaps.com/easternmediterranean.html
² http://www.maps.nationalgeographic.com/maps/.../mediterranean-eastern-map.html
Table 1: Market Capitalization and Trading Values of Security Exchanges in Eastern Mediterranean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange</th>
<th>Market Cap.</th>
<th>Trading Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSE (Euro)</td>
<td>13,454,288,618</td>
<td>1,518,998.57 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Est. 1996)</td>
<td>($17,818,725,290)</td>
<td>($2,011,747)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSE (LS or SYP)</td>
<td>160,523,350,800</td>
<td>52,404,808 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Est. 2006)</td>
<td>($3,439,854,884)</td>
<td>($1,123,361)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE (LBP)</td>
<td>$14,722,306,680</td>
<td>$485,175 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Est. 1920)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASE (NIS)</td>
<td>930,321,800,000</td>
<td>1,912,827,273 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Est. 1953)</td>
<td>($257,620,991,600)</td>
<td>($529,692,477)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEX (JOD,USD)</td>
<td>$2,400,000,000</td>
<td>$1,479,496 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Est. 1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASE (JOD)</td>
<td>21,044,572,000</td>
<td>20,653,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Est. 1999)</td>
<td>($29,734,002,430)</td>
<td>($29,180,339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TADAWUL (SAR)</td>
<td>1,267,440,000,000</td>
<td>3,408,838,132 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Informal since mid 1930s - Est. 2007)</td>
<td>($337,980,000,000)</td>
<td>($908,901,920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGX (LE or EGP)</td>
<td>485,378,478,280</td>
<td>490,912,000 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alexandria 1883, Cairo 1903, Est. 1998)</td>
<td>($81,410,544,016)</td>
<td>($84,790,812)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISE (TRY)</td>
<td>$328,000,000,000</td>
<td>$2,575,000,000 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Est. 1986)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,073,126,424,900</td>
<td>$4,132,665,327 per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the information given above, the top 3 rankings by market capitalization and daily trading values in Eastern Mediterranean security markets are summarized below:
Table 2: Top 3 Security Markets of Eastern Mediterranean by Market Capitalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange</th>
<th>MCAP</th>
<th>MCAP %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TADAWUL</td>
<td>$337,980,000,000</td>
<td>31.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ISE</td>
<td>$328,000,000,000</td>
<td>30.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TASE</td>
<td>$257,620,991,600</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The security exchanges listed above accounted for 86% of the total market capitalization in Eastern Mediterranean.

Table 3: Top 3 Security Markets of Eastern Mediterranean by Trading Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange</th>
<th>Trading Value</th>
<th>Trading Value %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ISE</td>
<td>$2,575,000,000</td>
<td>62.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TADAWUL</td>
<td>$908,901,920</td>
<td>21.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TASE</td>
<td>$529,692,477</td>
<td>12.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The security exchanges listed above accounted for 97% of the trading value in Eastern Mediterranean.


National market indices of the organized exchanges in the region generally capture the financial market performance of the related securities.
Figure 1: CSE Market Index\(^4\) (General Market Index)

Last 6 Month’s Performance

Figure 2: DSE Market Index\(^5\) (DWX Index)

\(^4\) http://www.cse.com.cy
\(^5\) http://www.dse.sy
Figure 3: BSE Market Index\(^6\) (BLOM Stock Index)

Last 1 Year’s Performance

Figure 4: TASE Market Index\(^7\) (TA-100)

Last 6 Month’s Performance

\(^6\) http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/quote?ticker=BLOM:IND

\(^7\) http://www.tase.co.il/TASEEng/
Figure 5: PEX Market Index\(^8\) (Al-Quds)
Last 6 Month’s Performance

Figure 6: ASE Market Index\(^9\) (General Index)

\(^8\) http://www.p-s-e.com/
\(^9\) http://www.ase.com.jo
Figure 7: Tadawul Market Index\textsuperscript{10} (All Share Index TASI)

![Tadawul Market Index Graph]

Figure 8: EGX Market Index\textsuperscript{11} (EGX 100)

![EGX Market Index Graph]

\textsuperscript{10} http://www.tadawul.com.sa/
\textsuperscript{11} http://www.egyptse.com/English/homepage.aspx
The market indices of the region clearly indicate that over the last 6 months the only stable market is Tadawul (Saudi) whereas markets on the rise are Tel Aviv (approx. 17 % return), Damascus (approx. 25% return), Egyptian (approx. 26 % return) and Istanbul (approx. 30 % return). Beirut has declined (approx. 5 %) but seems to be slightly recovering. Amman, Palestine and Cyprus markets have been generally unstable over this period without any significant net gain or loss and all seem to be on a slightly recovering upturn. In general, the markets of the region did not experience any major financial trouble during this period.

5. Existence of Bilateral MOUs/MOCs, Regional Market Formations and Dual Listing Opportunities in East Mediterranean

Co operations in financial markets, generally speaking, manifest themselves in the form of bilateral agreements signed by the officials of stock exchanges concerned, known as memorandum of understanding or cooperation. These memoranda generally include issues such as cooperation between exchanges, consultation services, exchange of information, listing issues and the likes. An extended version of MOUs can also include dual listing (cross-listing) of securities in both markets upon Board authorizations. Integrations in financial markets can generally be either in the form of co-establishing regional markets where securities selected from each of the markets constitute a new index or in the form of a stronger Exchange participation in the capital of the other Exchanges in a supportive manner to strengthen relatively weaker Exchanges.

12 http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/quote?ticker=XU100:IND
Without analyzing the existing agreements and formations in The Eastern Mediterranean region, it is not possible to reach an objective conclusion for the area especially with regards to opportunities that may lie ahead in the foreseeable future.

5.1 CSE (Cyprus):

Cyprus Exchange has disclosed its strategy as follows;

“CSE aims via its strategic plans and development initiatives to play an important role in the Cyprus region, regarding stock exchange issues.”

To this end, CSE also signed the following MOUs with other exchanges:

- Bucharest Stock Exchange (Romania) 2007
- Egyptian Exchange (Egypt) 2008
- Tehran Stock Exchange (Iran) 2008
- Malta Stock Exchange (Malta) 2010
- MICEX Group (Russia) 2010
- Damascus Stock Exchange (Syria) 2010

At the same time, under the leadership of Cypriot officials, Cyprus, Greece and Israel have jointly established a regional index known as FTSE Med 100 Index. This Mediterranean index is comprised of 100 of the largest and most liquid companies quoted on the stock exchanges of Cyprus, Greece and Israel and is quoted by FTSE (which is jointly owned by Financial Times and London Stock Exchange), as a major global index provider. Their vision is as follows:

“The three Exchanges aim at attracting foreign investments in the region. ....The three Exchanges are also going to invite other Mediterranean Exchanges to participate in the Index.”

Finally, FTSE CySE Index is a joint venture between FTSE and CSE. This index tracks largest and most liquid securities trading in CSE.

5.2 DSE (Syria):

Being a newly established market in October 2006, Damascus Securities Exchange has recently signed a MOU with Cyprus Stock Exchange (CSE) in October 2010 and a MOU previously with Egyptian Exchange (EGX) in December 2006.

13 http://www.cse.com.cy
14 http://www.cse.com.cy
5.3 BSE (Lebanon):
Beirut Stock Exchange has had no cooperation agreements with any of the regional or global Exchanges.

5.4 TASE (Israel):
Established since 1953, TASE signed the following MOUs with other Exchanges:

- London Stock Exchange (UK) 2007 -- includes dual listing agreement
- NASDAQ (US) 2007 -- includes dual listing agreement
- NYSE Euronext (US & Europe) 2008 – includes dual listing agreement
- Shanghai Stock Exchange (China) 2008
- Toronto Stock Exchange (Canada) 2010

At the same time, Israeli shares have been listed on FTSE Med Index since November 2010 and Israeli Biomed Sector started trading with NASDAQ since November 2010. TASE Board also approved dual listing of Protalix shares trading at AMEX since September 2010 upon the application received by Protalix, a Bio-Therapeutics company.

5.5 PEX (Palestine):
Palestinian Exchange has had no cooperation with any of the regional or global Exchanges most probably due to political reasons.

5.6 ASE (Jordan):
Amman Stock Exchange only had a MOU signed with Egyptian Exchange in November 2009.

5.7 TADAWUL (Saudi Arabia):
Tadawul has had no cooperation with any of the regional or global Exchanges. Most probably, Saudisation of foreign banks’ capital in 1970’s is still repelling to most foreign investors and financial markets today.

5.8 EGX (Egypt):
Established in 1998, with roots dating back to 1883, The Egyptian Exchange (oldest exchange in the region) signed the following MOUs with other Exchanges:

- Johannesburg Stock Exchange (S. Africa) 2000
- Malta Stock Exchange (Malta) 2001
- Thessaloniki Stock Exchange Center (Greece) 2004
- Bahrain Stock Exchange (Bahrain) 2004
- Borsa Italiana (Italy) 2006
- Abu Dhabi Securities Market (U.A.E) 2006 – includes dual listing agreement
- Damascus Stock Exchange (Syria) 2006
- Korea Exchange, KRX (Korea) 2007
- Shanghai Stock Exchange (China) 2007
- Cyprus Stock Exchange (Cyprus) 2008
- Shenzhen Stock Exchange (China) 2009
- Casablanca Stock Exchange (Morocco) 2009
- Iraqi Stock Exchange (Iraq) 2009
- Amman Stock Exchange (Jordan) 2009
- Libyan Stock Market (Libya) 2009

5.9 ISE (Turkey):

Established in 1986, ISE signed the following MOUs/MOCs with other Exchanges:

- Kazakhstan Stock Exchange (Kazakhstan) 1999
- Kyrgyzstan Stock Exchange (Kyrgyzstan) 1999
- Uzbekistan Stock Exchange (Uzbekistan) 1999
- London Stock Exchange (UK) 1999
- Korea Stock Exchange (Korea) 2001
- Shanghai Stock Exchange (China) 2007

At the same time, ISE participated 27.4 % in the capital of Kyrgyz Stock Exchange and 5.55 % in that of Baku Stock Exchange to support the development of these markets. Finally, ISE in collaboration with the Athens Stock Exchange (ATHEX) and STOXX Ltd., a global index provider initiated the GT-30 Index, a regional index comprised of 15 securities from Greece and 15 from Turkey (Index based information is available in Euro and TRY).

http://www.ise.com.tr
6. Cooperation-Integration Opportunities in The Eastern Mediterranean Region

Now assessment of the cooperation-integration opportunities in the region will be based on the findings of this study.

The three major financial actors in the region are namely Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Israel followed by Egypt. The other five financial markets in the region are not very significant in terms of both market capitalization and values traded. Is there any room for cooperation and integration mainly among these four important actors in the region? Considering deteriorating political relations between Turkey and Israel, collaboration between these two countries does not seem to be too realistic in the near future, especially if the current ruling party in Turkey solely wins the general elections in 2011 for the third time around. Also, the existing and recently improving relations of Israel with Cyprus, as evident in the establishment of FTSE Med 100 Index, leave no doubt to think otherwise. Cooperation-integration of Saudi Arabian financial market with the Turkish financial market is definitely a possibility despite its high level of uncertainty. Turkey could sign a MOU with Saudi Arabia and in the future move towards co-establishing a regional market as well as dual listings in the Saudi Arabian financial market. Egypt signed several MOUs with several countries in the region and Middle East but due to historical and political reasons it neither signed with Turkey nor Israel. Egypt signed MOU agreements deliberately with both Cyprus and Greece indicating closer ties with both countries. Needless to say, Israel and Saudi Arabia’s collaboration is out of the question due to the never-ending Arab-Israeli conflict in the region.

Cooperation-integration prospects with five other financial markets do not seem to be possible or beneficial for Turkey. Cyprus and Syria has recently signed a MOU with each other and most probably Cyprus (and Egypt) will exert unbearable amount of political pressure on Syria not to sign a MOU with Turkey. Of course, Turkey, a financially stronger market than Cyprus (and Egypt), could overcome this problem if Turkish diplomacy could be skillfully utilized. However, even if this materializes favorably for Turkey in the future, there will be more of a political gain for Turkey than a financial one since DSE is a small and new market.

BSE in Lebanon is definitely a possibility but again there is not much of a financial gain for Turkey. ASE in Jordan has so far signed a MOU only with Egypt and not with any other Arab nation in the Middle East because probably it is sensitive to confrontation with Israel. Due to this Jordanian attitude, Turkish cooperation with Jordanian officials is not highly probable in the near future. Needless to say, no Exchange in the region would officially sign any agreement with Palestinian Exchange in view of the tense relations between Palestine and Israel. Any attempt by any State to do so would disrupt or jeopardize any existing relations with Israel.

7. Conclusion

Is it possible to reach a comprehensive level of cooperation-integration among the Eastern Mediterranean countries in the region? The answer to this is clearly no, as long as the chronic Arab-Israeli conflict and the Cyprus problem between Greeks and Turks on the island continue.
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PORTS

Ladies and gentlemen, good morning and well come to seminar.  
I am going to explain Eastern Mediterranean region countries and their main commercial ports.  
And also Maritime Zone Proclamation EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE, according to the equitable principles in the east Mediterranean Sea.  
MIP (Mersin International Port Management Inc.) is a joint venture between PSA International and Akfen Holdings.

MIP VALUES
-Committed to Excellence  
-Dedicated to Customers  
-Focused on People  
-Integrated Globally

MIP MISSION
To be the port operator of choice in The East Mediterranean Sea, renowned for best-in-class services and successful partnerships.

MIP PEOPLE
They are committed to develop and motivate their employees to always strive for "Excellence in Everything They Do" in line with achieving business objectives and fulfilling professional goals.

MIP VISION
They always look forward to adopt the innovative application of technology to deliver significant enhancements in efficiency and service customization.

MIP PRINCIPLES
They abide by strong but sensitive work ethics that promote economic efficiency and harmonious customer-partner relationships.

MIP is multi-purpose facilities cater for all types of cargo including container, general cargo, project cargo, ro-ro, dry and liquid bulk. There are 21 berths at the port, over approximately 15 Million tons of cargo are handled every year.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Container Designed Capacity</strong></td>
<td>2,500,000 TEU / Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Cargo Handling Capacity</strong></td>
<td>500,000 Ton / Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dry Bulk &amp; Liquid Bulk Handling Capacity</strong></td>
<td>4,000,000 Ton / Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roro Capacity</strong></td>
<td>50,000 Unit - Vehicle / Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL CARGO**
Steel, Machinery, Marble, Pipes, Big Bags, Palletised Cargo etc.
Handling Capacity: Over 500,000 tons per year.

**PROJECT CARGO**
Ranging from 25 tons to over 300 tons.

**RO-RO CARGO**
All kinds of ro-ro cargo including construction and earth moving equipment, trucks, cars etc.

**DRY BULK CARGO**
Grains, cement, clinker, ores, etc.
Handling Capacity: Over 5,000,000 Tons per year.

**LIQUID BULK CARGO**
Palm oil, vegetable oils, acid, etc.
Handling Capacity: 1,000,000 Tons per year.

And passenger transportation.

Mersin's success as a port city continues today because of its proximity to major international markets such as The Middle East, North Africa, The Mediterranean ports, Russian Federation and Central Asian Republics, that have drawn many businesses to its shores.
MIP plays a vital role in the economy and trade of South and Southeast Turkey, and the inland transit markets of neighbouring countries which are connected by railway such as Iraq, Syria, Iran and Central Asia.

**STRATEGIC LOCATION**

MIP is an international port embracing The Middle East and Europe in The East Mediterranean Sea. Mersin International Port (MIP) serves all the trading regimes including import, export, transit, transshipment and cabotage. Mersin is situated on Mersin Bay, a broad body of water that is open southward to the Mediterranean Sea. It is the main port for the Eastern Mediterranean Region's industry and agriculture. The port's rail link and its easy access to the international highway makes it an ideal transit port for trade to the Middle East and Black Sea regions. With its modern infrastructure and equipment, efficient cargo handling, vast storage areas and its proximity to the Free Trade Zone, Mersin is one the most important ports in East Mediterranean.
Mersin International Port (MIP) is linked by railway and highways to Turkey’s industrialized cities such as Gaziantep, Kayseri, Kahramanmaraş, Konya and to countries at borders such as Syria, Iraq and Iran. MIP is one of the most important container gateways in the Mediterranean Region with excellent transshipment and hinterland connections to the Middle East and Black Sea.
Sea. Parallel to the development of logistics sector across the world, efforts are in progress to make Mersin a leading logistics centre.

By being one of the most important ports in The East Mediterranean and with its vast hinterland, committed human resources and easy access, MIP handles a considerable portion of Turkey’s export & import volumes. Eastern Anatolia, Southeastern and Central Anatolia Regions choose MIP for their import and export activities. MIP is a port of choice for transit and transhipment operations fulfilled by dedicated and experienced staff with a service quality being at international standards.

CEYHAN YUMURTALIK PORT

The Iraq - Turkey Crude Oil Pipeline System transports the oil produced in Kirkuk and other areas of Iraq to the Ceyhan (Yumurtalık) Marine Terminal. The pipeline system with an annual transportation capacity of 35 Million tons was commissioned in 1976. The first tanker was loaded on May 25, 1977. The capacity of the line was increased to 46.5 Million tons/year through the First Expansion Project, the construction of which was started in 1983 and completed in 1984. With the completion of the Second Pipeline, which is parallel to the first one, the annual capacity reached 70.9 Million tons as of 1987. The operation of the pipeline system was suspended on August 1990, in conjunction with the embargo imposed on Iraq by the United Nations. The suspension was ceased under the agreement of UN and Iraq on May 1996 and limited oil export has been allowed since then. Crude oil loading activities were initiated on December 16, 1996 under the UN Resolution. 167,600 Thousand barrels of oil were transported by this line in 2009. Also 33,619 million cubic meters Natural Gas Exported by this line in 2009.

I want to tell something about of

EGYPT-TURKEY NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECT

The Egypt-Turkey Natural Gas Pipeline Project was developed for the purpose of diversifying the supply sources and to meet some Turkish of gas demand by importing natural gas from Egypt. Regarding to the Project a Framework Agreement was signed by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources of Turkey and the Oil Minister of Egypt on March 17, 2004 in Cairo, for the import of natural gas by BOTAS from Egypt Natural Gas Company EGAS and the transit of gas Egypt from to Europe through Turkey. According to the Agreement Egypt would export 2-4 billion m³ of natural gas to Turkey and 2-6 billion m³ to European markets through Turkey.

As a result of negotiations held in İstanbul on 16 February 2006 a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed by Energy and Natural Resources Minister of Turkey and the Oil Minister of Egypt for continuance of cooperation and collaboration between the two countries in natural gas supply.
Under this MoU working groups were formed with the participation of Syria and studies initiated for the feasibility of the Project and its needs. Related studies were conducted with related ministries and also with working groups.

ISDEMIR PORT

*ISDEMIR Port, is the greatest bulk and general cargo harbour of Eastern Mediterranean region of Turkey.* It is located in Iskenderun Gulf at the shore of Iskenderun Iron and Steel Works Co. plant that 22 km to the Iskenderun and 4 km to highways. The port is integrated to the national railways network directly.

The port capacity could correspond to ISDEMIR’s needs and also significant percent of its capacity are served to the country/region industries and commerce.

ISDEMIR, Turkey's third largest integrated iron and steel factory in terms of date of establishment and the largest in terms of long products.

ISDEMIR was designed to have 1,1 million tons/year capacity.

While the construction activities of the plants for 1,1 million tons/year capacity are continuing; works are started to increase to 2,2 million tons/year capacity.

ISDEMIR will increase from 2,2 million ton/year to 5,25 million ton/year intensively flat product production.

Turkey East Mediterranean region Ports are Mersin International port (MIP) and Iskenderun Bay ports (Including: Yumurtalık port, toros gübre port, Isdemir port, ekinciler port, and İskenderun port). These ports are very important commercial port for Turkey and east Mediterranean region.

SYRIA

Port of Lattakia

Today, the Port of Lattakia is Syria's main container port, and it handles large volumes of metals, chemicals, machinery, and foodstuffs. Managed by a semi-autonomous state company, the Port of Lattakia is undergoing renewed development today.

In 2009, 1805 vessels called at the Port of Lattakia. During that year, the Port of Lattakia handled almost 472 thousand TEUs of containerized cargo. The Port of Lattakia handles about 3 million tons of cargo per year.

The Port of Lattakia is undergoing a modernization program to improve the port's performance by adding updated equipment, streamlining work processes, and training port personnel in the latest cargo-handling and port management practices. The project includes building new silos and rehabilitating old ones, expanding the port through a three-phased process, establish a new maritime training center, and secure container-management services.
Port of Tartous

The Port of Tartous lies on Syria's western shores on the Mediterranean Sea about 42 nautical miles (about 80 kilometers by land) south of the Port of Lattakia. The Port of Tartous is the capital of the Tartus Governorate and one of the country's two major ports.

In 2008, the Port of Tartous received 2776 vessels carrying 12.9 million tons of cargo, including 10.7 million tons of imports and 2.2 million tons of exports, and 785 cruise passengers.

The major cargoes handled at the Port of Tartous included metals (3 million tons), corn (2 million tons), phosphate (1.8 million tons), and cereals (1.5 million tons). Other important cargo groups included cement (951 thousand tons), marble (826.9 thousand tons), sugar (634.5 thousand tons), foodstuffs (622.4 thousand tons), wood (489.3 thousand tons), cars (223.3 thousand tons), oils (201.3 thousand tons), fertilizers (143.3 thousand tons), and chemicals (120.7 thousand tons). Cargoes less than one hundred thousand tons included containers, sulphur, animals or livestock, iron, coal coke, equipment, and others. The Port of Tartous handled 41.6 thousand TEUs of containerized cargo in 2008, including 21.5 thousand TEUs of imports and 20 thousand tons of exports.

The Port of Tartous has several projects underway to improve and expand its facilities. Another current Port of Tartous project is the addition of central laboratories of about 3 thousand square meters that will contain four dedicated labs for human and animal foods, chemicals, minerals, and construction materials.

LEBANON

Port of Beirut

The Port of Beirut is Lebanon's biggest city, capital, and main seaport. Port of Beirut is 100 nautical miles away from southeast of Cyprus' Port of Famagusta.

Until the mid-1970s, many Westerners viewed the Port of Beirut as the most westernized city of the Arab Middle Eastern states. Unfortunately, 15 years of civil war created terrible physical and cultural damage to the community. In spite of the violence, the Port of Beirut still has a tolerant liberal atmosphere. In the 1990s, the Port of Beirut began to rebuild, and tourists are beginning to return to this jewel of the Mediterranean. In 2003, almost 1.2 million people lived in the city, and over 1.7 million called the urban area home.

The Port of Beirut is one of the biggest seaports in the Mediterranean region.

In 2008, over two thousand vessels called at the Port of Beirut. Through July, the number of vessels calling at the Port of Beirut increased from 1192 in 2008 to 1402 in 2009 (an 18% increase). In 2008, the Port of Beirut handled a total of 5.7 million tons of general goods and containers (in 527.2 thousand TEUs), 96.8 thousand cars, and 2694 passengers. Through July 2009, the Port of Beirut had handled 3.7 million tons of general goods and containers (a 9% increase over the same time in 2008), and 340.7 thousand TEUs (an 18% increase over the same time in 2008). In July 2009, the Port of Beirut had handled 56.5 thousand cars (a 47% increase over the same time in 2008).

The container terminal in the Port of Beirut has a 365 thousand square meter stacking area with capacity for 745 thousand TEUs and 440 reefer points. The Beruit Container Terminal Consortium (BCTC) seeks to provide an efficient, cost-effective multi-modal container facility
serving the Eastern Mediterranean region. The BCTC supports local economic growth and acts as a base for cargo distributions into the central Arab Peninsula.

ISRAEL

Port of Ashdod

The Port of Ashdod is Israel’s economic gateway, accounting for 60% of the country’s ocean-going trade. Located just 40 kilometers southwest of Tel Aviv, the Port of Ashdod is the closest port to Israel’s most important commercial centers and transportation networks. Ashdod is one of Israel’s most important industrial centers and home to Israel’s largest port. The Port of Ashdod has been upgraded to support Panamax ships, and several shipping companies are located there. The major industry for Ashdod is an oil refinery, one of two in the whole country. Other industries include pharmaceuticals, construction, and soybean oil. It is also home to Israel’s manufacturer of radar equipment and electronic warfare systems.

The Port of Ashdod handled 16.2 million tons of cargo in 2007 and 808.7 thousand TEUs of containerized cargo. In 2005, the first fully-computerized container port was opened at the Port of Ashdod. This modern deep-water port includes an 1150-meter extension to its main breakwater and 1.7 thousand meters of new quays with alongside depths up to 15.5 meters. A new rail terminal will soon provide for greater access between the Port of Ashdod and nearby industrial and commercial centers.

The Ashdod Port Company manages and operates the Port of Ashdod. The company’s goal is to focus on the needs of the Port’s customers. Making significant investments in the coming years, the Port of Ashdod will add state-of-the-art technology, expand the workforce, develop new docks, and enhance customer services to reduce waiting times and increase outputs. The company is also expanding the passenger terminal at the Port of Ashdod.

In 2007, the Port of Ashdod handled 16.2 thousand tons of cargo, including 7.6 thousand tons of containerized cargo in 808.7 thousand TEUs, 3.0 thousand tons of bulk cargo, and 2.5 thousand tons of general cargo.

Port of Haifa

The major industries in today’s Port of Haifa include steel foundries, shipbuilding of smaller vessels, food processing, and the manufacture of chemicals, cement, and textiles. It is also home to oil refineries and a steam-driven power plant.

The modern Port of Haifa is home to one of Israel’s two oil refineries. The refinery processes nine million tons of crude oil each year. North of the port in Haifa Bay, an outer multi-buoy anchorage supports unloading of crude oil that is piped to a tank farm by underground pipeline. The storage tanks are located at the tank farm in Kiryat Haim.

The Port of Haifa is home to Israel’s main container terminal that is a modern, efficient facility. Containers are handled at the new eastern quay and the existing western quay. In 2005, the Port of Haifa handled over 1.1 million TEUs of containerized cargo, representing 65% of all containers through Israeli ports. Also an important hub for container transshipments for the
Mediterranean and Black seas, the Port of Haifa container terminal handles over 200 thousand TEUs of container transshipments per year.
In 2006, the Port of Haifa handled 19.2 million tons of cargo dominated by 11.5 million tons of containerized cargo. The Port of Haifa also handled 2.9 million tons of oil, 2.4 million tons of bulk grains, 987 thousand tons of liquid chemicals, 922 thousand tons of bulk in grabs, and 557 thousand tons of other cargoes.

Port of Alexandria

The Port of Alexandria is the second most important city and the main seaport for Egypt. The Port of Alexandria's economy is based on the seaport, industrial and commercial activity, and agriculture. Shipping, manufacturing, banking, food processing, and the manufacture of cement and petrochemicals are important to the national economy.
In 2008, 5447 vessels called at the Port of Alexandria, including 1834 general cargo ships, 1505 container vessels, 531 bulk carriers, 320 roll-on/roll-off ships, 247 vehicle carriers, and 81 passenger cruise ships as well as a wide range of other vessel types in much smaller numbers.
The Port of Alexandria intends to become the Great Port of Alexandria and to revive the city's prominent international role by the year 2015. In order to achieve this, several projects will expand and modernize existing facilities and infrastructure.

Port Said

Port Said lies near the Suez Canal in northeastern Egypt across the canal from its twin city, Port Fouad.
Port Said industries include manufacturers of textiles, glass, watches, clothing, china, cosmetics, and automobile tires and batteries.
Port Said has capacity to handle 12.2 million tons of cargo per year, including 4.9 million tons of general cargo, 2.5 million tons of dry bulk, and 4.7 million tons of containerized cargo in 800 thousand TEUs. It can also handle 300 thousand passengers a year. The port contains total warehouse area of 90 thousand square meters and total container yard area of 435 thousand square meters.
In 2007, Port Said and Port Said East imported a combined total of 12.8 million tons of cargo, dominated by transshipments of 10.3 million tons (6.6 of those at Port Said East). Port Said handled imports of 1.2 million tons of dry bulk, 1.1 million tons of containers, and 123 thousand tons of general cargoes.
Exports passing through Port Said in 2007 totaled 12.4 million tons of cargo, including 10 million tons of transshipments (6.5 million tons each through Port Said East). Port Said also exported two million tons of containerized cargoes in 2007. Port Said handled 75% of all of Egypt’s container transshipments in 2007.

CYPRUS

As you know that Cyprus has two parts. First one is TRNC (Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus) and second one is (Greek Administration of Southern Cyprus).
Southern part of Cyprus has two ports, Port of Limassol or Lemesos, and port of Larnaca. Both ports have a 380,000 container handling capacity per year and nearly 100,000 tons of cargos handling per year. Also, some oil products are imported to southern Cyprus by Tankers. Both ports are called small size port.

For the Northern Cyprus, there is a port of Kyrenia and port of Famagusta. Both ports have limited cargo capacities, 8,000 container handling and 100,000 tons of cargoes handling per year. The exclusive economic zone debates in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea and fisheries are important issues for several reasons for the bordering nations. The Mediterranean Sea is unique due to its geographical characteristics and some conflicts already existed on maritime delimitations among some nations. It is a matter of fact that all States will have to reach agreement, regarding proclamations of the delimitation of the Exclusive Economic Zone in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea. Equitable and reasonable principals and solutions are needed for the delimitation of maritime areas.

Turkey has 1577 km long coastline in the Mediterranean Sea starting from Fethiye to Samandag border up to Syria. 1851 fishing boats fishing in the territorial waters and high sea areas.

Turkey could not accept de facto EEZ Exclusive Economic Zone proclamations due to damage vital economical interests in the eastern Mediterranean Sea as limiting fishing rights in the high seas. Besides, the mineral and oil resources in the high seas are also substantial matter.

The Mediterranean Sea is very peculiar for the maritime delimitations due to several islands mostly in Aegean and Adriatic Seas; historical gulfs like Gabes and two parts do not reach 200 nautical miles. EEZ Exclusive Economic Zone delimitation in this sea has already discussed several experts e.g. Exclusive Economic Zone delimitation between Egypt and Southern Cyprus, this agreement could not be accepted by Turkey in many ways, inter alia, delimitation is not equitable and fair and not protects the rights of Turkey. Greek Administration of Southern Cyprus can not authorize to represent all Cyprus Island and to do international agreement for the name of entire Cyprus Island. This unfair and unacceptable agreement has serious impacts to the Turkish fishing fleet. Fishing ground is limited and smaller in very narrow and restricted areas which is not reasonable such a big and strong fishing fleet and long coastline. Turkey will have to dedicate special attention for the highly migratory fish stocks which will occur within its territorial waters and adjacent areas with the status of either the high seas or future EEZ of other Mediterranean countries which may proclaim them (Syria, Lebanon, Turkey, Egypt, Northern and Southern Cyprus, Israel and others). All these states will have to reach agreement, regarding coordination of the measures necessary for conservation and optimal utilization of these vulnerable stocks.

Having proclaimed its EEZ Exclusive Economic Zone, Turkey will be entitled to establish measures regarding the protection of the marine environment, conservation and management of the marine resources of the significant part of the Mediterranean Sea. Marine pollution mostly Marpol/73-78 implementation is very slow in the eastern Mediterranean Sea even main route
for the oil traffic route. Ship-originated pollution in many areas is in considerable level due to lack of port receiving facilities. Concerted action also needed under the REMPEC for the mitigation of illegal discharges from the ships in the eastern basin mostly in high seas areas. Turkey promotes international cooperation in the field of marine scientific research between other Mediterranean countries. Special priorities set up mostly for the migratory fish quotas, stocks assessment of the pelagic and migratory stocks, Total allowable catch and their maximum sustainable yield based on scientific research also important for the management of the bioresources. Oil spill monitoring in entire Levantine sea, biological invasion and tropicalisation of the eastern Mediterranean sea are also priorities. In fact, Turkey leads two cruises for those purposes in the last two years in the area. Potential mineral and oil resources sharing also another core issue for debates.
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Abstract

After the decline Rome Empire, Cyprus that became the supremacy of Byzantium, was the source of struggles and fought among great powers for many times. As the result of Crusade invasions at the end of XI century the countries of Eastern Mediterranean region, as well as Cyprus came in the phase of destructions and wars. The king of England, lion-hearted Richard invaded the island and sold it to the ex-king of Jerusalem, Qui de Luzinyan and at the result of it, the Crusade phase of Cyprus history began. During this period there were created unusual institutions in the island, the exploitation regime reestablished. Europeans formed their own rules here and did their best to establish the society in the sample of France. The area of the island was divided into small estates as well. The invaders made the policy of violation against Greeks and Arabs, and the individual freedom of peasants were reduced. During the Crusade reign, the Luzinyans utilized Cyprus as for post against Muslim countries. Antalya (1361), Iskenderun (1365) were invaded by Cyprus Crusades. At the end of XI century Cyprus was invaded by Venice. Only after the annexing of the island by the Ottoman Empire, the pursuits of Greeks and their church were over; the cathedral of Cyprus became the unofficial owner of the island.

Key words: Byzantine, Crusades, capture, Muslim people, provasolian church, The Ottoman phase

INTRODUCTION

The Cyprus Island being one of the centers of world civilizations was on the viewpoint of great statesmen because of its geographical position from the ancient history. It was also the centre of various culture, nations, languages and religions. The Cyprus Island, which was in the VI millennium B.C., still in IV millennium B.C. it became the developed civilization. The Island had deep trade and cultural relations with Egypt, Syria and Palestine. The Cyprus became the commercial and shipbuilding centre of the ancient world.¹ But even in the ancient time there began the period of invasions in the history of Cyprus. At First, it was captured by Assyria, then Egypt, Iran, Alexander Makedonsky and Roman Empire. In 395 Cyprus which was captured by the Roman Empire fell under the supremacy of Eastern Rome Empire (future Byzantine Empire) Namely Iran that time there began Christianity phase

¹ Illustrated encyclopedia “Rusika” History of Middle Ages. Moscow: 2004, p. 299
of the Cyprus Island.: V century Cyprus Church was declared independent. Then that times the leaders of the island was elected from Greeks. The reign of Byzantine didn’t change the economic and political development of the Cyprus positively, instead of it, its commercial, happened in the VI century caused to the destruction of ancient cities and economic-cultural values of Cyprus. The creation of the Caliphate and the spreading of Islam put its trace to the history of Cyprus. In 654 the island was occupied by Muslims, in 688 according to the treaty signed by Justinian the II and Abd-al-Malik Cyprus became a neutral country. But as this neutrality the Byzantine Empire didn’t observe the agreement the Muslim people of the island had to move from there in 8th-9th centuries. Byzantine, which utilized this chance, captured Cyprus again in 965.

1. CYPRUS IN THE EVE OF CRUSADE INVASION
The invasion of Cyprus by Byzantine again influenced to its political, economic and cultural development. So that new appointed governors of the island by Byzantine increased taxes, pursued the population ordinary people. Although some historians call this phase the period of prosperity in Cyprus history but the weakness of commercial relations, departure of Muslim people from the island completely, the revolts of Greeks against the Byzantine administration was the contrary to this idea. Certainly, the political fought inside of Byzantine, military alliances were also reflected in the life stock and development of Cyprus negatively. Generally, the political history of Byzantine enriched with military fought for the reign, often change of dynasties, appeals of emperors to foreigners, even enemies in order to keep their rule were typical for this empire. And of course these factors influenced to the development of the areas that were under the supremacy of the empire as well as Cyprus.
Comnins dynasty, which leaded to the Byzantine Empire in 1081-1185 wasn’t the exception in this issue: the reign of this dynasty confronted with the crusade of Western European countries to the East. All these facts were the sample of bitter history of Cyprus. In 1185, the last representative of this dynasty Isaac Comnin declared himself the independent emperor of Cyprus-basilevs. This reign in the island put very negative results to the history of the island, as he was very cruel and Self-confident person. That’s why ordinary people of Cyprus revolted against the authority of d Comnin. During this Struggles there came new her to the scene of crusade history Lion-hearted Richard and his role to the future destiny of Cyprus was very big.

2. THE PHASE OF “LATIN REIGN” IN CYPRUS (1192-1488)
This history of Cyprus is sometimes called “the francocratia” in historiography. The basic of this phase is related to the III crusade, as the Cyprus Company organized by lion-hearted Richard was the content of the III crusade. Although the historians call Richard the hero, his actions was far from heroism. This participation in Crusade wasn’t related to the struggle for religion, but eager of capture of lands and wealth.
Richard’s march to Palestine crossed by Sicilia confronted with great resistance of crusade leaders. Richard Stayed here from May to June 1191. Namely, because of the support of Cyprus, lion-hearted Richard was able to capture the island. The aid of ordinary people to Crusade leader was also related to the tyranny of Isaac Comnenos; that’s why they greeted lion-hearted Richard With great pleasure, and even according to some sources ordinary people shaved their beards in order to look like Richard.

But soon, the real face of Crusade leaders was opened: these main allies were Qvi de Luzinyan, his brother Qodfrua, Boemund the III, Onfrua. They wanted the only thing from the island: to plunder the island, obtain the wealth and so on. For this purpose Richard applied heavy taxes on population and ordinary people revolted against this action.

At the result of this revolt lion-hearted Richard decided to sell the island, and wanted 100,000 dinar for Cyprus. Tampliyers couldn’t found this sum and Richard found new costumer: he was Qvi de Luzinyan, who Jerusalem reign. The authority of the heirs of Qvi de Luzinyan continued in Cyprus for 300 years. That’s why these years are called “the phase francocratia” (as Luzinyans were Frenchmen by origin and there were settled a plenty of French people to Cyprus in those years).

During the reign of Luzinyans the governors did their best to establish in Cyprus the administration like in France. The ordinary people (Greeks, Arabs and so on) were violated by Crusade participants. At the same time with heavy taxes, they implemented the policy of religions discrimination as well. So that as Crusade leaders were Catholics, they pursued the provaslavian people of Cyprus, Greek confessors were withdrawn from the island.

The last column of Crusade leaders in Palestine-Accra was re-occupied by Muslims in 1291. After this event Cyprus became their “hope”. Christians utilized Cyprus as military platform against Muslim countries as well. They were eager to restaurate the Crusade again. For example, the Crusade king of Cyprus - Pieter I (1359-1369) attacked Turkey and invaded Antalya in 1361, and in 1365 he captured and plundered Iskenderun (Egypt).

In XIV century Cyprus came to its temporary improvement: the commercial importance of the island increased, agriculture was restaurated. Especially at this time the position of cities of Italy as Venice and Geneva in the island strengthened. In 1373 Geneva captured the commercial center of the island - Famaqusta and Luzinyans could withdraw them from Cyprus only by the aid of Egypt in 1464.

3. CYPRUS GOES UNDER THE SUPREMACY OF VENICE

In the beginning of XV century the political and military circumstances in Cyprus in complicated. On the other side the economic and commercial spheres here turned to the bad side. In 1426 the troops of Egypt sultan invaded and captured Cyprus.

In 1460 the governor of Cyprus became Jacob Bastard II (1460-1473). He married to the daughter of the richest family of Venice - Catherine Cornaro and after his death Catherine became the queen of Cyprus. During her reign (1474-1489) the interference of Venice to the island increased. Namely during the reign of this woman the great Crusade took place: The naval army of Venice, Neapol, Rome Cathedral, Cyprus and Rodeos fired Turkey’s cities -

---

6 Ibid, p. 43
7 Illustrated encyclopedia “Rusika” History of Middle Ages. Moscow: 2004, p. 299-300
8 Ibid, p. 300
Antalya, Smyrna, Izmir and so on. In 1489 Cyprus went to the supremacy of Venice. The supremacy of Venice in Cyprus didn’t influence to the circumstances in the region in a positive way, instead of it there occurred fought between Cyprus feudal and the noble men of Venice. As the officials of Venice were interested in the trade, the agriculture didn’t develop as well. As Venice gave attention to commercial sphere, the agriculture of the island didn’t develop. The population of Cyprus so disagreed with this situation that, they wanted aid from Ottoman Sultan. As the people moved to Turkey the real number of the island decreased about 150.000.

4. CYPRUS UNDER THE SUPREMACY OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE
Difficult circumstances that were Cyprus in, strengthened political fought among the countries of Western Europe. The struggle of Venice against the Ottoman Empire in the Eastern Mediterranean region increased the situation in a bad way. In 1571 there was organized new Crusade against the Ottoman Empire and it was intensified the struggle of European countries against Cyprus. At this time Rome Cathedral and Spain also participated in the attack together with Venice. These 3 countries created “Holy Alliance” against Ottoman Empire. On October 7, 1571 although the Ottoman Army lost the battle near Lepanto, allied countries began the fought among one another. On March 7, 1573 according to the treaty between Venice and the Ottoman Empire Cyprus went to the supremacy of the Ottoman Empire. When Turks came to Cyprus the Greek people of the island decreased and 47 thousand people of 84 thousand were Turks for 1572. In order to increase the number of population the Ottoman Empire declared movement from other islands and Balkans as well. So, for the first time after 200 years Byzantine, 300 years Latin authority, Greeks weren’t pursued for their ethnic identity. Another positive side of the reign of the Ottoman Empire was that, position of provaslavian church strengthened. That’s why English politician Turner wrote that, “the governors of Cyprus are archiepiscopal and cathedrals”.

CONCLUSION
According to historians classic Crusades were over at the result of the capture of Accra- capital of the kingdom of Jerusalem in 1291. But this relation didn’t end till the island occupied by the Ottoman Empire. Although Croissant states of the Middle East were destructed, Cyprus had been under the supremacy of Crusades for a long time yet. During this period political, economic and cultural spheres of Cyprus vanished. There happened a lot of invasions in mankind, but none of them was so cruel than Crusades: these invasions reduced the development of various nations, regions and cultures. Nowadays the name of Cyprus Island is in the agenda as an international problem: the creation of this problem is related to the modern events, but we can certainly mention that, the events occurred during the Crusades also influenced to the solving of Cyprus problem.

10 Illustrated encyclopedia “Rusika” History of Middle Ages. Moscow: 2004, p. 300
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Abstract

Despite its present fragmentation on north-south and east-west axes, the Mediterranean world has been a common sphere of civilisation marked by constant and intense communication and confrontation throughout ages. While the main impetus of communication and interaction was trade, efforts of political unification and power relations in this area brought about conflicts. Thus, while communication and interaction by means of trade made up a tendency towards cultural unification in this area, political conflicts played as fragmentary factors. Within this world, three centres of gravity came to the fore: the area extending from the eastern shores of the Mediterranean to Mesopotamia, Egypt and the Aegean basin. Cyprus, not only for being located just at the heart of the area surrounded by these focal areas of the Mediterranean, but also for being a natural and cultural extension of the Aegean world and Asia Minor, has a crucial place in this setting. It is in this setting that, the relationship between Cyprus and Europe seems quite peculiar.

At first sight, and especially in the context of European Integration in which the island has been involved for two decades now, this relationship seems so natural and clear that one could hardly dare to question Cyprus’s Europeanness. However, let alone the specific geopolitical conditions of Cyprus and its relations to the rest of the Mediterranean world, even the long-discussed question of “where does Europe end?” require a closer look on the peculiar nature of the relations between Cyprus and Europe. Thus, rather than questioning the Cyprus’s – rather recent and evident – Europeanness, the main purpose of this paper is to assess the nature and main features of the relationship between Cyprus and Europe, re-formulating the afore-mentioned question as “Where does Europe extend?”. Departing from this main question, it will be also asked “what makes Cyprus European?”. For this purpose, the role and place of Cyprus in Europe’s relations to the Levant and the Middle East will be analysed emphasising the periods of high degree of commercial circulation and conflicts throughout history. It will be argued that, although the island is located at the “centre of the centres” of the Mediterranean World, its special relations with the Western parts of Europe have transformed the island into an “extension” – if not an outpost – of Europe. This main argument will be elaborated through geopolitical and historical perspectives as well as drawing back to the constructive – and de-constructive – approaches on the question of Europe’s frontiers.
Introduction

As a huge amount of water posing numerous challenges to overcome, at first sight, the sea seems to be a geographical obstacle and hence a perfect determinant of natural borders of lands surrounded by, or located around itself. However, the knowledge of navigation makes a perfect environment of communication and interaction out of sea, which becomes a field in itself, bridging the distant shores and cultures. Needless to say, the main impetus for navigation has been trade and the Mediterranean basin has formed a perfect example of such an interaction. From the time immemorial, the immediate surroundings of the Mediterranean Sea have formed a common area of culture and civilisation. Some expressions such as “internal sea”, “Mare Nostrum”, etc. all imply uniqueness, unity and centrality of this part of the world, the unification being centred on the sea both in material and cultural terms.

On the other hand, although at first sight it might look contradictory or paradoxically complementary, besides trade, this area has almost always been characterised by constant conflicts from the time immemorial. Therefore, the sea and insular pieces of lands have also served as refuges throughout history for the people living on the shores of the Mediterranean. Especially in the Middle Ages, this dimension of the sea was so crucial that as Alcuin put in a didactic manner, the answer to “what is the sea?” (quid est mare?) was formulated as “a refuge in time of danger” (refugium in periculis). This motto, chosen as an epigraph to enlighten the very origins of the Venetian state, and the insular characteristics of its birth place, also characterises the ensuing nature of the Venetian politics and diplomacy across the Mediterranean. Thus, it should not be regarded as a coincidence that also the island of Cyprus once served as a “refuge” for Venetians in the Eastern Mediterranean for a while. This argument, which will be further elaborated below, suggest the paradoxical nature of being on an island, i.e. both being isolated from surroundings, and being within reach of very distant shores linked by maritime activity. It is out of this setting that the peculiar nature of Cyprus’s relation to Europe emerges. The main purpose of this paper is to suggest a closer look to this relationship. At this point, it should be clarified that it is not intended here to question Cyprus’s Europeanness, but rather to draw attention to the peculiarity of the relationship between the island and Europe. Appropriate question for this purpose might be formulated as follows: “What are the bases for Cyprus’s Europeanness?” Another – auxiliary – question, which might further help can be: “Why Cyprus’s Europeanness has been taken so naturally for granted?”

To address these questions, especially the former one, firstly the nature of insularity and Cyprus’s sui generis features as a Mediterranean island will be briefly accounted for, under the first two titles below. Then the historical background will be outlined from very early periods up until the last quarter of the 19th century, with particular respect to the interplay of trade and conflicts. This overview reflects a diachronic approach, which is expected to provide hints of structural features of the geo-economics and geo-politics of the island. Under the following title, the relationship between Cyprus and Europe will be tackled, taking into account the mostly-discussed question of “where does Europe end?” In this part conventional sources of Europeanness of Cyprus will be critically assessed.

1 Horatio F. Brown, Venetian Studies, Kegan Paul and Trench, London 1887, p.2
Insularity and the Paradox of Isolation

As stated briefly above, insularity reflects certain seemingly contradictory and paradoxically complementary aspects: isolation\(^2\) and hence autonomous features; barren lands and hence dependency on the “terra firma” and the intrinsic problem of being charted as “non-terra firma”. It is out of these aspects that the above-stated function of “refuge” arises. In the case of Venice, early history of which was shaped by the idea of taking refuge in the islands of Laguna in the face of external threats, geographical-topographical constraints eventually led to dynamism which ended up in a maritime empire. In the Aegean islands, structural geo-economic dependence on the mainland and scarcity of natural sources, agriculture etc. led the inhabitants to maritime activity, eventually giving rise to huge trade fleets and de-facto economic independence. This was the case not only during the ancient times but also in the early modern period, during which the most isolated and poorest islands (in terms of natural resources) such as Psara, Spetses, Hydra, ironically became the richest and most powerful ones, due to maritime trade, paving the way for Greek national awakening\(^3\).

Reflected by these examples, the curious nature of insularity, referred to as “island paradox”\(^4\), is accounted for by Braudel in following terms:

‘Isolation’ is a relative phenomenon. That the sea surrounds the islands and cuts them off from the rest of the world more effectively than any other environment is certainly true whenever they are really situated outside the normal sea routes. But when they are integrated into shipping routes, and for one reason or another (often external and quite gratuitous reasons) become one of the links in a chain, they are on the contrary actively involved in the dealings of the outside world, less cut off from them than some inaccessible mountain areas\(^5\).

Thus, despite their differing levels of isolation, islands are at the same time strikingly exposed to interaction and they are intricately linked into broader social, cultural, and politico-economic networks, serving as nodes where maritime communities meet and communicate, and where long-distance trading networks and island alliances form and develop\(^6\). As a consequence of this curious phenomenon, an island, “isolated” from its immediate surroundings by the sea can be linked to remote shores by means of trade routes. This “accessibility” made possible by maritime activity can also have political and cultural consequences. Needless to say, the case of Cyprus offers a striking example of these observations. In order to assess these arguments in the context of Cyprus, it seems necessary to have a closer look at the historical and geopolitical aspects of Cyprus’s position in the Mediterranean world, with particular reference to the

---

2 It should be noted that both the words “insularity” and “isolation” derive from the same root in Latin “insula” meaning “island” (Webster’s Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language, Gramercy Books, New York 1996).

3 Sırrı Erinç, Talip Yücel, Ege Denizi, Türkiye ile Komşu Ege Adaları [Aegean Sea, Islands Neighbouring Turkey], Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yay., Ankara 1988, pp. 82-83;


6 Knapp, 20.
periods marked by the increasing volume of commerce and to those characterised rather by conflicts.

Cyprus and the Mediterranean: A Land in the Middle of Lands

As an island, Cyprus shares many of the above stated generic features of the islands dispersed around the Mediterranean world. As a matter of course, it also reflects the consequences of insularity. However, additional to these general traits of islands, certain factors give Cyprus some more idiosyncratic characteristics that make it a unique case in the Mediterranean. These characteristics are its spatial extent and natural resources which has fostered self-sufficiency and its location at the heart of the ancient centres of the Mediterranean.

In the first place, as the third biggest island in the Mediterranean (following Sicily and Sardinia) Cyprus stands out (along with other larger islands) because of its spatial extent, natural resources and geographical configuration. Its spatial extent, dimensions and the breakdown of mountainous and plain lands provide the island (unlike many islands in the Mediterranean) with relatively sufficient water supplies and agriculture areas. These features in turn not only bring about self-sufficiency for the islanders, but also lay the foundations of an export-based economy deriving mainly from agriculture, as well as other natural sources such as copper ores, salt reserves etc.

It is on the base of this setting that from the very early phases of its development, Cyprus has been marked by an original island culture distinct from its surroundings. It seems that this pattern, especially the self-sufficiency continued to exist right into the early modern period.

The second characteristic of Cyprus, which distinguishes it from other Mediterranean islands, is its location. The “strategic location” argument is widely accepted and referred to, but what touches the main arguments of this paper somewhat exceeds the classical argument of strategic position and touches a particular aspect of this position. Accordingly, Cyprus is located at the “centre of the centres” of the Mediterranean world, which are as follows: Mesopotamia, Egypt and the Aegean basin. These three centres of gravity, each of which came to the fore during the crucial periods of Mediterranean history laid the foundations of Mediterranean civilisation. Consequently, for certain periods, Cyprus became parts of the empires emerged from these areas. Among these, the role of the Aegean has been the most important, as from the very early periods onwards the island has become and remained as an extension of the Aegean world. At this point, a clarification might be needed as to the role of the Roman Empire and whether Rome (and the Italian peninsula) might also be seen as a fourth centre of gravity exercising influence on the island. As known, Rome emerged as a political power at the western margin of the Aegean world, which comprised not only littoral parts of Anatolia and South Balkans but also South Italy. Then, not only it assumed the cultural legacy of the Aegean world, but from 4th century onwards it carried its very capital towards the centre of this world, transforming Byzantium into “New Rome”. Consequently, Aegean world itself experienced a shift of centre

7 Knapp, 3.
within itself, from classical metropolitan centres such as Athens, Ephesus, and Pergamum to Istanbul. In this context, Rome should also be regarded as part of the Aegean world in wider sense. Thus, following Mesopotamia and Egypt, Aegean world centred on Istanbul has become the last and the longest-lasting centre of the Mediterranean. But needless to say, other ancient centres kept their crucial positions, albeit as remote extensions of Roman, Byzantine or Ottoman Empires. Thus, in any case, for hundreds of years, the island of Cyprus has remained as part of these centres and been virtually at the heart of the Mediterranean.

As a consequence of the aforementioned phenomenon of insularity, while the island remained central with reference to its surroundings, periods marked by armed conflicts such as crusades, made the island “refuge” and hence extension – or outpost – of remote political-religious centres, located mainly in Western Europe. The peculiarity of Cyprus’s relationship to Europe arises in this setting. Accordingly, from the emergence of European trade centres onwards, island’s commercial relations with Western Europe have been as intense as those with its immediate surroundings. During the peaceful periods when trade and diplomatic relations went on smoothly, the island had a central position both with reference to its surroundings and to the relations between Europe and the Levant. Whereas periods marked by conflicts, tended to lead the island to a marginal position both with reference to its surroundings and Europe. This argument will be further elaborated after having overviewed the interplay of trade and conflict on and around the island up until modern times.

Trade and Conflict in Cyprus throughout History: An Overview

From the time immemorial, the island of Cyprus has always been a flourishing hub of trade and transport due to its favourable position at the crossroads of Eastern Mediterranean. As early as the late Bronze Age, the island had established overseas trade relations and its interconnections with the outside world focused especially on Egypt. The wealth brought about by trade during this period was based on copper and olive oil production, as well as manufacture of vases for the export market. In fact, it was during the course of the period referred to as Bronze Age (c.2700/2650–1100 BC) that the island underwent a transformation from an isolated, village-based culture into an international, town-centred, perhaps even state-level polity. Although main factors of these developments differ greatly, the island’s central location with reference to its surroundings as a nodal point of trade and interaction is beyond discussion.

Needless to say, island’s centrality has changed through ages in accordance with the shifting of centres of gravity in the Mediterranean. But what is for certain, from the earliest periods to the wake of modernity, except for certain periods of conflicts, the island’s trade relations with the outside world have always flourished. Concrete data, which form the basis for this observation can be traced back through consular reports, travellers’ logs etc. as far back as 16th century.

10 Knapp, 1.
As early as the first years of the 16th century, British ships were carrying English cloth to Crete, Cyprus and Syria in exchange for silks, spices, oils, carpets and mohair yarn. Except for the periods of armed conflict, especially between the Ottoman Empire and the Venice, trade in this area was carried out without obstacle. Shortly after the conquest of the island by Ottomans, which brought the end of Venetian rule in the area, trade relations were rearranged. As for centuries Venice played the role of bridge between eastern and western parts of the Mediterranean world, its decline had also brought about a temporary decline in the Mediterranean trade. It was in this setting that Western European countries started to get into direct trade contacts in the region. At the end of the decade following the conquest of Cyprus by Ottomans, certain merchants of London were incorporated as the “Turkey Company”, laying the foundations of the Levant Company. On the expiry of the patent granted by Queen Elizabeth in 1588, the Turkey Company’s patent was not renewed due to a conflict of interests with the Venice Company, founded in 1583. In 1592 both companies were merged together as the Levant Company, which arranged the British Isles’ trade relations with the region up until its dissolution in 1825. This Company, during its lifetime, appointed and paid all the British consuls and consular offices in the Ottoman Empire. It was due to increasing trade relations and the role of Cyprus that Western European countries started to appoint diplomatic representatives on the island. Although existence of a British vice consul on the island is traced back to 1626, the first regular appointment of a consul occurred in 1636. According to Turkish sources, the first consulates opened on the island were of France, Britain and Venice. During the following decades Netherlands, Holy Roman Empire, Sweden, Kingdom of Two Sicilies and the Republic of Ragusa had also appointed consuls to Cyprus, all of whom were located in Larnaca. Among them, the most active ones were the British and French, due to the intensity of trade with their respective countries. Especially French Levant Company was active on the island throughout the 17th century, whereas British Levant Company’s “factory” (trade centre) in Cyprus rose into importance during the 18th century.

Between 16th and 20th centuries, the most important products of Cyprus being subject to foreign trade were grain, wine, seeds, locust-beans, cotton, madder roots, silk and salt. Hamilton Lang, who served in Cyprus during 1860s and 70s as vice consul and consul of Britain reports that, while the area allocated for grain production amounted to around 350 sq. km., (87,000 acres) in 1844, he estimates that as of 1878 around 450 sq. km. (112 acres) was used for grain production, mainly barley and wheat. Basing on a previous consular report,
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12 Wood, 3-4.
17 Özkul, 112.
18 Özkul, 113.
Lang writes that in 1862, while wheat production of the island estimated to be around 1500 tons (120000 quarters), barley produced on the island was estimated at 2250 tons (180000 quarters). In fact, during this period agriculture was reported as on the increase, both in area and quality, the tithes having increased more than one third in amount from 1865 to 1872.

Island’s cotton supply to Europe, which had already been of considerable amounts under the Venetian rule, continued during the Ottoman period. As relevant sources indicate, along with Izmir, the island was the chief supplier of cotton for Manchester manufacturers during the first half of the 17th century. During this period, the cotton of Cyprus was transferred to British Isles by means of the factory of the Levant Company. Therefore, Cyprus is referred to as “a very early contributor to the wealth of Manchester.” As far as the British textile industry is concerned, another contribution of the island – along with Izmir, Naples and Syria – was the madder root, out of which the red colour referred to as “Turkey red” was extracted. The article was largely exported to Britain by the Levant Company and it was only from the last quarter of the 19th century onwards that the exports started to decrease due to the development of cheaper ways for dying textiles. A related branch of industry was printing of British calicoes, which were in high demand in the Ottoman Empire. Albany Savile reports that towards mid-19th century, there was an intense trade of these articles and numerous establishments located around Nicosia were printing British calicoes in bright colours for divan and quilt covers, window blinds etc., which were exported in great quantities to Istanbul, Izmir and Syria.

Basing on consular reports, Savile writes that during the second half of the 19th century this industry started to decline due to high exportation duty charged upon the articles.

Although not largely produced in Cyprus, thanks to the exceptional quality of silk cocoons, silk and silk cocoons were also articles of export. While the export of silk cocoons was headed towards France, merchants from Beirut used to come over yearly to buy cocoons and stifle them with their small portable machines. Although not much in quantity, local manufacture of silk was also worthy of attention, as far as the high quality of the articles are concerned. Accordingly, Savile reports that some very pretty light silk stuffs were manufactured in Nicosia by women, for dresses, scarfs, shirts, mosquito nets, and pocket-handkerchiefs; the latter being “especially good and considered equal to any made in France.”

Wine production was also considerable for the external trade of the island. During the first decades of the second half of the 19th century, annual production of wine is reported as around three millions of gallons. The exports of wine in 1861 and 1862 were respectively 707,000 and

21 Lang, 224-225.
22 Fred Fisher, Cyprus, Our New Colony and What We Know about It, George Routledge and Sons, London 1878, p. 72.
23 Lang, 229.
24 Lang, 228.
25 Lang, 234-236.
26 Albany R. Savile, Cyprus, Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, London 1878, p. 144
27 Savile, 144.
28 Lang, 236.
29 Savile, 144-145.
824,940 gallons. As of 1878, all the exports headed towards Syria and Alexandria, except for a modest amount of famous Commandaria wine sent to Trieste.

The fruit of the carob tree grown chiefly around Limasol, Larnaca and Kyrenia, was also a traditionally important article of export. Lang reports that as of 1878, the annual export was about 10,000 tons, heading mainly towards Russia, where it was highly esteemed and eaten as fruit.

Leather products were also traditional objects of trade which were drawing attention with their high quality, softness and brilliant colours. Accordingly, “very fine blue, yellow and red leathers were made for Turkish shoes and slippers, a considerable quantity of which was exported to Alexandria”.

Another product crucial for island’s trade was salt, which was extracted from the Salt Lake nearby Larnaca. Salt production seems to have enormously increased during the 19th century and as of 1878, the yearly sales were about 12,000 tons, exports targeting mainly the coasts of Syria. Among other groups of products, sponges of all sizes and qualities sold to Syrian buyers, as well as tobacco, linseed and sesame were worthy of mention, the latter referred to as of excellent quality and being exported chiefly to France.

As shown by these data, from the time immemorial up until to the early modern times, the island of Cyprus had always intense connections not only with its immediate surroundings around the Eastern Mediterranean and with the centre of the Empire, but also with western European trade centres as far as Manchester, London etc. Negative impacts of conflicts on trade were tried to be minimised by diplomatic arrangements in the aftermath of conflicts, as the creation of Levant Company and consular offices of various European nations on the island indicate.

The end of the British Levant Company sheds light on the intertwined natures of trade, diplomacy, politics and conflicts in the region. As Britain’s interests in the region were mostly trade-related up until the 19th century, the Company, founded by a royal charter both financing and appointing consuls in Ottoman Turkey, was acting as a loose diplomatic extension of British Isles in the region. The role of the company in diplomatic setting was to such an extent that the seal used on official consular documents bore not the British but the Company’s arms. Thus, rather than its own administrative problems or changing patterns of trade in the region, it was because of the growing complexity of Ottoman Empire’s political relations with the Western Europe that the British representatives in the Empire were made directly responsible to their government, dissolving the Levant Company.
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As was the case during the late Middle Ages, towards the last quarter of the 19th century, interest in Cyprus once again started to rise, perceived as a “pied-à-terre” by European powers, mainly France and Britain\(^{38}\). It is in this context that the strategic importance of the island once more came to the fore and with the British rule the island once more became an extension of Western Europe in the region. Upon this background, it might be interesting to further question the roots of Cyprus’s Europeanness, a question which seems especially interesting with reference to the eternal question of “where does Europe end?”. For the sake of arguments held throughout these paper, it seems apt to re-formulate this question as “where does Europe extend to?”

Cyprus and Europe: Where does Europe [Ext]end [to]?

Given the current situation and Cyprus’s being part of the European integration, the complementary questions of “what makes Cyprus European” and “where does Europe extend to?” seem at first sight quite obsolete and naive. However, what makes these questions, and especially the first one worthy to be addressed is the very fact that they have not been addressed so far, which in turn suggest that their answer, i.e. Cyprus’s being European was taken for granted. It is for this reason that the issue needs to be addressed, not to argue or question Cyprus’s being European but to question the roots and nature of this identity.

Possible and alternative answers to the question “what Makes Cyprus European?” might be as follows: Hellenic Element, Christianity, Gothic Legacy, British Legacy and EU dimension. In the light of the following quote from the relevant literature, which reflects a generally-accepted viewpoint, assessment of these probable answers is expected to become easier:

“Our has been part of this [european] heritage on many levels. First, the anthropological and ethnic origin of the country descends from the Mycenaeans, who first settled the island in the 16th century BC spreading the Greek language and culture to the indigenous population. The island was also controlled by other European cultures such as the Romans (58 BC–AD 395), the Byzantines (395–1191), the English Crusaders (AD 1191), the French Lusignans (1192–1489) the Venetians (1489–1571) and the British Empire (1878–1960) who brought their own customs and traditions and influenced the fabric of the island’s society.”\(^{39}\)

According to the same viewpoint, the island “was also conquered by non-European cultures such as the Assyrians and Egyptians (8th–7th century BC), Persians (6th century BC), the Arabs (AD 649–965) and the Ottoman Empire (1571–1878).”\(^{40}\)

Although classical Greece and Roman legacy are conventionally accepted as the primary sources of European culture, and although they are utilised as discursive tools to ground and construct the European identity, main concern of both the Hellenistic and Roman mentality was universality, rather than being confined to a certain geographical area as Europe. As a matter of fact, these cultures have flourished originally across the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean

\(^{38}\) Lang, 193.


\(^{40}\) Sepos, 16.
world. Moreover, with the Christianity and especially upon the great schism between Catholicism and Orthodoxy, Eastern Orthodoxy developed an identity in opposition to western Catholicism, often inimically identified with “Europe”. In Cyprus it was the reflection of this identity that the “Frankish rule” (Frangokratia) has always remained alien and unpopular to local Greek Orthodox population of the island\textsuperscript{41}. Across the territories of the Eastern Roman (Byzantine) and Ottoman Empires this identity was expressed through “Romiosini” (Ρωµιοσύνη, Romanness) which reflected the universal nature of Roman legacy combined with Orthodox Christianity. As known, this legacy was also adopted also by Turks as “Rûmîlik” (Romanness), this time mainly perceived as a geographical identity but still with reference to civilisation and universality\textsuperscript{42}. According to this perception, the concept of “Rûm” corresponds firstly to the Anatolian plateau and in wider sense to the areas surrounding the Aegean Sea, theoretically including the rest of Europe. Thus, although ancient Greek or Hellenistic culture, Roman legacy, and Christianity have contributed to the emergence and development of the idea of Europe, they can hardly be identified with Europe itself. In so doing one would limit and distort the historical scope of these concepts characterised by universality.

Thus, neither Greek, nor Roman cultures, nor Christianity can be referred to as sources for Cyprus’s Europeanness, given that these elements are found elsewhere outside Europe originally and indigenously, and given that their main concern is universality. The remaining arguments are the medieval European rule on the island, which can roughly be referred to as the “Gothic legacy”; British rule and the ongoing European integration. Among these, so-called Gothic legacy include the period starting with the crusades and ending with the Ottoman conquest of the island. As known, rulers of the island during this period were originating mainly from Western Europe. The culture, architecture etc. they brought was originated in Western Europe. Needless to say, their existence on the island was at the expense of both Eastern Roman (Byzantine) and Ottoman powers and the main function of the island during this period was rather a military outpost of Western Europe.

Although originating from Western Europe and despite its “europanising” impacts on the island, British Empire was also something exceeding the scope of Europe, claiming a type of globality – if not universality. As far as the European integration is concerned, although it was initially economically motivated with only implicit political connotations, the Association Agreement signed in 1972 between the Republic of Cyprus and the EEC reflected strategic concerns of EEC\textsuperscript{43}. To quote from Christou:

\textit{“From the EEC perspective it made sense to draw Cyprus into the European club and make it economically interdependent. The reason for this however, was more strategic than economic from a European point of view. It had little to gain economically from Cyprus at that time, but the importance of attaining political stability in the region and the strategic importance of}

\textsuperscript{41} Nuri Çevikel, \textit{ Kıbrıs'ta Osmanlı Mirası (1570-1960)}, [Ottoman Legacy in Cyprus], 47 Numara Yayıncılık, Istanbul 2006, pp. 113-120, 130.
\textsuperscript{42} Salih Özbaran, \textit{ Bir Osmanlı Kimliği, 14-17. Yüzyıllarda Rûm/Rümi Aidiyet ve İmgeleri}, [An Ottoman Identity, Rûm/Rümi Identity and Images in 14-17\textsuperscript{th} Centuries], Kitap Yaynevi, Istanbul 2004, pp. 89-108.
Cyprus as a bridge to the Middle East overrode any economic argument. The aims and interests of the EC have been longstanding and have not changed substantially since then.”

On the other hand, from 1970s onwards, despite its traditional non-aligned foreign policy, Greek Cypriots have started to perceive the European integration as a means for the reunification of the island and settlement of the Cyprus problem. Thus, the role of European integration was also politically-and-strategically-oriented both from the European and Greek – and later on Turkish – Cypriot sides.

Needless to say, no debate has drawn attention so far, as to Cyprus’s being or belonging in Europe. Given that the question of Europe’s boundaries is a political one rather than geographical or historical, it seems irrelevant to question Cyprus’s European identity. But what might be worth discussing seems to be the fact that from very early periods onwards, sources of this identity originate from political-strategic concerns developed in conflictual contexts.

Conclusion

Throughout its history, the main determinants of the relations of Cyprus with the rest of the Mediterranean world have been trade and conflict. Due to its being located at the heart of trade roots and classical centres of the Mediterranean, the island has always maintained trade relations not only with its immediate surroundings, but also with remote commercial centres of Western Europe.

Although, during the conflictual periods, especially among the principal powers of the Mediterranean world, Cyprus played the role of an outpost and an extension of Europe, it had never been referred to as part of Europe up until the last few decades. Principally it was with the European integration that the European identity of Cyprus has come to the fore. It is interesting to observe that the sources of this identity have been formed and fostered in a conflictual context, separating and “isolating” the island from its immediate surroundings and making it an extension – if not an outpost – of Europe – once more.
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ABSTRACT
Cyprus, which was under the reign of the Ottoman Empire from the end of XVI century didn’t decline in its cultural, economic and social spheres during this phase, on the contrary to it, the cultural relations of the island extended, there was achieved plenty of success in art and scientific fields, especially in architecture.
As the result of Lozano agreement that was signed in 1923 Cyprus was annexed by England and beginning from 1925 “The Cyprus issue” appeared and this problem continues nowadays as well.
Greeks, who were pleased about English administration in the island, used the suitable circumstances and did its best to annex Cyprus to Greece. These activities of Greeks were supported by England as well. At the result of it, from 1930s the relations between two communities complicated.
During the English reign the movement of Greeks to Cyprus and deportation of Turkish people intensived. The Greek Church participated in this activity as well: there was aided to Greek people who moved to the island materially, and supported the deportation of Turks.
After the World War II, the decreasing of colonial system in the Middle East influenced to Cyprus and Greek people of the island began to want the right of government from 1950s. “The Cyprus issue” wasn’t the interior problem of England. And England had to appeal to United Nations, Turkey and England as well. At the result of this, “The Cyprus issue” became the international issue.
Consequently, Cyprus, which was under the reign of Turkey for 300 years, at the result of 35 years’ English administration became the main, difficult and vague problem of the Eastern Mediterranean region.
Key words: colonization policy of England, departure of population, the pursue policy, international problem

INTRODUCTION
There are very few conflicts of mankind that attract the attention of international society as the Cyprus problem. This problem disturbs all European countries, European Union as well as the members of NATO. Almost all secretaries of the UN were occupied with this problem in the period of their authority. The Cyprus problem was included to the agenda of General Assembly and Security Council in 1964.
The Cyprus problem will keep its distressing urgency and will be the sample of difficulty of the international system in the solving of this issue even after its solution.1

---

1 International conflicts of the modernity. Moscow: 1983
If we explore the history of the island, then we’ll see a lot of faults of statesmen, politicians, and military leaders as well. These faults occurred both in the period of Arabians, the Ottoman Empire, and Britain. That’s why, it is very essential; to research not only the theoretical side of the problem, but also the faults, made. The nearest faults that are made in the island coincide with the reign of Britain.

1. THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AND BRITAIN IN 1878
From 1571 to 1878 the Cyprus Island was under the reign of the Ottoman Empire. This phase can be considered the period of development for the island in economic, social and cultural spheres. The Cyprus hasn’t declined for 300 years, in spite of it there were gained plenty of achievements in the fields of science, art, trade, architecture as well. Both Turks and Greeks developed equally; the Greek people pursued neither religious, nor the grade of nationality. The Greek cathedral was the governor of the island.

Though the Ottoman Empire was very democratic in the attitude to other nations, the pressure of European countries to this state intensified. The West was eager to destruct the Empire from inside, make her live in dependence on Europe by the vehicle of non-Turkic nations. That’s why, the non-Turkic nations of the Empire – Arabs, Greeks, Serbians, Kurds, and Armenians were presented as people who were pursued and their leaders were contributed financially. Nevertheless, non-Turkic people of the Empire had more privileges than Turks in the country. It was related to the Greek people of the Cyprus: “In the Ottoman Empire Greeks was the most privileged nation after, probably before Turks”.

Despite everything, states as Russia, Austria-Hungary and England performed themselves as the messenger of the struggle of Greeks for “their independence” both in Balkans and the islands of Aegean Sea, but in reality they had the only aim – to withdraw Turks from Europe and Mediterranean region. In this period Greeks created new plan under the name of “Magalia idea”. This idea was about “the restoration of Byzantine – Greek Empire, putting an end to the reign of Turks in Anatolia and Balkans”.

Approximately at the same time with “Magalia idea” become famous the idea of “Enosis” (the annexing of Cyprus by Greece). In this idea Greeks hoped to the aid of the Russian Empire. Especially during 1877-1878 Russia-Turkey War Greeks gained great chance. The Ottoman Empire, who inspired from the military lucks of Russia did their best to gain more lands her maintainer Russia supported the Empire in this aim.
The San-Stefano treaty (Yashil Koy) that put an end to the war was signed with the difficult terms for the Ottoman Empire: According to the treaty there should be established new state – “Great Bulgaria”, the Ottoman Empire had to recognize the independence of Bulgaria, Romania, and Serbia, give the right of self governing to Bosnia and give indemnity to Russia. It was obvious that, such heavy treaty could not be accepted by Abdul Hamid the II. After this treaty the sultan of the Ottoman Empire, Abdul-Hamid signed secret agreement between England on June 4, 1878. According to the agreement, the Ottoman Empire wouldn’t fulfill the San-Stefano treaty and instead of it would give the governing of Cyprus to England.
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result of this agreement the Cyprus, which was under the reign of the Ottoman Empire officially, went to the dependence of England.

2. LOZANO AGREEMENT AND THE COLONIZATION OF CYPRUS
The great sample of the struggle of European countries for colonization occurred during World War I. In this war England had her own aims as well as each Western State. The plans of England, related to the Ottoman Empire differed from the policy in the XIX century. So that, if in the XIX century the main goal of England’s Middle East policy was to protect Istanbul and straits from the invasion of Russia, in the eve of WW I her major aim was not to let Germany enter to this region.7

According to the above-shown plan, England continued the same policy in Cyprus as well: to weaken and break Turkey–the alliance of Germany in the war.

That’s why on November 5, 1914 England invaded Cyprus and officially declared war to Turkey.8 England also suggested giving Cyprus to Greece, but instead of it Greece should participate in the war at the side of England. As Greece rejected to take part in the war, England also took back this suggestion.

After the WW I the leading powers of England considered that, Britain Empire never was so powerful than then and that’s why she had right to solve the destiny of the world.9 At the results of the weakness of Russia and the Ottoman Empire there were formed suitable condition in the straits and Vice-minister Lloyd George considered that, if both European and Asian sides of Aegean Sea were given to Greece, then the security of the road from Mediterranean to Indian would be provided.10 Also, for the Britain Empire that enlarged from Suez Canal to Far East and Australia Aegean islands, especially Cyprus were very important.

Soon, the changes happened in the region–beginning of the struggle for independence in Turkey, protection of Turkey her rights in front of European countries made England change its Middle East policy. In 1922 there was organized Lozano conference. On July 24, 1923 on one side Turkey, on the other side England, France, Italy, Greece, Romania, Japan signed peace treaty. The greatest victory of this agreement for Turks was the recognition of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Turkey by the Antanta Block. All former privileges of foreigners were abolished.11

But for Cyprus the Lozano Conference became the phase of bitter history: according to the treaty Turkey was reduced from the rights in Cyprus.12 Namely at the result of this agreement Cyprus became the official colony of Great Britain, and the history of colonization of the Island began.

3. CYPRUS UNDER THE SUPREMACY OF ENGLAND
The colonization of Cyprus by England shaped the “Cyprus problem”. The movement of population aided to the creation of this problem as well; so that, according to the Lozano treaty
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a plenty of Greek people were settled in Cyprus, and Turkish people were removed to Turkey, Germany and Italy.  

At this time, the government of the island was legislative power–Soviet, and real reign was in the hands of Greeks. As English administration supported Cyprus Greeks, they continued their Enosis idea openly. The Greece cathedral and administration interfered to the interior policy of the island and England didn’t do anything against these actions. At the result of the support of England in 1930 s. the relations between two communities strained: the Greeks of the island were supported financially, Turks were removed from Cyprus.  

At the result of above-shown events Muslim Turkish culture and Turkish people of Cyprus confronted with the danger of condense.  

All these evidences were sample that, England supported Greeks, but Greeks disagreed that the administration had some hesitations. In 1931 Greek people of Cyprus revolted against English supremacy. After this revolt Britain administration abolished the constitution and stopped the activity of the local government. Greek people didn’t agree with the governing phase (1933-1939) of Herbert Palmer. 

As the result of beginning of world war II Cyprus problem was in the back plan, but the Enosis plan of Greeks didn’t change. English colonists made an election in 1943 and again Greeks achieved success. Namely after these ballots Greeks intensified struggle for Enosis and applies about the independence of the island (although Turkish society was against it) intensified. 

After the WW II, at the result of the weakness of Middle East colonial system, the population of the Cyprus began to demand the right of self-government. Greece society performed its thought in the context of the Enosis policy, and as it was the danger for Turkish settlers they had to appeal to Turkey administration. In 1949 there occurred the first revolt of Turkish people of the island against Enosis. 

In 1950 s. “Cyprus issue” lost its local character. Struggle between Greek and Turkish societies, cruel policy of Greek people against Turks. England administration, which lost the control over the island had to apply to UN, Turkey and Greece. At the result of it “Cyprus issue” became an international problem. 

We don’t want to chase the new of history of the Cyprus in this report, and that’s why will not describe the events resulted with the independence of Cyprus. The goal of the report is to pursue the influence of the events, happened in the period of English supremacy in the period of independence.  

CONCLUSION  
As we noticed in the beginning of the report, the establishment of the Cyprus problem isn’t the event of XX century, but its origin goes to the deep history. In 1925 the English government colonized this island and at the result of it there occurred plenty of social, economic and ethic struggle in Cyprus. In reality, national struggle in the colony gave a chance to England keep in
hands the region. Sometimes English colonists speeded this process, didn’t perceive the results of Enosis policy then. This tortured namely Turkish people of Cyprus.
In conclusion, the Cyprus that was under the reign of the Ottoman Empire in peaceful and mutual understanding process for 300 years, lost its tranquility after annexing of the island by England and the Cyprus became the origin of tension in the Eastern Mediterranean region for 35 years.
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Introduction

Although there is not a single government in Cyprus that represents both the Greek and the Turkish Cypriot communities, and although the Government of Cyprus has not asserted its sovereignty over the Turkish Cypriot’s area since 1964, the Republic of Cyprus (RoC) became an European Union (EU) Member State on May 1, 2004 without a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem.

The Greek Government of Cyprus argument for this membership is voiced by ex Foreign Minister Georgios Iacovou as “the island’s political situation should not have an effect on country’s the EU membership application as in the case of East and West Germany”.

Nevertheless, arguably, this claim is inappropriate and Cyprus case does not bear similarity with the Germany case. In the inclusion of East Germany to Germany, no claim made by any country regarding to the territorial scope of the membership and there was not any problem regarding to authority and jurisdiction of the new state. However, the Cyprus case was completely different because the RoC became a member without having full control over all the areas that it claimed to be under its jurisdiction.

This reality alone contradicts the basic principles of the EU regarding the free movement of people, goods, and services, and freedom of residence along with the application of the common EU policies. Furthermore, there is little doubt that the admission of the RoC into the EU before the final settlement of the critical issues such as the jurisdiction, territory, and status of the two communities makes the solution of the Cyprus problem more complicated.

Deriving from these preliminary remarks, this article aims to critically elucidate and demonstrate the paradoxes of the contradictory EU membership of the RoC. Historically speaking, the social contract and obligation to the international law have formed the basis of social formation in modern Europe. According to the social contract concept, only people who are under contract could trust to each other and honour their mutual obligations. In this sense,

when one analyzes the emergence of the society of states and the development of international society, the key concept is obedience to international law.

The international system is founded upon both the desire and responsibility of the rational white man to ‘universalize’ the European idioms. In this sense, Europeans work with the taken for granted premise of the right to determine other’s ‘capacity’ on sovereignty and ‘civilization’ status. The most prominent part of this process was the insurance of these standards and practices under the legal framework, which is the European inspired international law. Generally speaking, obedience to the international law separates the self from the other, inside from the outside, civilised from the uncivilized, and modern from the traditional.

Same principles applied to the EU negotiation process with the candidate countries. The former European Commissioner responsible for enlargement, Gunter Verheugen, has made a remarkable statement about Turkey’s membership process. He said that Turks misunderstood the term of “negotiation”. In the EU negotiation process in fact there is no space for ‘bargaining’. The EU process is not a ‘negotiation’. It is something that a candidate country must comply. The principles and laws are clear and valid for every state. If a state fulfils them, it becomes a member. If does not, then it cannot.\(^4\)

Is this really the case? Is the EU really based upon the ultimate reign of rule of law, and there is no space for ‘bargaining’, political blackmail, and double standards? Through this presentation, I would sought to answer this question and hit the ‘legitimate’ EU membership of the RoC with its’ own guns.

The admission of the RoC into the EU also constitutes a clear and evident clash with the principles of international law. As I have emphasized earlier, historically and normatively speaking, compliance with the international law is one of the main principles that both the European and the EU countries rest upon.

Nevertheless, by accepting the unilateral application of the Greek Cypriots, the international agreements related to the sui generis situation of Cyprus have been discredited. In this connection, the bypass of the international law contributed to the asymmetric negotiations between the two sides. This argument could be further developed under two main points.

First of all, Article 8 of the London and Zurich Agreements that defines the basic structure of the RoC and Article 50 of the RoC Constitution clearly emphasise that:

\begin{quote}
The President and the Vice President separately or conjointly, shall have the right of final veto on any law or decision concerning foreign affairs, except the participation of the Republic of Cyprus in international organisations and pacts of alliance in which Greece and Turkey both participate, or concerning defence and security.
\end{quote}

Similarly, Article 1 of the Treaty of Guarantee, which is one of the founding and fundamental constitutive treaties of the RoC declares that:

\begin{quote}
The Republic of Cyprus undertakes to ensure the maintenance of its independence, territorial integrity and security, as well as respect for its constitution. It undertakes not to participate, in whole or in part, in any political or economic union with any State whatsoever. It accordingly declares prohibited any activity likely to promote, directly or indirectly, either union with any other State or partition of the island.
\end{quote}

\(^4\) The Interview with Gunter Verheugen, CNN Turk, December 7, 2005.
Therefore, as these articles made clear, from the international law perspective even if both Greece and Turkey are members of any international organisation that Cyprus would like to be a member of, either the President (which is a Greek Cypriot) or Vice President (which is Turkish Cypriot) has a right to veto this decision. Since Turkey is not a member of the EU, and the view of the Turkish Cypriot leadership was not taken into account, this principle contradicts with the principles of international law.

Secondly, Cyprus could not become a member of any political or economic organisation of which both Turkey and Greece are not members. Since the EU membership refers to becoming a part of an economic and political union, there is an evident clash with the aforementioned principle. As argued by Mandelson, Article 1 of the Treaty of Guarantee specifically refers to this condition within the context of the clauses of the Treaty. Furthermore, this principle was conducted for the political, economic and social balance between Turkey and Greece in Cyprus. Nevertheless, the membership of Cyprus to the EU has broken this balance in favour of Greece.

In summary, the RoC’s admission into the EU clashes with the international treaties and the rule of law that the European countries widely advocated throughout history especially following the post Westphalian order. The waiver or amendment of aforementioned international obligations requires the consent of both the Turkish Cypriots and the three guarantor powers (Britain, Greece and Turkey).

Then, the crux of the problem highlights two contradictory conclusions: if the EU still accepts the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee and Constitution as valid, then the admission of the RoC automatically contradicts with the international treaties and the rule of law. On the other hand, if the EU considers 1960 settlements as no longer valid, this means that only the Greek side of Cyprus has become a EU member, which could open the way for the recognition of the TRNC. Arguably, the main reason of the aforementioned paradox and asymmetric negotiation is Greece’s earlier membership to the EU (in 1981). This membership formed an important constraint on the Turkey-EU relations as it also gives a comparative advantage to Greece on the RoC’s membership issue.

With the membership of Greece, inevitably, the EU could not remain neutral towards the Cyprus problem. Greece not only attempted to block the normalisation of the Turkey-EU relations from the mid 1980s onwards, but also blockaded the EU’s economic incentives for Turkey, and also utilised all possible instruments within the EU in order to support the membership aspirations of the RoC.

For instance, on March 6, 1995 Greece lifted its veto on the Customs Union agreement with Turkey in return of the guarantee that the RoC’s accession negotiations would begin within six months. Similarly, on December 10-11, 1999 the European Council Helsinki Summit asserted that the political settlement in Cyprus would not constitute a precondition for the membership of the RoC to the EU. In return, Greece lifted its veto on the Turkish official candidacy.

---


6 For the examination of the Turkish-Greek relations see Isiksal, H. (2002). “An Analysis of the Turkish-Greek Relations from Greek ‘Self’ and Turkish ‘Other’ Perspective: Causes of Antagonism and Preconditions for Better Relationships”. Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations. 1 (3). Winter. Pp.116-135.
Finally, as a response to Greece’s threats of vetoing the accession of Central and East European states (if Cyprus was excluded from the first wave of enlargement), on December 12-13, 2002 the European Council of Copenhagen declared that Cyprus would become the member of the EU from May 1, 2004 regardless of the resolution of the Cyprus problem.\(^7\) Therefore, it is evident that during each of the stages leading to Turkey’s admission into the EU, Greece has used its membership advantage and forced the EU to compromise for the RoC’s membership to the Union.

As an overall conclusion, the Helsinki Summit declaration that enabled the admission of Cyprus into the EU was asymmetric and controversial. The accession of the Greek Cypriot administration into the EU as the sole representative of the whole island (and in the name of both communities) before the final settlement is the main source of asymmetric negotiations in Cyprus. This argument could be further developed under three main points.

First of all, with this decision, the EU authorities approved all the previous policies of the Greek Cypriot administration including the dismissal of the Turkish Cypriots from the legislative, executive, and judiciary organs of the RoC. The Greek Cypriot administration is accepted as the legitimate ‘successor’ of the 1960 Republic. In the meantime, the Turkish Cypriot side’s political existence and economic condition were regarded as non-existent. The equivalent attempts for the adoption of the *acquis* and economic accession into the EU were not formulated for the Turkish Cypriots as a constituent political community and the partner of a prospective federation.

This means that the Turkish Cypriots were degraded to a minority status and their political rights and equal community status in the island (that originated from the international treaties) have been discredited by the EU. In accordance with the international treaties, ideally, both communities had to participate in the decision making process of this crucial decision at least by separate referendums. In consequence, these crucial political mistakes could lead to the permanent division of the island.

Secondly, although the EU had asked the Central and Eastern European countries to settle their border and minority disputes before their accession through the Balladur Stability pact, the Cyprus problem did not constitute any obstacle for membership of the RoC. Through the membership of the RoC, the EU actually accepted a state that does not even enjoy full jurisdiction and the territory that it claims to rule. This incidence demonstrates that the EU could be selective on a set of principles and criteria that are applied for the candidate countries in accordance with its interests. This makes the moral arguments that advanced in European circles highly questionable.\(^8\)

Thirdly, the EU did not put any pressure on the RoC government for the solution of the Cyprus problem. Accordingly, the RoC’s membership makes it even harder to find a fair and lasting

---


solution in Cyprus. As stressed by Ziya Öniş, the EU required a more balanced approach towards the Cyprus problem and should have set explicit standards for the Greek Cypriot government to resolve its disputes with the North as a necessary step for accession to full membership.\(^9\) In the present, the Greek Cypriot administration has no pressure, challenge, or incentive to compromise for the settlement of the Cyprus problem.\(^10\)

To sum up, although Turkey desires to separate the Cyprus problem from its overall membership process, under the current situation this does not seem possible. The Helsinki Summit declared that the Cyprus problem is not directly related to the Turkey’s membership process. Nevertheless, the functioning of the EU organs constrains this decision. With the membership of the RoC, in addition to Greece, Turkey now would face a double veto constraint. Technically speaking, both Greece and the RoC have seventy two vetoes each (one for opening and one for closing of the every special topic in addition to the overall opening and closing of all thirty five technical issues) during Turkey’s admission process. All these factors caused further asymmetry in the Turkey-EU relations in favour of the latter.
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Abstract

In this study, Cyprus has been evaluated according to geopolitical strategies as land, sea and air power and rimland theory. By this starting point, the main purpose of this study is to identify the importance of Cyprus according to these strategies.

Mainly the geopolitical theories consist of four parts including land, sea, air and rimland theories. The discussion about which one of the air, land and sea powers are the main and which one is the sub power have not reach a definite conclusion yet. For this uncertainty, as an objective presentation a chronological line has been followed. According to this line, the views and thoughts will be considered respectively sea, land and rimland and finally air sovereignty or powers.

Actually, according to geopolitical theories, the position of Cyprus is quite different from other geographies. Geography of Cyprus is at the center region of land power theory and at the same time at the most sensitive point of rimland theory. For this reason, geography of island as an accepted value in itself, has very important field. Cyprus is already at the intersection point of land power theory and rimland theory. This point is very important, because, the provided integrity had eliminated the availability of Mackinder’s land power theory’s center region and rimland theory which was formulated as a precaution to land power theory and applied successfully after the II. World War. According to sea and air power theories, Cyprus has a strategic place.

According to this reality, this work is composed up of three parts. The concept of geopolitics is emphasized in first part. In the second part, geopolitical facts are determined and in the third part, the place and importance of Cyprus according to geopolitical theories is indicated.

Keywords: Cyprus, the Dominance Theory, Geopolitics, Geostrategy, Geography.
Introduction

Relations with among the states, are generally identified with using of power with the shape of last prefer of policy. Generally the decisive element is geographical features. (Göksan, 1980:10; Mümtaz, 1999a:53; Mümtaz, 1999b:151). In this case geography impresses the country’s authority and power with various shapes. For example, Soviet Union had a big geography until 1989, gained this state a ability of abrasive war and this helped this state at II. World War for the targets. An another example England with its’ island properties, has gained this state a balance role (Bilge, 1966:83) with the problems of European countries in the history. USA with its far way to big power center Europe gave an opportunity to this country isolation policy (Bilge, 1966:83) until World War I and also to World War II. So geography is argued with its’ effects of country’s power and foreign policy, many discussions have been done about geographical determinism (Gönlübol, 1993:106) and have been improved civilization theories on it.

By this way we can say that one country’s economic advantages, national power and its’ security depend on its’ geographical location (Macridis, 1962:5-6). So geographical elements affect all countries’ foreign policy (Morgenthau, 1963:110). By this way it is impossible to expose the reasons of international policy actions without geographical elements. With this reality, it is evaluated that Cyprus’ importance with geopolitical and power theories. Especially for understanding better about evaluations Cyprus, it is argued that geopolitical elements and some ideas are given. And then there are some evaluations Cyprus’ geopolitical position with Land, Air and Sea Supremacy, Rimland theories.

In this research our subject is evaluated with rationalist and productivist ideas. But here it is used process analysis as a method. Especially analytic evaluations have been used. So it is cared for researching “happenings” without “not happenings”. Indeed all these are targeting for discussing Cyprus’ geopolitics elements and theories with its value and specialities.

1. The Concept of Geopolitics in Cyprus

The most important feature of the geopolitics is its’ deep content and wide extent. So geopolitics can give a looking in minding as a whole and indicates effecting of the region and nation from this condition. Indeed any geopolitics research about Cyprus is not going further with geopolitics datas in itself. Nevertheless such a research for Cyprus is a first step from idea condition to acting condition. So geopolitical researches about Cyprus have to be evaluated with former politic. Otherwise not caring of geopolitical ideas about Cyprus and real actions, that will cause lacks of foreign policy, security area and evaluating of opportunities.

Although from these the best evaluated ideas about geography is geopolitical theories among the determinist ideas. By this opinion geopolitics can be expressed new evaluation from geographical datas with international politic and strategy subjects (Gönlübol, 1993:106).

“Geopolitical” word is a combination of words land and politic, largely described1 in dictionaries as a “country policy and with its’ strict sense deciding of foreign policy, is a systematic science in researching.” (Bilge, 1966:101; İlhan, 1992:7; İlhan, 1993:4).

Indeed this describing is very close to terminology describing in our language as a political geography (Bilge, 1966:101). Indeed political geography is changing with various

---

1 Geopolitic’s word meaning is with its best describing, geographic policy and policy about the geography. But if it is described with scientific way it is summarized as a policy of geography with directing (İlhan, 1992:7; İlhan, 1993:4)
schools and it is described as a science of researching land and state together (Pearcy-Fifield, 1952:1, 5, 12, 13; Wright, 1965:48; Kalijarvi, 1954:298). With this describing, subject of the political geography is researching the relations between regions and resources where people live and political establishments (Pearcy-Fifield, 1952:12). Indeed when we do geopolitical evaluations, we have to explain establishments and geopolitics theories. With this idea researches about Cyprus have four main titles: First, Cyprus’ theory condition to geographic situation and power centers; Second, Cyprus’ condition to power centers in the world; Third, Cyprus’ condition to geographic situation in the region and Fourth, Cyprus’ condition to power centers in the region. So when we establish relations of policy, power, strategy and target about Cyprus, it will become a reality of developing tactical actions style.

In reality geopolitical evaluations are sourcing of big necessities by the states. Information about this subject is required elements for applying political level. By this way countries’ international behaviours and politics are researched by geopolitics with its’ manner land and geographical dimensions has 4 essential level (O’Tuathail, 1996:56; Parker, 1998:5):
1. Classical geopolitics, land and sea powers have a dominance (1880-1940),
2. Classical geopolitics losing of its’ legacy, but there is substantially (1945-1975),
3. Emphasizing of two different geopolitics to environment case, in other words geostrategic and new geopolitical era (1975-1990),
4. After bipolar world system, multilateral geopolitics era (1990-…).

From these aspects’ conditions after 1990 in the world, especially East Mediterranean Region became new conflict area for big powers. New actors increased in this strategic game and strategic value increased in the region and the geographies here are very sensible has made difficult of continuing the balance (Öztürk, 2001:173). So we have to evaluate possible results about Cyprus in multi ways nowadays. Otherwise it is possible to be crisis in East Mediterranean different with regional crisis happening in Middle East, Caucasus and Balkans after 1990.

2. Geopolitical Elements in Cyprus:
Geographic constructs and elements have an importance of politic acts and decisions. By this way geopolitics helps for adding geographical elements to politics (İlhan, 1992:8). And it also helps for evaluating other social elements completeness in this subject. Indeed, this case can be search not only economic, social datas and military evaluations but also taken into consideration as a study. By this way geopolitics gives a method to researchers caring of economic, social, military and cultural elements as a completeness.

Other specialty of geopolitics is that it gives an opportunity to effects to everywhere of countries’ problems as a national (Tamçelik, 2008:330). In this case, international problems are dealt with national problems and evaluated with global level or taking this subject is dearth with all other problems in other words there is an obligation of evaluating geopolitics. Contrary to this there will be big deficiency. Because national values in a country are very sensible to effects different sides (Tamçelik, 2009:252). So it always waits interest.

By this way geopolitics, gives a soul and liveliness to geography adding with social elements (İlhan, 1992:9). Intellectual always have made comments about geopolitics used this tree words: “State”, “Geography”, “Policy” (İlhan, 1992:9). Indeed state, geography and policy

\[\text{2 Theories, institutions and evaluations will be given with other parts in this study.}\]
\[\text{3 Here it is emphasized economic, social, politic, military and other cultural values.}\]
words could be sufficient for expressing geopolitics. But lackness from one of these words will be incomplete geopolitics. Geopolitics has unchangeable elements in geography and changeable elements in social subjects. By this way Cyprus’ social, economic, politic, military and cultural environment and its’ values are changeable elements.

As for this the geopolitics elements of the Cyprus are in two groups with “changeable” and “unchangeable” elements.

1. Cyprus’ Changing Elements: These are social-cultural values, economic values, political values, military values and time.

2. Cyprus’ Unchanging Elements: These are Cyprus’ or regions’ borders, land structure⁴, situation in the world and geographic character⁵ (Tamçelik, 1996:324, Tamçelik, 2009:253).

As emphasized geopolitics has some elements which are changeable elements base of the geography and unchangeable elements base of the social subjects (İlhan, 1992:9; İlhan, 1993:7).

Nevertheless unchangeable elements in geography have to be evaluated in 4 topics. Firs of these are land (Tamçelik, 2008:331; Tamçelik, 2009:253). There is land including sources of basement in state and policy. In all ways land is a power. So it is important difference of Cyprus’ position of near to the Turkey and far to the Greece.

Second unchangeable element is geographical wholeness (Tamçelik, 2009:253). So island countries are the strongest land parts with their geographical wholeness. These states have secure borders. But this situation has a proportional quality with the reason of two states in the island.

Third unchangeable element is countries situation in the world and its’ region (Tamçelik, 2008:331). Cyprus is important as a general in Mediterranean basin and special East Mediterranean basin. With this shape Cyprus has a direct relation with North Africa, Middle East and Mediterranean.

Fourth unchangeable element is geographical specialty of country (Tamçelik, 2009:253). It is important that whether country is an island state, border state, in continent or continent state. Cyprus has to be evaluated with its’ geographical specialities. Only for this reason England invaded the Cyprus in 1914. Indeed England wanted to use Cyprus as a base camp. So England has gathered an important intelligence center, logistic camp in a strategic part of the East Mediterranean (Tamçelik, 2008:617). By this way England has gathered strategic depth in Middle and Near East, Anatolia, Suez Canal and North Africa.

Changeable elements are including social parts of geopolitics as an economic, social, time, military and politic values. In this way geopolitics searches states’ civil and foreign policy with physical geography. (Dâver, 1972:62). It is possible to see this result. One state’s position in the international politic, depends on its’ geographical position of the world (Padelford-Lincoln, 1962:65). So state’s position effects its’ economic, foreign and defence policy. Because state’s position to power centers indicates its’ foreign policy. So Cyprus with its’ geographical position gives an opportunity to being out of a conflict areas.

All of these show that looking to global and regional events and developments as a whole is possible with the opportunity of geopolitics. So researches and datas with the Cyprus’ geopolitics elements will help us for evaluating events and developments.

---

⁴ It is expressed geographical wholeness and physical base.
⁵ It is expressed the situation of island, peninsula or continent state.
It is impossible to say geopolitics theories can answer all cases and caring of world’s power balances (İlhan, 1993:vii). So it is obligation a new evaluations have to be done with the situation of the global powers.

3. Cyprus with Geopolitical Theories:

Geopolitical values have improved its’ action side in developing and global world. In 19. and 20. centuries reel policy elements have some important differences. In other words elements which are determined by history and geography effects reciprocal today’s politic, economic and strategic dependence (Tuğ, 2000:273). However developments in technology and information diversify the structure of dependence, regional realities and own wholeness won’t change easily.

First comprehensive theories about this subject are suggested in 19. century and Swedish geographer Kjellen (1864-1922) is the first person of era who used a word geopolitics. After World War I German geopoliticer Haushofer identified the geopolitics as natural conditions and historical developments effect that word and living place for political life (Kalijarvi, 1954:289). But after that geopolitics has been improved of application with Spykman. To Spykman’s opinion geopolitics is a planning of state’s security policy to geography as an area (Pearcy-Fifield, 1952:32). Wright has also used geopolitics as an art of world policy (Wright, 1965:336).

From all these, in a real meaning first geopolitics ideas have been seen in a book of “Politiche geographie” from Friedrich Ratzel (1844-1904) who inspired from Kant (Hill, 1954:315). Ratzel especially said that: one state or country’s geographical elements have a big importance in foreign policy and international relations as philosophers, commanders and statesman implied. Indeed this interest with the base of idea has gone towards to conflict of powers in international policy, use of geographical advantages and apply of foreign policy (Bilge, 1966:100). Some different ideas have come to this research area about geographical elements support foreign policy and go to more realist targets. After the World War I for benefiting this opportunities some formations have been established. So new studying area has appeared for giving geographical elements to foreign policy.

With this aspect, geopolitics gives to politic some direction and constructs an information and idea basement to this policy. In other words scientific base which include political ideas has been developed by geopolitics. Geopolitics gives an opportunity thinking the whole world and effecting the region and country from this element (İlhan, 1993:5).

It is obvious that we have the think regional policies with world policies and national policies with global and regional policies (Tamçelik, 2009:256). It is also impossible that accomplishing of the national policy isolated from regional policies and world policies. Indeed this situation has caused a geopolitics science description itself. So when geopolitics researches power and target (İlhan, 1993:5) from the base of policy, it expressed various theory appearances.

Countries have to take care all theories in a changing world for saving their power and for coming to good position. In this way geopolitics give a some opportunity for protecting national security policy and national existence. Without geopolitics idea, there will be some absence of expressing problems. Indeed this absence is sourced from this: First, modern social sciences don’t care classical geopolitics. Second many things don’t happening which geopolitics estimate. Third from the beginning this are sourced at the ethnocentric base
Indeed this idea can be evaluated as a protecting of the power from one state in the international area. Obviously this can be seen from classic geopoliticians German Ratzel and Haushofer, American Mahan and Spykman, English Mackinder and Swedish Kjellen.

Especially when we research the German school Ratzel thinks that powerful states have to take new lands, take new colonies and need new military naval force (Heraclides, 2002:129). Haushofer improved Ratzel’s idea and supported Nazis’ widening policies. And this effect to Hitler has affected this theory as a finishing of idea (Parker, 1998:59).

Five main tendencies have occurred about the geopolitics last ten years in scientific world. These are American geostrategy, French geopolitical\(^7\) (Heraclides, 2002:129), geopolitics\(^8\) (Huntington, 1996:236), geo-economy\(^9\) (Luttwak, 1993:123) and critical geopolitics\(^10\) (Agnew, 1998:58; O’Tuathail, 1996:51; O’Tuathail-Dalby, 1998:221). So it can be said that from all these with the developments of the 21. century Cyprus’ geopolitical evaluation can be done only with caring of the geopolitics theories. Geopolitics theories are considered in two topics from this realities:

1. Theories based on power
2. Theories based on geography (İlhan, 1993:9; İlhan, 1992:10)

Indeed theories based on power\(^11\) are questions of military strategy. Theories based on geography are land supremacy and rimland theories (İlhan, 1993:9; İlhan, 1992:10). Indeed these theories are not only a theory but also they have been applied. But it has discussion whether it is enough for Cyprus’ all geopolitics events. Cyprus’ geography is a whole with its land, air and sea. So using the one part of the Cyprus’ geography, in other words using the only sea, air and land as an independent is a meaning of not caring the policy of supply.

Indeed geographical position and geopolitical position have different meanings. Because Cyprus’ geographical position indicates the island’s situation and position. But geopolitical position indicates the island’s position according to its situation at world and regional power centers. Cyprus’ geopolitical position is very broad from its geographical position. So geographical position of this island has a geopolitical situation as a value.

For example this island is across to intersecting point of North Africa, Middle East and Anatolia and that gives an importance as a geographical position. With this aspect it opens or closes east to west, west to east, south to north, north to south and ties the Mediterranean to the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean is increasing its importance in the region. In brief all these Cyprus’ geographic position and its specialty physical geography describe humankind power elements\(^12\). But when we evaluate Cyprus’ position and situation in the geopolitical system we have to estimate changing global and regional power centers. For example in today’s world power center is USA and if this changes to South America or East Asia as a power center Cyprus’ geographical position won’t change but its geopolitical position will change as a value.

---

\(^7\) It is argued by Lacoste.
\(^8\) It is argued by Huntington.
\(^9\) It is argued by Luttwak.
\(^10\) It is argued by Agnew, Dalby, O’Tuathail.
\(^11\) These are Sea and Air Supremacy Theories.
\(^12\) It is explained power elements of sourced from human and changeable.
So with the changing of power centers, it has to be evaluated Cyprus’ changing geopolitical position and it has to be done new researches for the future.

3.1. Cyprus’ Importance According to Land Supremacy Theory

This theory has been improved by English intellectual Sir Halford Mackinder (1861-1947) in 1920s and German Nazi author Karl Haushofer. To this theory Asia, Europe and whole Africa are named as a World Island (Mackinder, 1904:426). From this idea which place is between, from east Volga, from east Siberia, from north Himalayas and from south Arctic Ocean is a Heartland and central region. Later whole East Europe has been inserted to central region (Mackinder, 1904:421-444). Indeed Land Supremacy Theory is formulated as a “who controls the East Europe he controls the central region, who controls the center region he controls the world island” (Mackinder, 1943:598). Mackinder has indicated there are two pretended crescent around the central region and these are named inside border crescent and outer crescent (Ilhan, 1989:26).

To Haushofer’s idea the most important power is land power. (Gönlübol, 1993:106). Because a state which has land power, has a heartland of world island which region is Middle Asia (Tamçelik, 1996:327).

To Mackinder’s Land Supremacy Theory, heartland controls the axis from Middle East to Africa. Mackinder makes an comparison of states which have seas and which have heartland of controlling the centers (Tamçelik, 1996:327). So all these show researching of the region or geography like Cyprus, it is obligation of not doing as a global power. Especially it has to be evaluated Cyprus’ physical position, regional changes with other power centers. As to Mackinder’s Land Supremacy Theory Cyprus’ geography has to be on near the heartland and first rimland’s important point.

Indeed Mackinder is an architect of the reason to the World War Theory of the Land Supremacy (Özey, 2001:85; Wright, 1965:156; Bilge, 1966:109). To this idea Cyprus is on the strategic action axis in the region and that shows its geostrategic position (Çakır, 1999:542). Mackinder thinks that East Europe and Siberia region are world’s heartland. From Balkans to China, these lands are rimland for Mackinder (Özey, 2001:86; Tamçelik, 2009:260). Cyprus’ position shows itself at this point. But Cyprus’ only this position hasn’t any meaning. If Cyprus’ position is evaluated with in a real manner, it will be a better sight and idea with its effects to nearest land. With this aspect Cyprus is sometimes opportunity and sometimes threat with its sense. To this idea one country’s position on centers, existence of strategic targets shows its’ strategic position.

To Mackinder who controls the East Europe he has heartland and so he can control the rimland (Özey, 2001:86). He thinks that center region is open to effects from rimland; from Germany, Austria, Turkey and China (Bilge, 1966:111). As understood it is impossible Cyprus directly effect to outer Crescent. Because Cyprus’ position and its geopolitics value doesn’t allow this. Cyprus hasn’t a permanent effect to conflict areas. But it is thought Cyprus will be more effective when regional interest threat insider border crescent.

To this idea, for controlling the world and acting for this first target is Mediterranean (Kıbrıs’in Dünyi, 1995:3). Indeed Cyprus is at the center position about the regions of conflicts as a geopolitics position (Davutoğlu, 2002:116). Because Cyprus with its geographical position

---

13 It is explained futuristic studies about this subject.
14 It is formed from Germany, Austria, Balkans, Turkey, India and China.
15 It is formed from England, Africa, Australia, Japan and USA.
16 It means like heart center.
has a big importance on the axis of Anatolia, Middle East and Suez Canal as a conflict area. In 1877–1878, after the Ottoman-Russia War, England saw Anatolia is in danger for their advantages and they wanted to use Cyprus as a camp (Tamçelik, 1996:329; Tamçelik, 1999:174-180). It is not a coincidence of this act from England in 1878 and this is a result of far policy.

3.2. Cyprus’ Importance According to Rimland Theory

From the ideas of American geopolitician Nicholas Spykman (1893-1943), it is not a problem for researching the geopolitics’ elements from some author’s changing of geopolitics idiom (Sprout, 1955:169; Padelford-Lincoln, 1962:79). So geopolitics has been used as a meaning of decide to idea in foreign policy (Thompson, 1967:28-29). Spykman’s main idea is domination of the world is based on rimland countries (Bilge, 1966:120).

Spykman believes that besides the specialities to center region, rimland countries have more importance from strategic point. He states rimland countries are Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, Afghanistan, India, China, Korea and East Siberia (Spykman, 1944:43; Spykman, 1970:125). Spykman expresses that this region is buffer state between the land power and sea power. His world sovereign formula is who have rimland countries; he can rule Eurasia (Ilhan, 1993:9). To this theory he gives bigger strategic importance to Rimland States (Bilge, 1966:121).

After World War II this theory has gained an importance. Application of rimland theory NATO and close to this SENTO, relations with Japans and Koreans are some examples of this (Ilhan, 1992:11; Davutoğlu, 2002:105). All these have to be evaluated are related with each other and total of the activities. When it is evaluated carefully after the World War II they have been done on this rimland region. Korean, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Cyprus, Iran-Iraq Wars are some of the examples of this. But there is big difference of the war in the Cyprus. Because this limited war has occurred in the blocs, not between the blocs between the Turkey and Greece as an alliances. Indeed all these developments have to be seen as a result of the Rimland Supremacy Theory. And today this theory is applied because of its suit to power centers.

In 1990s Cold War balance has gone and that has caused wide geopolitics and geoeconomic absences in the region. That has caused some interests from Turkey, Israel and Egypt and have been done some strategic choices by these states. Indeed borders of the rimland countries’ are formed partly from sea and land. So these have not secure borders like island and continent states. But these are more secure from inside border states (Ilhan, 1989:74). Rimland states have geographical wholeness with its around capacity and it has to be considered rimland state like Spain, France, Italy, India and Turkey with Cyprus. For example Cyprus with its geographical position has an opportunity of amphibious assault (Tamçelik, 1996:328; Tamçelik, 2009:263) to Turkey and Middle East countries of the chain related with rimland. That is the real Cyprus with its wholeness comes with its danger to region countries and regional power center. So solution for the Cyprus, it is not wanted a one power on the island. Obviously this case is not effective only for Cyprus geography. With this evaluating, developing technologies change all states, regions or geographies.

---

17 For new ideas about this subject look at Tamçelik, 1997; Tamçelik, 2008; Tamçelik, 2009.
18 For the importance of absence spaces look at…Davutoğlu, 2002:115.
19 Greece isn’t included because of effect the surface.
20 It is explained Turkish, Greek, Cyprus Turk and Rum nations.
Indeed controlling the Eurasian is possible with the sovereign on rimland. This rimland is starting from Scandinavia and lying down on Spain, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Middle East, India, Malaysia, Indochina and Korea (Tamçelik, 1996:328; Tamçelik, 2009:263). We say that inside islands chains. Cyprus which island is in the inside islands chain is at the back with other islands from the peninsula. In this chain the most critical region is Cyprus and Middle East and its’ neighborhood Turkey and Greece (Tamçelik, 1996:328; Tamçelik, 2009:263).

Indeed today’s world has some relations as mutual relations for each other. With this view states have some foreign policies for their effective action sides. To this idea Cyprus is one of the best geography for using regional and global powers. So Cyprus has some good advantages when we evaluate better and if we use worse it has some serious risks. So only from that reason Turkey has to develop some regional policies and original developments in this region (Davutoğlu, 2002:318).

3.3. Cyprus’ Importance According to Sea Supremacy Theory

To this idea for being sovereign to the world first it is obligation that we have seas (Gönlübol, 1993:106). Indeed expressing this idea with this subject, in these days from history sea trading had a big importance of state’s economy.

American admiral Alfred Mahan (1841-1914) is an important person in this theory. To Mahan controlling the seas is everything (Davutoğlu, 2002:106). Seas have some opportunities. If we want to rule whole world, with this way that will be successive (Sprout, 1955:153). But the key of the sovereign is the control sea lane. Sovereign from the land has some limited control. It is a necessity of the having a strong naval force for this purposes (Buehring, 1955:121). A naval force which is the free in the seas and one of the state’s owner, it can also act freely. So we need to have some control urgently in the seas. Indeed this requirement will help USA for their sovereign of the far away seas and Russia will gain some opportunities in wide Asia lands. This case shows that Cyprus is a conflict area for big and regional powers for the region and purposes.

During the Cold War Aegean and Cyprus were two important values for Turkey and that importance always goes on. After Cold War some national elements have been added to this subject with the developing events. The most important ones of the elements are regional effecting land and strategic (Davutoğlu, 2002:169). Aegean and Cyprus are the passing areas especially for Balkans and Middle East, with this reality effecting capability has increased and has gained different importance in the region. With these developments interaction has developed as timing and contents after the Cold War era. Cyprus’ region importance has increased with its specialty as a sea interaction region. These problems also have some interregional specialties with their importance. So Turkey is not a only Aegean state, with its interaction lands and problems like Cyprus, Aegean; Turkey is an East Mediterranean state with all regional problems. Aegean and Cyprus problems have to be evaluated with its wholeness. Today there is an important interaction area between the regions of East Europe-Balkans-Adriatic-Aegean-Middle East and Gulf. Especially there are some relations between the problems of Balkans and Middle East with the same timing of Aegean and Cyprus problems.

Military experts still believe these ideas from Mahan. To Mahan’s sea supremacy theory it has to be controlled by means of Suez Canal, pasting from the Mediterranean, opening roads to the Indian and Pacific Ocean (Hayes, 1954:5; Morgenthau, 1963:161). So who controls the seas he will control the world (Tamçelik, 1996:326). Because this is related with
naval ways and critic land ways in this region. That is the real Cyprus is on the axis area and power centers of between USA, Russia, EU and Middle East. For this four power for protecting security and for their developments in all actions Cyprus has different interest for these states.

In all situations they want to affect Cyprus with their desires and for their advantages. Of course that is a source for Cyprus to understand multiway policy and threading senses.

Indeed this opinion’s main base is Cyprus’ controlling area from Suez Canal to Pacific Oceans. Especially Suez’s position to Cyprus has different importance. Because Cyprus control the roads from Suez Canal to Indian and Pacific Oceans.

Cyprus have same distance to Europe, Asia and Africa and with this reality it is the center of the world main continent. England has military camp on the island because of this island’s strategic position. A state who neglects the importance of Cyprus can’t be effective for regional policies. This small island can effect the position of Asia-Africa, Europe-Africa and Europe-Asia.

After the Cold War Cyprus has gained new specialities with new balances. There is a serious discussion about energy and trade road from middle Asia to Europe. Whatever be or which change occurs Cyprus is on the main road for all projects and some developments. So Germany has some benefits from the island and with the membership to the EU to this island, it has gained some advantages towards the USA in the region especially as a strategic benefit. Europe will gain some advantages to Middle East with this developments and membership of the Cyprus to European Union.

And Cyprus can control Turkey’s whole south seaports and particularly others especially for controlling the Middle East Cyprus have a big importance and in a key position (Kıbrıs’ın Düny, 1995:3). So Cyprus was under the control who has ruled the Anatolia and Middle East (Nenman, 1940:213; Alasya, 1969:18). Besides for a lot of powers Cyprus was a gift as a conquering area (Gibbons, 1997:18; Gibbons, 2003:19). As we known England is one of these countries who know the importance of this gift. For England security situation is so important in the region. But England has lost Suez and than Cyprus and now perhaps it will lose the camps in Cyprus.

Indeed geographies like Cyprus have some wholeness from its strong blocs like seas. So islands are usually protected from attacks and have found improvement opportunities. But this doesn’t suit to Cyprus. Because as we mention before it is impossible to say island’s geographic wholeness. Island’s north and south establishments are different and independent wholeness to each other.

3.4. Cyprus’ Importance According to Air Supremacy Theory:

As an innovator of the air geopolitics Alexander P. De Seversky has mentioned land and sea forces lost their power as compared to wonderful air power and has developed new strategy model (Seversky, 1950:128-129). Seversky has developed with a new dimension this geopolitics idea from Mackinder and Spykman’s world maps (Seversky, 1950:203). To this theory world has changed its effect area between the sovereigns of USA and USSR.

Air power with its effecting side and fast has some more advantages. So air power has some opportunities as an acting capability compared to sea (Kalijarvi, 1954:300). Some developments of the air forces in the last times and strategic changes have shown us these policies will always change (Bilge, 1966:123). So today it is impossible to think theories of Sea and Land Supremacy without air force (Tamçelik, 1996:328; Tamçelik, 2009:263).
Air power has some advantages rather than sea power with its’ acting capability and reaching the regions. Also developments in air power nowadays give some strategic changes beside the tactical changes at defense policies. So it is impossible that thinking of Sea and Land Supremacy Theories without air power (Bilge, 1966:124).

To this idea, who controls the central region, he can control the East Europe. If this control is done with air control, which control the central region he can control all world island. But it is obligation that there has to be a air power. But we have to know that two element has a big importance of air power in the world policy. As you known air power gives a big fasting power and acting capability. But still it depends on land and sea military installations. However it is impossible to practice of land and sea supremacy theories without air sovereign and it shows that Cyprus has a ideal geography for this case. So we have to evaluate this island with its’ geopolitics importance and acting power.

If Cyprus controls the air on the region, that will give strategic importance to this island.

Conclusion

In this research it is especially evaluated threat and opportunity concepts opposing to power theories of Cyprus geography. When evaluating these disadvantages it is taken into consideration that each geography has a potential power and value. Especially in the last years it is discussing subject Cyprus’ real power potential and using the measures of this power potential from diplomatic way. Especially in the last years it is a discussing matter what is Cyprus’ real power potential and using of this power in a diplomatic way. That is the real for today these comments are late for Cyprus’ for its dynamic power with other world powers. The reason is that for this event, it is not evaluated as a whole with its strategic wholeness. It is a static factor for Cyprus geography. But this geography’s geopolitics and diplomatic dimension have to be commented with the global changing. So these theory ideas have become some disadvantages in time.

But this new geopolitics ideas will directly effect the economic and security, politic aspects of the Cyprus. As we mentioned the ideas are determined systematically by main geopoliticians. The principal ideas of these are sea, land, air and rimland supremacy theories.

There is not a definite decision today about which theory is main theory and which one is lower power. Competitions among the powers are increasing. Indefiniteness of this reason it is followed chronological order. So it is evaluated firstly sea, than land and rimland, finally air supremacy theory.

To the geopolitical theories Cyprus’ position is very different from other geographies. Cyprus’ geography is in center to land supremacy theory and also in sensitive region to rimland theory. So island geography has wide field as a value. Cyprus is in intersecting area of land supremacy theory and rimland theory. This point is very important.

Cyprus has a big importance and value for all theories. So Cyprus is strategic target and it can control many strategic targets.

As a result of these we can say that for Cyprus in supremacy theories:

1. It has a communication road to Middle East petroleum.
2. It controls the axis from Middle East to Africa and Anatolia-Middle East-Suez Canal.
3. It can control sea roads from Suez Canal to India-Pacific Ocean.
4. To air supremacy theory Cyprus has a strategic importance for directing the air forces.
5. It has a strategic concept of support a logistic and depot in a war Middle East.
6. Who controls the island, he will have prestige on Middle East states.
7. Cyprus is an outpost for security in Mediterranean basin.
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Abstract

Historically, the Western Balkans was of strategic importance that saw frequent conquests by various invaders and empires coming mostly from Mediterranean and Black Sea direction. Its history was also changing faster than in the rest of Europe from internal struggles as a clash between national and cultural differences that could not be merged into a more harmonious coexistence, which temporarily existed in some interrupted times. Unlike the countries in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) that experienced a peaceful transition from communism to political pluralism and a market economy, the former Yugoslavia occupying the overwhelming majority of the Western Balkans and regarded as more prosperous than its communist counterparts, witnessed a bloody disintegration through civil wars with worst atrocities that Europe has seen since the World War Two. Consequently, the Western Balkans today is a fragmented region of seven independent states still remaining outside the European Union to which it aspires to join, just like many former communist countries in CEE that already have made their way through. This Paper observes this distinct region of Europe since Roman Empire to the present day, and assumes its further perspective.

Introduction

The Western Balkans is a geographical region in Southern Europe comprising of seven independent states which all together have an area of 264,279 km^2. Despite that its name is relatively new, officially used for the first time not earlier than in 2004, the region in roughly present size has existed as a union since antiquity known as the Kingdom of Illyria, until 168 BC when it was conquered by the Romans and renamed as the Roman Province of Illyria. The land was inhabited by the Illyrians from a number of tribes that are assumed to have been united by a common Illyrian language (Wilkes, 1992). The Province was transformed into a prosperous region with legacies lasting to modern times – the Roman influence. Slavs began migration into the area during the 5th century AD. They were later identified as South Slavs to include Serbs, Croats, Slav Macedonians, Bosniaks, and Montenegrins who
were Christianized by Eastern Roman or Byzantine Empire. Their massive waves of migration weakened Illyrian heritage. After the fall of Byzantium, the Ottoman Empire from the Black Sea direction overrun the region in the second half of 15th century and held much of it until the first decade of the 20th century. Struggles for independence of the Western Balkans’ people continued but were unsuccessful until the Ottoman reign was forced to withdraw completely from the region.

Apart from Albanians who fought for a national state, the South Slavs who became more numerous were becoming conscious to establish a union between themselves. Although with the same heritage, the history of Slavs in the Western Balkans has been often associated with bloody conflicts among themselves and their neighbors. With Bulgarians they had alliances and sometimes rivalries. With Greeks as an autochthon different people relations through history were generally cooperative. Albanians as another autochthon people have mostly suffered from Slav invasions. The only people in the Balkans that Albanians traditionally held good relations with, were Romanians, explained by, perhaps some cultural similarities between them.

The South Slavs experiencing frequent invasions, especially from the West and the East, decided to establish Yugoslavia in order to resist external threats as a unified force. On the other side, slight heritage and identity differences were sufficient to generate internal wars between themselves. That was to result in disintegration of Yugoslavia twice, the last one which resulted in her modern successor states. The last country gaining independence from Yugoslavia was Kosovo in 2008, the population of which is around 90% Albanian or non-Slav.

To find out how the history of the Western Balkans’ people has evolved with some repeated behavior over time, it was necessary to provide a brief discussion on Roman invasion of Illyria in section one of this paper. Given that this was the area where Roman Empire would be divided into the West and the East, section two will focus on Byzantine Empire that lasted longer than its Western sister. The fall of Byzantium in which the South Slavs, Albanians and the Greeks were a constituent part of, did not bring them freedom and independence. The region was conquered by another Empire – the Ottoman Empire that will be discussed in section three. That conquest, with some exceptional interruptions, continued to the First Balkan War when the Ottoman Empire dissolved. Section four treats the First World War (WWI), the fuse of which was lit in Sarajevo on June 28, 1914 by a Serb called Gavrilo Princip who assassinated Franz Ferdinand, the Archduke of Austro-Hungary. Following the end of WWI, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was established. In World War Two (WWII) the Axis invaded the country. After liberation, Yugoslavia was reorganized into a communist state. Both of these are subject of discussion in section five. But communist Yugoslavia too, collapsed and disintegrated. The course and consequences of this collapse are provided in section six. The last section of the Paper draws conclusions on current and future prospects of the Western Balkans.

1. Roman Province of Illyria

The Roman Province of Illyria or Illyricum stretched from Drilon river in present Albania to Istria Peninsula in the west and Sava river (both in modern Croatia), bordering Dacia and

1 Slav Macedonians should not be confused with ancient Macedonians. Bulgarians are also South Slavs, though there is evidence that much of them are assimilated Thracians. In any case, Bulgarians do not fall in the area of the Western Balkans, or the focus of this Paper.
Thracia to the East, and Greeks to the south, with Salona near the modern city of Split in Croatia as a capital. It was a Province of great importance for Roman Empire. Many warriors, administrators and emperors who ruled Rome came from the Province and/or had Illyrian origin. The most notable one was Constantine the Great (27.02.272 – 22.05.337), the emperor who empowered Christianity throughout the Empire (Barnes, 1982). He founded Constantinople (modern Istanbul) which later initially replaced Rome as the capital, then became the capital of Byzantium. The Byzantium emperor Justinian the Great (463 – 14.11.565) was also of Illyrian origin from the tribe of Dardani living in the Roman Province of Dardania (part of Illyricum), or in the territory of today’s Kosovo, then extending to Southern Serbia.²

While Illyricum was under the reign of Rome and served as one of the major administrative divisions in the Empire, the Roman influence was facing the Greek culture which was becoming dominant especially in south-eastern part. It is perhaps this sort of influence from the south causing the division of the Roman Empire in two parts by Emperor Diocletian in 285: Western or Latin Empire with its capital in Rome, and Eastern or Byzantine Empire with the seat in Constantinople.³ The line division in 330 was made in Drina River, where today is the border between Serbia and, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). The population in the west of Drina River to Rome and beyond became Roman Catholics and those to the East Orthodox Christians.

In the 3rd century AD, waves of non-Illyrian and non-Roman people such as Huns, Visigoths, Alaric and Goths begun to cross into the Province and later turned as invaders. They first conquered the area and moved westwards to invade Italy as well. The Roman influence and heritage in half of the Western Balkans stagnated and experienced disorders as did the Illyrian heritage. However, while the Latin Roman or Western Empire was destroyed, the Eastern Empire or Byzantium continued to exist for more than 11 centuries (from 330 to 1453).

2. Eastern Roman Empire or Byzantium

As already discussed in previous section, the Greek influence was growing stronger as the Rome’s frontiers in the Balkans were weakened politically and economically. The fall of Western Empire made Byzantium to strengthen even more the influence in the Balkans. The Emperor Justinian was able to restore much of the territory that was lost by the West, including the capital in Rome. Greek was the primary official language of Byzantium and that is why we often come across in literature the term as the Empire of the Greeks, despite that other peoples such as Albanians (descended from Illyrians) and later Slavs were a constituent part of it. Recaptured territory of Western Illyricum by Byzantium which previously was devastated by barbarian invaders, did not assimilate the Illyrians much as did the massive migration of Slavs into the region. The greatest territorial extent was reached under the Emperor Justinian in 550, occupying almost entire Mediterranean, starting from a part of Spain, involving the three largest peninsulas in full (the Apennines, the Balkans, and Anatolia) returning through North

² Literally translated, Dard(h)ania in modern Albanian language means pear tree orchard or the land of pears. This view was supported by Johann Georg von Hahn, a philologist and specialist in Albanian history, language and culture (Elsie, 1998).
³ The Roman Emperor Diocletian was also Illyrian, born in the Roman Province of Dalmatia (modern Croatia and Bosnia).
Africa and meeting the starting point to the Gibraltar Straits with the outlet to the Atlantic Ocean.

Byzantium was one of the most powerful economic, cultural, and military forces in Europe. While multinational, there were rivalries within the Empire and struggle for domination among the nations that consisted it. The first serious conflict came between Byzantium and Bulgarians who had settled in the western coast of Black Sea. In the series of wars the Bulgarians defeated the Byzantium and established the First Bulgarian Empire (632-1018). With Byzantium shrinking after long wars with Bulgarians (680-1355) and Arabs (780-1180), the Serbs as one of the major rivals in the region managed to create an empire under Stefan Dušan for 25 years (from 1346 to 1371). The change in domination of one nation in the Balkans versus another and the switch of empires from Greeks to Bulgarians and later for a short period to Serbs, still was associated with Byzantium legacy until a strong storm came from the Black Sea giving the final stroke and the end of Byzantine Empire – the Ottoman conquest of the Balkans.

3. The Ottoman Conquest of the Balkans

The first account of a complete dissolution of the Byzantine Empire is taken the fall of Constantinople in spring 1453 and its capture by the Ottomans. The Ottomans had earlier already invaded much of the Balkans behind the enemy lines before the final assault on Constantinople. On September 26, 1371 they defeated the Serbs in the Battle of Marica that marked the end of 25 years Serbian Empire. In less than two decades, the Serbs organized and headed a coalition of the Balkans in the Battle of Kosovo in order to stop the Ottomans from further advancing to the West. The Battle of Kosovo was fought on 15 June 1389 five kilometers away from today’s capital city Pristina. Historical accounts report the Battle as fierce and intense that perhaps did not last longer than half a day (Malcolm, 2001). Casualties were heavy from both sides, in which the Ottoman head of battle Sultan Murad I and most of Serbian field commanders were killed. The Battle was a victory for the Ottomans that turned Serbia into a vassal (servant) by paying tribute and supplying soldiers to the Ottoman Empire.

Bulgaria fell in 1422. Resistance by what had remained from Byzantium still continued. The Balkan people undertook yet another attempt to stop the Ottomans in presumably the same location where their coalition was annihilated in 1389. This is known as the Second Battle of Kosovo fought between the coalitions of the Kingdom of Hungary led by Janos Hunyadi. In this Battle fought from October 17-20, 1448 the Ottomans overwhelmed the Balkan coalition by manpower and scored a decisive victory.

With Serbia and Bulgaria under occupation, and with Hungary marginalized outside the Balkans, it appeared that the Ottomans had no any major impediment on advancing towards deep continental Europe. However, there was one resistance which proved to be the fiercest in the Balkans for the Ottomans. The Albanians, whose status in the Byzantine Empire remains not properly and fairly investigated by historians, put up the major roadblock for 25 years to the Ottomans and effectively stopping them. Their leader Gjergj Kastrioti – Scanderbeg (16.05.1406-17.01.1468) was an educated commander in Istanbul and fought battles for the Ottomans. Since Greek was the official language of Byzantine Empire, the record of Albanian activities are either scarce or neglected. For instance, the seal of Skanderbeg that was kept in Denmark since it was discovered in 1634 has inscriptions in Greek language. The following words and letters in Greek:

\[ \text{Sublime Porte (Bab-ı Ali – High Gate, the Ottoman} \]
imperial government) to fight in Hungary, he arranged a secret agreement with Janos Hunyadi before the battle by notifying him that he (Scanderbeg) and a division of his Albanian army in service of the Ottomans will not fight but leave the front free to Hunyadi and his army. Scanderbeg with Albanian division did not appear in the battle but returned in in Kruja of Albania. Hunyadi won the battle against the Ottomans. Frustrated by the betrayal of Skanderbeg, the Ottomans amassed an army and attacked several times Albania but were unsuccessful in conquering it until Scanderbeg died. Scanderbeg is believed to have fought 25 battles, of which only two were defeats and the rest victories. Scanderbeg sought to strengthen ties with Janos Hunyadi to create an alliance against the Ottomans. Both were to meet each other and join their armies in the Second Battle of Kosovo in 1448, though Scanderbeg did not arrive. His non participation in this battle (some rumors believe he participated) is explained by two reasons: i) he was delayed or impeded on the route by the Serbs (who then were vassals to the Ottomans) to join Hunyadi and prepare the strategy; and ii) Hunyadi did not wait his delay on the route where they were supposed to meet first but went to the battle.

The resistance of Albanians led by Scanderbeg had echoed to Western Europe, especially after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 which had demoralized the fighting capabilities among the peoples in the Balkans and created fear in Central Europe of possible advance of Ottomans towards them. After Scanderbeg’s death, the entire Albania fell under Ottoman Empire and remained for some 450 years to come. Hungary too, would later be conquered and the Ottomans reached the greatest extent in the outskirts of Vienna.

Resurgence of resistance in the Balkans did not occur until the Ottoman Empire begun to decline. The First Serbia Uprising (1804-1813) gave Serbia a semi-independence, and the Second Serbian Uprising (1815-1817) resulted in de jure independence that became complete and recognized in 1878. Earlier that year, Montenegro also gained independence. The Albanians after the death of Scanderbeg, had become a better servants to the Ottomans than any other people, perhaps because they did not receive the proper place and recognition under the Byzantine Empire. Majority of them had largely embraced Islam as a religion and lived in peace as a nation, in a prosperous Empire at that time. For almost 400 years, there is no any major historical event such as wars or battles with Albanians in the territories they lived in majority. The Ottomans were a more tolerant invader towards different people in the Balkans than any other before and after. Their interest from Albanians in voluntary embracing Islam served both sides while being tolerant towards the Albanians who wished to remain Christians.\(^5\) To the Ottomans, Islam for Albanians somehow served the policy of divide and rule to make sure that Albanians do not get assimilated into Serbs and Greeks (Greek was the official language for Albanians in Byzantine Empire), a potential threat of unified resistance to the Ottomans. One of the greatest figures of Albanian culture, Faik Konica (15.03.1875 – 15.12.1942) who was the Kingdom of Albania’s ambassador to the United States before WWII,

\(^5\) Historical and profound evidence suggests that majority of Albanians adopted Islam willingly, though they did not have any other alternative under the Ottoman rule (Arnold, 2001).
has put the issue of Islam among Albanians as follows: “Had there not been Turkey, Albanians today would certainly have been larger in number but only as Greeks and Serbs, not as Albanians.” The Albanian Franciscan friar, Gjergj Fishta (23.10.1871 – 30.12.1940), who was also the chairman of the commission of the Congress of Manastir, which sanctioned the Albanian alphabet, prior to the First Balkan War (October 1912 to May 1913), expressed the alternative that Albanians should stay with the Sultanate of Istanbul as they were powerless to resist alone the Serbs, or preferred the rule of the Turks over Albanians rather than of Serbs.6 Albanians served in all segments of Ottoman Empire starting from statesmen, scientists, diplomats, writers, generals, and so on. For instance, Mustafa Kemal (19.05.1881–10.11.1938) regarded as Ataturk or Father of Turkey born in Thessaloniki of Greece is widely believed to be of Albanian parents, or at least descent from them. Turkey’s only national poet Mehmet Akif Ersoy (20.12.1873 – 27.12.1936) is the son of an Albanian emigrant from Kosovo.7 The founder and the first head of independent Albania, Ismail Qemali (16.01.1844 – 24.01.1919) served as a governor of several towns in the Balkans for the Ottomans.

Kosova Vilayeti (1877 – 1912) was an Ottoman Province in the Balkans covering an area of 34,000 square kilometers, or at least three times larger than current territory of the Republic of Kosovo. It included the entire Kosovo, Western FYR Macedonia, Southern Serbia, a part of Eastern Montenegro, and at one time extending to Bulgaria. It was the most developed part of the Balkans and its capital was Skopje (Üsküp in Turkish) or the present capital of FYR Macedonia. While Kosova Vilayeti was the most developed region of the Balkans, Kosovo today is the poorest country in Europe. The claims often used in Western circles that current Kosovo’s underdevelopment is because of the Ottoman rule and legacy, is unfound and can be refuted outright.

---

6 This can be found in Fishta’s (1937)[2006]) epic poem Lahuta e Malcis (The Highlands Lute). The Congress of Manastir was held from 14 to 22 November, 1908 in the city of Manastir, now renamed by Slav Macedonians as Bitola, in the present day of FYR Macedonia.

7 To be more precise about this that may sound as a little surprise to the reader, Mehmet Akif is the son of Tahir. Tahir was born in 1826 in the village Shushica (where I, the author of this Paper is also born), then part of Peja District, currently in the municipality of Istog in Kosovo. Tahir’s elder brother was Halit. I descended from Halit, Mehmet Akif was the son of Tahir. Tahir emigrated to Turkey for education at the age of 24 and was supposed to return to Kosovo but remained in Istanbul. Tahir (Hajredin) Mulaj visited only once Kosovo where he attempted to persuade and get my grandfather Beqir to Turkey, but Beqir refused and remained in Kosovo. Mehmet Akif has served as a veterinary inspector in Albanian territories under Ottoman Empire for four years. For e biography of Mehmet Akif, see Yayinevi (2000).
The national awakening against Ottoman Empire among Albanians culminated in 1878 with the League of Prizren demanding a national state, which corresponded with the independence of Montenegro and Serbia the same year. In fact, as they were fighting against the Ottomans to drive them out, a worse invader, which was also fighting the Ottomans, came in from which Albanians will experience the greatest suffrage in their history – the Serbs and Montenegrins. The Vilayet of Kosovo was fully occupied and its colonization with Serbs and Montenegrins along with deportation and killing en masse of Albanians begun.

4. First World War and the First Yugoslavia

Yugoslavia means the land of the South Slavs. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the first idea of a joint state for the Slavs in this part of the Balkans originated in the late 17th century among some Slavic intelligentsia and philosophers. The reason behind the idea can be extracted from discussion in previous sections of this Paper – lost of sovereignty for centuries by occupation from East and the West. After the first Balkan War (1912-1913), the idea tended to come into being a reality and was pushed forward. Meanwhile there was another empire from the West that still had under control much of the territory which in the idea of those advocates and proponents of a union of South Slavs was meant to become Yugoslavia. The border between what was previously under the Ottoman Empire and became Serbia and Montenegro, and the Austro-Hungarian Empire along the Drina River where it was between Roman Western and Eastern (Byzantine) Empire some 17 centuries ago, to shape Yugoslavia. Following the end of WWI in which the Western Balkans fought on the side of Entente Block, and dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Council of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs pushed the efforts to establish a joint state. The result of these efforts was the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. It was proclaimed on December 1, 1918. From 1920 to 1921, the Kingdom together with Czechoslovakia and Romania established the Little Entente. In 1924 it engaged in the Balkan Bloc with Greece, Romania, and Turkey. The type of government was constitutional monarchy until 1929, renamed the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and evolved into a

---

8 For a detailed description of the horror, see an article of the New York Times (31.12.1912).
dictatorship. Since WWII to the present, the Kingdom is colloquially referred to as the First Yugoslavia.

Not only as the name suggests, but the Kingdom was not a true union of South Slavs as it recognised only Serbs, Croats and Slovenes as a nation. The rest such as Bosniaks, Slav Macedonians and Montenegrins were considered as Serbs. Non-Slavs such as Albanians, German, and Hungarians with sizeable population were treated as citizens of second hand. Albania as part of the Western Balkans declared independence on 1912. The London Treaty of 1913 recognized Albania in present day borders as a sovereign state but refused her demands for additional territories inhabited by Albanians that were given to Serbia and Greece, i.e. 2/3 of Albanian inhabited areas, most of them in Kosovo.

The terror by the First Yugoslavia, namely by the Serbs, against Kosovo Albanians was associated with deportation, murder, land confiscation and bringing in the Serb newcomers through the program that became known as agrarian reform and colonization of Kosovo (Obradović, 1981). The provinces known in Ottoman era as Sandjak of Niš and Novi Pazar (Yeni Pazar in Turkish), were ethnically cleansed of Albanians by terror, villages leveled, and the population deported to Kosovo and elsewhere south, much of which reached Turkey.

Although the primary motives of South Slavs in the Western Balkans for one state were their many close historical, national, cultural, and other similarities to resist as a union against external threats of invasions, the coexistence of three recognized nations begun to manifest some divergences in language, religion and power. The Serbs as Orthodox Christians were the most populous nation to be followed by Croats as Roman Catholics, and Slovenes (also Roman Catholics) which, according to the 1921 census comprised only around 9% of total population. Serbo-Croatian language was the only official state language. The Serbs wrote in Cyrillic while Croats in Latin alphabet for the same spoken language. Slovenian was a more differentiated Slavic spoken language written in Latin characters. Perhaps these and other differences generated some rivalries between Serbs and Croats over the power. In 1934, a Slav Macedonian activist from a nationalist organization in conspiracy and collaboration with the Croatian extreme right banned political party Ustaše (insurgents) assassinated in Marseille of France the King Alexander I who was of Serb ethnicity. This was one of the major cases of clashes involving differences and internal threats that should be remembered, among others, to better understand some related events during WWII and afterwards in Yugoslavia.

9 In addition to the bulk of historical evidence, a video record of the 1904 in Novi Pazar shows that it was an Albanian city. This can be seen by the people in typical Albanian dress. Today, around 90% of the population is Bosniak and the rest Serbs with almost no Albanian. Some scholars after the publication of the video are discussing whether apart from those Albanians deported, some have been assimilated into Bosniaks, though this assumption should be backed by further investigation as the current Bosniaks throughout the First and the Second Yugoslavia do not resemble anything in dress with traditional Albanian costumes in 1904 that can be watched at this address: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PiSQellQUSM. This evidence has questioned and refuted the claims of many historians, primarily of Serbs and Croats, according to which, the Bosniaks are Serbs and/or Croats but with different religion – Islam. The Bosniaks are a separate nation, most of which descended from Illyrians, and a part of them are of separate Slavic tribe that spoke the same language just like Serbs, Croats, and Montenegrins.
5. Second World War and the second Yugoslavia

As already pointed out earlier, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia fought on the side of the Allies during WWI. The outbreak of the WWII found the Kingdom signing the Tripartite Pact on 24 March 1941, most likely due to the fear of an invasion by the Axis Powers. Within days, massive demonstrations broke in Belgrade capital city against the decision signed by the Prince Paul of Yugoslavia. The prince was overthrown on March 27 by a military coup d'etat supported by the British. Hitler wanted Yugoslavia within the Pact without war as he had a greater and broader agenda to the East against the Soviet Union – USSR (later to be known as Operation Barbarossa). Having realized that Yugoslavia is now practically out of the Pact, the Axis Power decided to invade. The invasion was launched from Romania where Luftwaffe had assembled aircrafts as a preparation for Operation Barbarossa, the beginning of which was delayed due to the invasion Yugoslavia. Hundreds of Luftwaffe’s aircrafts were returned to the West in the morning of 6 April heavily bombing Belgrade in what was named as Operation Punishment (Unternehmen Strafgericht). The bombing continued on April 7, destroying administrative and severing communication infrastructure of the Yugoslav government with the rest of the country. Within ten days after bombing of Belgrade, Germany, Italy, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria invaded Yugoslavia from all sides. Germans entered from the north and held Slovenia, Italians from occupied Albania (Albania was the first Balkan country to be occupied by the Axis in WWII) and Adriatic Sea invaded Montenegro, much of Kosovo and a part Croatian coastline, Bulgaria took Macedonia and Eastern Kosovo, and Hungary the northern Vojvodina. Once invasion was complete, the Axis begun to establish puppet regimes. The most known was with Independent State of Croatia (Nezavisna Države Hrvatske – NDH) which extended to include entire BiH and reaching to Zemun in the outskirts of Belgrade. The NDH was led by the Ustaše, a far right nationalist group which had a very small and insignificant popular support among the Croats, but were installed into power by the Axis. The Ustaše were known to have committed notorious crimes against Serbs, Jews and Roma with appalling methods in a number of concentration camps. Serbia’s Chetniks (Četnici – detachments) which largely descended out of the remains of the First Yugoslav army, were the first to have resisted the Axis’ invasion and enjoyed the support of the Allies in their fight. The support was quit in 1943 when the Allies found that the Chetniks were not fighting the Axis but collaborating with Italians intensively, which was the cause why the Allies shifted side by aiding the communists lead by half-Croatian and half-Slovenian Josip Broz – Tito. In Serbia the Nazis installed a puppet government led by Milan Nedić whose efforts to exterminate the Serbia’s Jews turned out to be far more efficient than of the Ustaše against Jews in the NDH (Croatia and BiH together).10 For Kosovo Albanians, the coming of Italians fascists and joining munch of Kosovo with Italian occupied Albania was again a change of one invader (Serbia) with another, but this time a “better” one because they were used to live under constant terror and repression by Serbia. The Albanians formed the Balli Kombëtar (National Front) whose idea was a homeland for Albanians in one state as the South Slavs did before. Given all this complicated war and political landscape, it is important to remind an interesting thing about Yugoslavia; that the Axis did not need to commit many troops. In no country of

10 Total population of the Jews before WWII in Yugoslavia was 76,654. Of 32,000 living the NDH 23,000 had been killed. In Nedić’s smaller territory of Serbia than the NDH, of 30,000 pre-war Jews 24,000 had been killed by the end of the war (Bennet, 1995: 48).
Europe during WWII struggles and atrocities between ethnic groups have been on a larger scale than in Yugoslavia. The NDH committed atrocities against Serbs, Jews, Roma and to some extent Bosniaks, puppet regime of Serbia against Jews, Chetniks against Albanians and Bosniaks. The most distinctive and interesting of all not only in the Western Balkans but also in Europe with WWII was the issue of the Jews among the Albanians. Strangely enough, Albania was a puppet state of fascist Italy but the end of WWII there found more Jews than before the war. Albania became a safe heaven for the Jews that were already living there and many others deported from the rest of Europe. An American Jewish scholar, who has investigated the event in details, maintains that this is a unique case in history given that the Albanians historically were occupied by various invaders with the one during WWII which in its official policy had the plan to exterminate the Jews. Any long repressed people would have been willing to comply with the demands of an “honest” occupation force if that force would release the people from another repression under certain requirements such as the handing over of the Jews, but Albanians had not. On the contrary, the Albanians risked their lives on an unprecedented scale by hiding and sheltering the Jews in private houses.  

In remaking the Balkans and its western part in particular, the Great Powers always played a significant role throughout the 20th century (Glenny, 2000). The end result of the WWII in Yugoslavia was the victory of communists which they never would have been able to come in that position without the support from outside. While overemphasizing external threat, the biggest battle was inside. The communists did not have much to fight the Axis as they had to battle against all various ideological and national conflicts within the Yugoslavia. In fact, the communists fought only 4-5 major battles against the Axis in 3 of which were defeated with heavy casualties and the rest achieved only strategic goals. The communists demanded the Allies to bomb several cities, including Belgrade which the Allies did. This was an indication that after the Axis withdrawal (which had small presence on site, anyway) the Yugoslav communists would have not been able to win over many fighting factions. As of January 1944, partisans in Serbia did not count more than 1,700 fighters, while the number of Chetniks on active duty was between 60,000 and 70,000 of which 10,000 were fully armed (Benson, 2004: 83). The Red Army had already advanced to central Europe and participated in the liberation of Belgrade. But an important aspect for Yugoslavia as far as SU is concerned is that, the communists after the rise to power took control of the country, distanced themselves from the USSR, and remained outside the Soviet camp of Eastern Europe. After the split with the USSR, Yugoslavia embarked on a separate road of socialism known as self-management or market socialism. The country was organized as a federation of 6 republics (Slovenia, Croatia, BiH, Serbia, Macedonia, and Montenegro) and two autonomous provinces (Vojvodina and Kosovo), each having the right of a veto in the federal government over the country’s major decision makings). In 1956 Yugoslavia with Egypt and India established the Non-Aligned Movement that became the third most influential block in world affairs after that of the United States and the USSR. In 1963 it was renamed the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). Today it is sometimes colloquially referred to as the Second Yugoslavia that covered a slightly larger area (255,804km²) than in previous borders as the First Yugoslavia (247,542 km²).

For full details, see Sarner (1997). Malcolm (1999) notes that of 520 Jews living in Kosovo before WWII, 200 were handed over to the Germans by Albanian collaborators of the Nazis. However, since over 60% of the Kosovo Jews were saved, it is the second highest survival rate (after Albania) of the Jews in Europe during WWII.
According to the 1981 census, total population of SFRY stood at 22,424,711 inhabitants. Serbs were the largest ethnic group by 36.3%, Croats followed by around 20%. The rest of the population composition included: Bosniaks (9%), Slovenes (7.8%), Albanians (7.7%), Slav Macedonians (6%), Yugoslavs (5.4%), Montenegrins (2.6%) and the rest were minorities with Hungarians being the largest one by 1.9% (Statistical Yearbook of Yugoslavia, 1990). By 1990, the population estimate put Albanians as the third largest group after Serbs and Croats as it was having the fastest growth rate in SFRY. Though Albanians were the third largest group and mostly living in Kosovo, they did not have a republic like Serbs, Croats, and Slovenians, Slav Macedonians, and even Montenegrins whose republic had a population of only 1/3 of that in Kosovo. Most federal units mainly had a diverse ethnic composition of the population. Kosovo and Slovenia were the most ethnically homogeneous with around 90% Albanians in the former and Slovenes in the latter. Three largest ethnic groups in BiH were: 44% Bosniaks, 33% Serbs, and 18% Croats (Croats also lived in Vojvodina). Serbs also accounted for 12% of Croatia’s population. Bosniaks lived in a significant number in Novi Pazar district of Serbia. The share of Albanians in Macedonia rose to over 25% of two million inhabitants. In Montenegro they were 7% of the total. While Serbs and Croats were dispersed in some interrupted geographical districts, Albanians were largely in compact territories.

The very diverse ethnic composition of SFRY when associated with other inherited profile such as religion (e.g. Serbs, Montenegrins, and Macedonians were Orthodox; Croats and Slovenes were Roman Catholics; Bosniaks and Albanians (most of them Albanians because a minority is Roman Catholic) were Muslims, were some of major differences that communism was unable to reconcile or refrain them from the tendency of clashes. Demonstrations of Albanians in 1968, the 1972 Croatian Spring rethinking independence, the 1981 massive student demonstration of Kosovo Albanian students demanding the status of province to be advanced to that of the republic in the federation, and the rise of Serb nationalism in 1987, were only some of the major indicating internal problems that the SFRY was facing. The second unification of South Slavs in the wake of great systemic changes from communism to democracy disintegrated in the early 1990s.

Albania as a separate country of the Western Balkans became communist after WWII. It initially was aligned with the USSR from which it received military and economic assistance, then broke the relations and withdrew from the Warsaw Pact in 1961. As what geostrategic importance Albania had in the geopolitics of Mediterranean, this can be traced to the events during WWII and its aftermath under communism. Vlora is a city port located in Southwestern Albania on the shores of Adriatic Sea and Strait of Otranto. Here, a German and Italian submarine base and naval installation was set operational, which was heavily bombed by the Allies. Under communism, Vlora became a submarine base of the USSR, to which the NATO, in particular the United States, was seriously concerned for this only Soviet military base in the Mediterranean. For the USSR and its Marshal Zhukov, the handicap of the Soviet fleet with respect to the Mediterranean, were the Dardanelles Strait, Bosporus, and many Greek islands, thus Vlora in the Otranto Strait and as an entrance to the Adriatic Sea, was an excellent location from which to destroy the American Sixth Fleet. It was also seen by the USSR as a distant deterrent location for the major Soviet naval base in Sevastopol in the Black Sea. The Albanian communist regime was pleased to offer Vlora the USSR to be sacrificed first or become a defending point of Sevastopol. However, the Soviets were forced to withdraw from

---

12 Horvat (1988) saw the underdevelopment of Kosovo in SFRY as a result of discrimination of Albanians by the Slavs, namely the Serbs.
Vlora (and from Albania completely) under their broader agenda and front of the Cold War with the West elsewhere. This coincided with the Berlin Crisis in 1961 (4 June – 9 November 1961), culminating in the erection of the Berlin Wall, followed by the Cuban Missile Crisis (14 – 28 October 1962), the closest moment of a potential nuclear war (Pearson, 1998). These were the two events why the USSR decided to give up the submarine base in a strategic location in the Mediterranean – in Vlora – by the end of May 1961, or six weeks before the Berlin Crisis. After the split with the USSR, Albania aligned with China, but these relations lasted only until 1978 when China ended assistance programs for Albania. Since then, Albania was one of the most isolationist communist countries in the world. Religion was brutally suppressed and from 1963 it was prohibited, thus making Albania the first and the only country in the world that officially enforced atheism until the communism collapsed in the early 1990s.

6. Disintegration of SFRY and the emerge of the Western Balkans

Tendencies for a domination in SFRY begun after the death of the long-time charismatic leader Tito and were accelerated in the course of transition from communism to democracy that escalated in interethnic wars. The terrain of what is known as the bloodiest war in Europe since the end of WWII was prepared earlier. The rise of nationalism in Serbia under Slobodan Milosević became the primary culprit for the bloodiest conflict in Europe since WWII. It started by abolishing the autonomy of Kosovo and Vojvodina by Milosević in 1989. Montenegro became a servant to Serbia. Macedonia was neutralized. In BiH there was a large population of Serbs. The only republics outside the rule of Serbia now were Croatia with a sizable Serb population, and Slovenia as the only republic not bordering Serbia. Federal institutions begun to fall in the directives of Milosević, including the Yugoslav People’s Army (Jugoslovenska Narodna Armija – JNA) in which during the entire post WWII, at least 50% of officer corps were Serbs. Propaganda from the past was effectively used by Milosević’s to intimidate, primarily Croats and Slovenes, and indoctrinate Serbs. The reference to Ustaše was intensively used.

Slovenia declared independence from SFRY on June 25, 1991 after which the JNA attacked but was temporarily defeated in a Ten Day War and forced to retreat. Macedonia became the second republic to declare independence on September 08, Croatia third on 08 October of the same year. BiH joined the secession on March 01, 1992. The independence of Slovenia and Croatia was recognized by the EU on January 1992, of BiH on April 07, 1992 and of Macedonia a day after. Slovenia seceded with a limited war and later would be the first former Yugoslav republic to join the EU, leaving behind the rest in the Western Balkans which Slovenia officially is not part of. Macedonia broke away from the SFRY without war. But the situation in recognized independent Croatia and BiH was different. By 1995 the Serbs had conquered 1/3 of Croatia’s territory. The Croatian War of Independence was costly with thousands of lives lost, damages to infrastructure, and facing atrocities by the Serbs in Eastern Slavonia bordering Serbia. Croatia retook the territories lost to the Serbs in 1995 (Operation Oluja - Storm) and around 200,000 Serbs left as refugees.

The worst atrocities known as Bosnian genocide occurred in BiH. About 100,000 people killed, majority of them Bosniaks. The Bosnian War (1992-1995) created an estimated number of 2

\[13\] For a very detailed and excellent study of the collapse of Yugoslavia see Bennet (1995), though it is not a complete record as disintegration continued afterwards. The remaining story for the events after 1995 can be found, among many others, in Benson (2004).
million people displaced, nearly half of total population. Ethnic cleansing was the aim of war. The Serbs had advantage over Croats and Bosniaks in military equipment they had inherited from the JNA, or the JNA fought itself. Croatia was aiding its nationals in BiH. The United Nations enforced an arms embargo to Yugoslavia, which did not affect the Serbs because the SFRY was the net exporter of arms, and proved a disaster for unarmed Bosniaks who were facing both Serbs and Croats. The Serbs run a number of infamous concentration camps resembling to those in WWII used by the Nazis and Ustaše, where Bosniaks were beaten, tortured and murdered, and between 20 000 to 50 000 women raped. Croats and Bosniaks also run few prison camps detaining Serbs and committed atrocities. The outcry in the world pressured the United Nations (UN) to intervene. However, the peacekeeping force UNPROFOR proved ineffective in separating the warring factions and stop the genocide. The Srebrenica Massacre or Genocide was the killing of more than 8,000 Bosniak boys and men by the Serbs in the presence of UNPROFOR despite being declared by the UN as a “protected zone”. In the aftermath of war, BiH was divided between Serbs (49% of territory as Republika Srpska) and Federation of the BiH (Bosniaks and Croats together holding 51% of the territory). The fear of international community and the UN what happened in BiH can be repeated in Kosovo, forced NATO to intervene against Serbia in Kosovo. The NATO campaign lasted for 78 days in Spring 1999 (24 March – 11 June) to drive the Serb forces out and place Kosovo under the UN protection. Kosovo Albanians, however, suffered an estimated 15,000 people killed and missing, 120,000 houses destroyed, around 850,000 people deported to Albania, Macedonia, and Montenegro, thousands of women raped, extensive damages in the infrastructure, and systematic looting. A number of Serbs also fled to Serbia after the UN deployment.

FYR Macedonia which throughout the 1990s was the quietest part of the former SFRY, in 2001 faced an armed conflict with Albanians who were demanding more rights. There was also an insurgency by Albanians in South Serbia the same year demanding more rights from the Belgrade. From 2003 to 2006 Serbia and Montenegro created a union between them (that included the UN administered Kosovo). The union was named as the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia but this was never recognized as a legal successor to Yugoslavia or the “Third Yugoslavia”. It was known only as Serbia and Montenegro. Montenegro seceded on May 21, 2006. Kosovo declared independence on February 17, 2008. At the moment of writing this Paper, 73 countries have recognized Kosovo, which is a “supervised independence” by an EU mission.

The main language in the SFRY was Serbo-Croatian. Now there is a number of new artificially declared languages as a replacement. The Serbs speak Serbian, the Croats Croatian. The difference between these two spoken languages is smaller than the difference between British English and the American English. A Bosnian language is also created. And a further interesting invention is the Montenegrin language. If one knows Serbo-Croatian that existed two decades ago, s/he will be fine with all these dialects of lose distinctive languages around political borders only. FYR Macedonian is a bit different from Serbo-Croatian and is more akin to Bulgarian language from which it descended, jus as the Slav Macedonians as people are “refined Bulgarians”. Albania and Croatia joined NATO on April 1, 2009. Croatia is closer to
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14 The United Nations did not recognize this (re)union as the successor of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). Differently from the disintegration of the former Yugoslavia, Russia took the place of the USSR and is recognized as its sole successor, e.g. inheriting the permanent seat in the UN Security Council.
accession in the EU. The rest of the Western Balkans has longer route to that aim. Not much has changed in BiH, Kosovo, and FYR Macedonia which remain fragile democracies with the risk of interethnic tensions. The Republika Srpska aspires to join Serbia if possible and a Croat part of BiH to Croatia. Serbia has already divided a part of Kosovo and keeps it under control. Albanians in FYR Macedonia still feel not to have the proper place and role in the state. Kosovo Albanians may want to join Albania but that is unlikely to happen as long as it is supervised and to some extent ruled by the EU. All these scenarios suggest that there is a lot to do in political stabilization in this part of the Western Balkans. Not much has changed in this respect since the wars ended and the region is still colloquially referred to as the “black whole of Europe”.

Conclusions and prospects

The Western Balkans was perhaps the most appropriate location in Europe for living since ancient times. That may partially be the reason why the most powerful empires of the time from Mediterranean (Roman Empire) and Black Sea (Ottoman Empire) first sought to capture this region in their agenda of conquests. Before invaders in sequence spotted the region for invasion, it was known as Illyria, an ancient civilization built by the Illyrians. Some invaders like the Slavs, were not interested in conquering the region like Romans and Ottomans, but to desert the areas in which they lived in massive waves and come to settle forever. This has assimilated the Illyrians, although Albanians and many historians strongly support the view that the only direct descendants of Illyrians are Albanians because of their unique Indo-European language.

From Middle Ages to modern times, immigration of Slavs had overwhelmed local native population and became dominant in numbers and legacy of the Western Balkans. But that was not the end of invasions from empires such as Austro-Hungary and external threats to South Slavs in the regions. Lose differences of their tribes generated the idea of a union or one state for South Slavs. That this was historically a troubled region not only in Middle Ages but modern times, was to be proven again in 1914 when the WWI begun due to an assassination in Sarajevo, the capital city of BiH, then, in WWII delaying the plans of the Axis for Operation Barbarossa, and recently, the worst and largest bloodshed since WWII as the Bosnian War from 1992-1995. Such a complicated and interesting the history of the Western Balkans is. External risks usually act as a pushing force for strengthening of alliances inside and eventually leading to the union. The region was not short of alliances through history when facing external invasions. The Slavs, Greeks, and Albanians proved this when facing the Ottoman Empire. Sometimes they were not alone and were aided by Hungarians. Due to closer national identities, the South Slavs formed Yugoslavia twice. When external threats appeared, the union did not prove to serve much the idea behind which it was established. The two unions were more fatal for internal security when confronted with foreign invasions than beneficiary due to collaboration with invaders and jealousy among themselves for small national and cultural differences. In WWII many South Slav people slaughtered each other than they ever did against those who were more strangers to them, except Albanians. The only effective result in resisting external threat as a union, was the defiance against the USSR whose aim was to subordinate Yugoslavia like the rest of communist states in Eastern Europe. In absence of similar external threats, the South Slavs returned to the practice of WWII in slaughtering each
other for the purpose of domination in the last decade of the 20th century. That is why they got independent states on major national lines, but not yet as they intended or still hope. The South Slavs are not asking for a union between themselves to resist any external threat of invasion, but independently seeking join an external union of states with different cultures from which the Yugoslavs earlier united to expect potential risks. That union of states now is the EU, an active player in the Western Balkans. While the union between South Slavs came altogether at one and second time, integration into the EU is piece by piece or each state separately. And the Western Balkan countries to be integrated and accessed into the EU, they also need to be integrated between themselves, not like in the past as a union or single state, but (inter)independent states. Membership in the EU, however, is only one of the major aspirations of the Western Balkan countries. Membership in NATO is another major strategic objective. Here there is a little divergence. NATO is led by Washington and the EU is ruled by Brussels. Once Albania and Croatia were admitted to NATO, the EU initially liberalized the visas for Serbia, FYR Macedonia and Montenegro on one hand, and excluding Albania, BiH, and Kosovo on the other hand. It later included Albania and BiH, though Kosovo still remains out. This may perhaps be a sign of some kind of silent rivalries between two modern most powerful empires, the U.S.A. and the EU, who have their interests over the region. The Western Balkans has been under such interests since the ancient times, it is today, and will be in the future. While the EU and/or its individual predecessors either brought, generated, or silenced the bloodshed and genocide in the region, the U.S.A. was always called in to pacify. The same battle may be waged again and the countries in the region should carefully prepare their long term strategies on which side they will silently want to be after membership in the EU and NATO. The threat from the Mediterranean and Black Sea direction now is over.
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Cyprus Question remains one of the unresolved and long-lasting issues of the international community and has been addressed by numerous UN Security Council resolutions. It has come to the fore of international and regional politics in 2004 and figures largely in terms of regional relations and balance of power, international law and conflict resolution.

From the geo-political angle, the role of Cyprus question in the Eastern Mediterranean region (which in my presentation will be defined in a larger geo-political context encompassing the Middle East, the Balkans and, to some extent, the Caucasus) is important as of one of the thorniest issues poisoning relations between two important regional actors and historical rivals, Turkey and Greece. Both view this region as the arena for extending their respective spheres of influence and promoting their interests, primarily because the much needed energy and natural resources produced in the Middle East, the Caucasus and Central Asia are transferred to the world markets via the Eastern Mediterranean where Cyprus is strategically located. The location of at the intersection of most important naval gateways makes the island an valuable asset in controlling the flow of resources, and consequently, the rivalry between Greece and Turkey over the limits of their respective authorities in the region is one of the major questions in the Eastern Mediterranean.

The historical background and roots of the Cyprus questions go back in ages. Starting in the early-nineteenth century the Greek Cypriots sought to bring about an end to almost 250 years of Ottoman rule over the island and the presence of a distinct Turkish Cypriot community amidst them. The seeds of the present dispute were effectively sown then and bore fruit during the years of British colonial domination in the early 20th century and the years of anti-colonial struggle in the 1920s-1950s. However, the Greek Cypriot community’s desire for freedom did not lead to a demand for independence only. Rather, viewing themselves and mainland Greeks as one people, the Greek Cypriots expressed their desire for freedom through enosis (union with Greece), coupled with Greece’ active involvement which took the form of diplomatic pressure on Britain and within the UN. With the failure of Greek diplomacy, the Greek Cypriot movement resorted to armed struggle led by terrorist EOKA fighters against the British colonial regime. Aware of the potential danger of enosis to the Turkish Cypriots and to serve its own colonial aims, Britain encouraged the counter-mobilization of Turkish Cypriot community, supported and worked together with the Turkish Cypriot anti-enosis struggle. At the same time, it highlighted Turkey’s strategic interests in Cyprus and its aversion to enosis.
Well aware of the discriminatory treatment of the Turks/Muslims in former Ottoman areas annexed to Greece, the Turkish Cypriots fiercely rejected union with Greece. This spontaneous rejection led to a British-Turkish Cypriot front against EOKA, and by the late 1950s the main parties to the conflict were at loggerheads with each other. The Greek Cypriots and Greece were pushing for enosis, while the Turkish Cypriots and Turkey responded with demands for taksim (division of the island into Greek and Turkish zones). The British, meanwhile, were determined to retain full sovereignty of the island. The compromise solution between the extremes of enosis and taksim was independence. The parties agreed on a basic structure for the new, independent Republic of Cyprus (ROC) based on the London/Zurich Agreements and Treaties of Guarantee, whereas the basic structure of the ROC was laid down in the 1960 Constitution, which established a bi-communal partnership Republic (both documents are to be elaborated in the following sub-topic). From the outset, many Greek Cypriots voiced their discontent with the agreements, regarding them as a betrayal of the enosis cause. Greek Cypriot-imposed amendments abolished critical constitutional provisions that characterized the bi-communal nature of the Republic and set the stage for a unitary, centralized state with minority rights for the Turkish Cypriot community. Tensions grew until Turkish Cypriot officials either left or were made to leave all public positions. The outbreak of inter-communal violence between the Greek Cypriot police forces and the Turkish Resistance Movement, and between Greek and Turkish Cypriot paramilitary groups, led to the forced displacement of over 30,000 Turkish Cypriots from mixed villages to enclaves put under severe economic embargo. The problem intensified with Greece’s efforts to destabilize Greek Cypriot-run government. Tensions between Greece and Cyprus had been exacerbated following the 1974 military coup in Greece and the growing Greek interference in the internal affairs of the island pushing towards enosis. At this point, Turkey, which had already been on the verge of intervening in 1964 and 1967 in response to inter-communal violence, intervened militarily on 20 July 1974, invoking its rights under the Treaty of Guarantee. The pro-European regime in Athens and the Turkish occupation of over one third of the island made some member states such as France more supportive of the Greek Cypriot side, while others like Germany and the UK preferred to retain an even-handed approach. Since 1974 Cyprus has been divided into two distinct zones. In the north, the Turkish Cypriot community first declared the Turkish Federated State of Cyprus in 1975, and, following the failure of negotiations to restore the principles of bi-communality and partnership under the 1960 Constitution, declared the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) in 1983. The international community, with the exception of Turkey, condemned this unilateral declaration of independence as a secessionist act. In the south, the Greek Cypriots retained the title of the ROC and were viewed as the only legitimate authority on the island despite the absence of Turkish Cypriots there.

The underlying conflict between their respective kin-states, Greece and Turkey, has been a contributing factor to the division between the two communities. Since the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453 and the ensuing four centuries of Ottoman rule over Greece, which ended with the Greek war of independence in 1821-29, tensions between the two nations have been high. Rivalries were reinforced in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with the wars of 1897, 1912-13 and 1919-23, and again after 1974 by conflicts over sovereignty rights in the Aegean Sea. In view of the fact that the two Cypriot communities identify with their respective ‘motherlands’, Greek-Turkish rivalry hinders the creation of shared or coexisting identities in Cyprus. Both parties (but particularly Greece), inspired by the level of created conditionality, elevate their demands to the maximum degree. This handicap draws
particularly Turkey to a dilemma, and under the pressure of this conditionality, any solutions would only satisfy one of the parties and would be inadequate to implement and sustain durable peace between Turkey and Greece.

Furthermore, the impossibility of achieving a compromise is determined by the fact that for decades the actual parties to the conflict had been defending mutually exclusive negotiating positions on the key issues – political equality, sovereignty, security and territory. To the Turkish Cypriot leadership the principle of political equality means equality between the two federated states, coordination rather than subordination between the federated states within a common structure, and equality of the two communities within the federal level. The key principles of Greek Cypriots' proposals center on the proportionality and majority rule. By the same token, the concept of Turkish Cypriot land being economically self-sufficient and thus large enough to sustain its autonomy is rejected by Greek Cypriots on the grounds that the separating boundary should take into account the demographic balance on the land. From the security viewpoint, to the Turkish Cypriots, Turkey alone can protect the smaller Turkish Cypriot community from the larger Greek Cypriot one. To the Greek Cypriots, however, the main security threat is posed by Turkey itself, hence their calls for demilitarization and resistance to Turkey's interference in Cyprus.

For the Greek-Cypriot community, the Cyprus question is mainly viewed as an international conflict which dates to 1974, the year of Turkish invasion and occupation. The inter-communal nature of the conflict prior to the island's division is downplayed or completely denied. The Greek Cypriot side sees the relation between the two ethnic communities as one of majority towards minority, with the former enjoying domination in the government. Since the establishment of the ROC, Greek Cypriots have fiercely contested what they believed to be the over-generous concessions granted to the Turkish Cypriot community relative to its size. In their view, the Turkish Cypriots, who represented 18% of the island’s population, should have been granted minority rights rather than an almost equal share in government arrangements. The complete withdrawal of Turkish troops and the unrestricted return of refugees are the central demands of the Greek Cypriots. The settlement by mainland Turks is also a contentious issue. The Greek Cypriots also contest the right of intervention granted to the three protector states, claiming it allows for the violation of the sovereignty, independence and self-determination of Cyprus and is thus at odds with international law. According to the Greek Cypriots, the Republic of Cyprus has never ceased to exist, a position that corresponds to the international legal position. Based on this, the Greek Cypriot government claims to be the sole and rightful representative of Cyprus. The Cypriot Greeks consider their international status and their current position within EU as their only advantages compared to the military superiority of Turkey and its support of Turkish Cypriots. To abandon this comfortable status in order to enter into open negotiations is generally considered unacceptable.

The Turkish Cypriots, on the other hand, emphasize the inter-communal character of the conflict and insist on their right to self-determination as an ethnic group. Greek Cypriot claims are refuted on the grounds that the Constitution of 1960 was rendered invalid with forced removal of the Turkish Cypriots from all state institutions. Turkish Cypriots were driven to form their own independent state as they had been rendered stateless by the Greek Cypriots in 1963 through intimidation and outright atrocities and confined to tiny isolate enclaves shortly thereafter. With Greek Cypriots forcefully changing the realities, refusing to restore the status quo under 1960 Constitution and to follow the principle of bi-tonality, Turkish Cypriots had to adjust to these realities accordingly. Thus, TRNC came into existence not as a cause but as a
natural consequence of Greek Cypriot policy towards them. In particular, Turkish intervention of 1974 was a timely reaction to the coup against the then Greek Cypriot President Makarios and taking over of the Cyprus government by the fervent follower of the Megali Idea (according to which vast parts of the Eastern Mediterranean region were viewed as a rightful domain of Greater Greece) and EOKA terrorist Nicos Sampson. And lastly, Turkish Cypriots argue that Turkey's intervention was in full accordance with international agreements, put a decisive end to on-going atrocities perpetrated against Turkish Cypriots and restored peace on the island.

Since 1974 till present, rounds after rounds of negotiations have amounted to little more than a few inconsequential successes and failures. Yet, the international community, embodied mainly by the UN Secretariat, has been increasingly clear as to what the legal framework of a settlement would look like, namely, based on the political concepts underpinning the 1960 Constitution.

Within this framework, the following sub-topics are elaborated in my presentation:

Cyprus Question and the international community - the sub-topic closely examines Cyprus question within the context of international law, with a particular emphasis on the legality of the UN/EU recognition of Greek Cypriot-usurped Government of Cyprus. It touches upon the strategies employed by Greek Cypriot Government, directly and via international channels in seeking a solution to the Cyprus question on Greek Cypriot terms: economic embargo as a method of political blackmail, lobbying campaign within the EU institutions, political intransigence in the face of international pressure and rejection of the UN sponsored Annan Plan.

Cyprus Question and Turkey - the sub-topic explores the interdependency of Turkish-TRNC relationship. Cyprus Question is analyzed as a national cause for Turkey and a significant factor in Turkish foreign and domestic policy. It also assesses Cyprus as a strategic outpost of Turkey as a regional power. The relationship in terms of Turkish army's presence, social, economic, diplomatic aid to TRNC and the prospect of accession to the EU is put to scrutiny, as it presents a challenge in terms of the Turkish Cypriot leadership's desire to improve its image abroad, while still being of immense support in helping to diminish international isolation.

Cyprus Question and other conflicts within the region: Comparative Analysis of Cyprus, Kosovo and Palestinian questions - the sub-topic looks at the important lessons of Kosovo and Palestinian-Israeli cases in power-sharing, and their applicability to Cyprus is evaluated. Shared characteristics of Cyprus question with Kosovo, Israel/Palestine in terms of cultural, language and socio-economic dimensions; commonality of external factors - ethnic communities being influenced by actions and political schemes of respective “mother countries”- are examined.

1. Cyprus Question and International Community

It’s been more than thirty years now that Turkish and Greek Cypriots have been living separately on one island, in relative peace. What’s wrong with this picture is that the international community doesn’t accept this status quo, as it sets a precedent in international law.
Many experts in conflict management and resolution will tell you that if two sides are left alone and their positions on the issue remain unchanged, then two options are on the table, both prone to violence and hostility, 1. either the stronger side imposes its will on the weaker side via military, diplomatic or economic means, or 2. the status quo may last for years, with two sides relying on the changing realities on the ground and feeding on their mutual non-acceptance of each other, which further distances the two from reaching a long-standing and just agreement. Both scenarios are untenable and unproductive in the long run and the solution is not on the horizon unless 3) involvement of the third party (generally represented by international global or regional institutions) exerts sufficient and effective pressure on both sides to get to the negotiating table and to reach a finalized, comprehensive solution, provided that the third party has powerful incentives to offer to both sides to the conflict and to get them interested in rapprochement.

Solution plans and incentives brought forth by the EU on one side, and the UN on the other, have often overlapped and complemented each other, with each side acting as both a mediator and arbiter. Both have failed. Why? Two important factors are worth mentioning here: 1. international community's disregard for the legal framework that established Cyprus as one state and serves as a legal basis for reaching a settlement. 2. questionable neutrality of the third party as an arbiter and lack of will to impose a solution on the intransigent party in the conflict. Consideration of international law does play a crucial role in the state's decision making processes during times of international crisis. There is undeniable relevance of international politics to international law, specifically where a state’s vital national interest is at stake. Ideally, abiding by the provisions of international law is a primary matter for a state in order to legitimize its actions. Under international law, states establish rights and obligations by ratifying treaties amongst each other. In principle, international treaties are viewed as legally binding norms in international law, at least for the parties concerned. The widely acknowledged principle of international law concerning treaties is “pacta sunt servanda”- that is, international pacts - should be respected. Unfortunately, no distinct subordination of state politics and national interest to the international law exists in the international arena. Quite often, lack of political opposition or insufficient international legal enforcement against violator creates a status quo through legitimization of an illegal act, and this, unfortunately, has been the case with Cyprus conflict.

In dealing with legal aspects of Cyprus question, the international community often disregards the framework that formed the legitimate basis for the state of Cyprus under its first, internationally recognized and endorsed 1960 Constitution, and the Republic of Cyprus (ROC) was founded under the Treaty of Establishment, the Treaty of Guarantee, and the Treaty of Alliance. These treaties, which are also known as London/Zurich Accords, signed by the ROC, Turkey, Greece and UK, formed the basis of the new state's functions and place in the international community. The Treaty of Guarantee was intended to “ensure the independence, territorial integrity and security” of the Republic of Cyprus and to prevent its “political or economic union with any state whatsoever” (Article 1). In support of this aim, the Treaty gave Britain, Greece and Turkey “the right to take action with the sole aim of re-establishing the state of affairs established by the Treaty” (Article 4). The three guarantors could intervene in the internal affairs of the island, either jointly or independently, to ensure compliance with the Treaty and to prevent both enosis and taksim (article IV of the Treaty of Guarantee). The Treaty of Alliance was a defense pact to safeguard the independence and territorial integrity of the ROC. In its additional protocol, the Treaty allowed Greece and Turkey to station 950 and
650 troops, respectively, in Cyprus. According to the principles set forth in the London/Zurich accords, both communities, Greek and Turkish Cypriots, were co-founders and co-partners of the republic on the grounds that both hold political and legal equality despite disproportionate population rates. The structure of the ROC was designed as a bi-communal partnership which was not based on territorial separation. The point is, the Republic of Cyprus was not founded as a Greek state or a Turkish state, but as a state based on the equal partnership of two ethnic communities and with the guarantorship rights of Turkey, Greece and Britain, and Turkish Cypriots, though less in number, were not given a status of a minority but a founder of the Republic with equal status. All parties involved undertook to maintain the constitution and agreed that Cyprus was never to become a part of any other state (articles I & II of the Treaty of Guarantee). None of these clauses were later given consideration in the UN Resolution 353 (1974) which demanded an end to the military intervention and the withdrawal of foreign military personnel on the premise that its presence was unjustified by international agreements. Moreover, given the nature of 1960 Cyprus Constitution, both UN SC Res. #186 of 1964, recognizes Greek Cypriot Government as the sole representative of the state) and UN SC Res. 541 of 1983 (calls upon the world not to recognize any Cypriot State other than Greek-Cypriot run Republic of Cyprus) translate as a blatant disregard of the fact that the Cypriot state was forcibly usurped by the island Greeks through the violation of this constitution. The acceptance of the Greek Cypriot administration as the legal government of the Republic of Cyprus has long been based on the argument of “state of necessity,” referring to the abnormal situation on the island. An institution cannot claim a state of necessity as the basis for its actions if the institution contributes to the continuation of the abnormal situation. Thus, the ill-founded decisions of the UN in the matters of Cyprus conflict constitute infringement of provisions set forth in the London/Zurich Guarantee Accords, displaying a striking example of how politics can override international law.

Second important legal aspect concerns the legality of 1974 Turkish intervention and its continued military presence on the island. Turkey intervened militarily with the primary goal of protecting the Turkish Cypriots who were facing the threat of annihilation, and to revive the Republic of Cyprus within the framework of the Zurich/London international agreements and 1960 Constitution. The international community was well aware of Turkey's status as a guarantor power. And yet, as Turkey took the lashing of international condemnation, the UN and much of the Western world kept mute on Greece pushing for annexation of Cyprus in breach of its international treaty obligations as a guarantor power. Did Greece face similar diplomatic and economic pressure from the international community, given the actions of its dictatorial military leadership at the time? On the contrary, the US, though unable or unwilling to protect the Turkish Cypriots and to restore their rights in the state, imposed an arms embargo against Turkey, largely due to the influence of the Greek lobby in the US Congress, while EC delivered similar threats to Turkey as the Greek diaspora managed to get support of its “Christian fellows in Europe”. The legality of Turkey’s action was upheld even by the Athens Court of Appeal in March 21, 1979, which reads as follows: "The Turkish intervention (note the correct use of word intervention, not invasion, my emphasis) in Cyprus, which was carried out in accordance with the London-Zurich agreements, was legal. Its legality was upheld by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in a resolution adopted on July 29, 1974, namely Resolution 532 (1974).
Quite notably, Nicos Sampson, the leader of EOKA group pushing for forced hellenization of Cyprus at the expense of Turkish Cypriots and eventual enosis, said in the interview to the Greek newspaper Eleftherotipia published on Feb. 26, 1981: “Had Turkey not intervened I would not only have proclaimed enosis, I would have annihilated the Turks in Cyprus.” When on January 31, 1990, Greek leader Vassiliou discussed his proposals for settlement in a speech to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, three members of the British House of Commons who were present, Keith Speed, Andrew Faulds and Michael Knowles, wrote a report that contained the following apt remarks: “Mr. Vassiliou's insistence that the Turkish troops must leave demonstrates that he is not willing to understand the fundamental concerns of the Turkish Cypriots. He expects them to be satisfied with his assurances, with written safeguards, and with international guarantees, but is well aware that the 1960 Constitution guaranteed their rights and was ignored, that U.N. troops were meant to protect them but failed, that international guarantees likewise failed, and that the only factor which saved them at the eleventh hour was the Turkish army.” In a press conference given at the end of the Turkish-EU Joint Council meeting in Luxembourg, Gunther Verheugen, the EU Enlargement Commissioner, responded to a question asked by a Greek Cypriot journalist "whether it was not a drawback for the army of an EU candidate country to be present in another candidate country" stated that the existence of the Turkish army on the island does not create a situation that is against the principles of the EU. Verheugen drew attention to the importance of the conditions under which the Turkish army came to Cyprus: “Turkey's military intervention in 1974 was not an attempt to gain more territory or invasion. If Turkey didn't act in 1974, the island would be united with Greece as result of a coup and there wouldn't be left a single Turkish Cypriot alive in the hands of Greeks. Turkey used its international treaty rights to protect Turkish Cypriots from ethnic cleansing in Cyprus.”

Part of the problem concerning the Cyprus question is that historically the international community led by the EU, the UN and much of the Western world has not been entirely neutral in the Cyprus issue. Western organizations and states in particular have offered notable support to the Greek side and this support has been regarded as "Christian solidarity" by Turkish Cypriots. The bias primarily comes in writing off ten years of the conflict's history and dating the conflict to Turkey’s 1974 intervention while disregarding ten bloody years that preceded Turkish invasion. And this is where the root of the problem lies, the inability of the international community to set the record straight in providing a historical background to the Cyprus question. The international community remained silent when Greek leadership under Makarios unilaterally changed provisions of the 1960 Cyprus Constitution, thus reducing Turkish Cypriot partners to the status of a mere minority, and as Greek Cypriots ousted Turkish Cypriot leaders from their elected positions in the Cypriot government, consequently destroying the bi-communal form of government. The international community failed to act decisively as ethnic cleansing of Turkish Cypriots and reign of terror resulted in a destruction of more than 100 Turkish Cypriot villages despite the presence of UN peacekeeping troops.

The international community failed to act when on July 15, 1974; mainland Greek troops landed on Cyprus overthrew Greek Cypriot government and installed one in support of enosis. Throughout the 1963-1974 period of ethnic cleansing of Turkish Cypriots by EOKA forces, the UN Peace Forces neither managed to stop the violence nor were able to enforce the rights granted to Cypriot Turks by the Constitution. The ineffectiveness of UN as a guarantor of security has never been so vivid at the time as in the case of Cyprus question. The international community as well as Greece and Britain, the two guarantors of the Cypriot State holding
rights and responsibilities including military intervention in case of disruption in constitutional order, preferred to watch from the sidelines as the island was steadily transformed into a purely Greek homeland. Regardless of the liability of the Greek Cypriots in breakout of the inter-communal fights, despite the absence of Turkish Cypriots from the organs of the defunct ROC, the international community continued, and still continues, to recognize the Greek Cypriot ROC as the sole legitimate authority of the entire island, disregarding the fact that the foremost reason for the presence of UN Peace keeping forces in Cyprus was the aggression of the Greek Cypriots, the terrorism and killings, depriving the Turkish Cypriots of their political rights. At no point at any level of UN institutions was there ever raised a question of the Greek Cypriot administration’s responsibility for breaching the partnership in 1963 and which factors led to the Greek Cypriots' usurpation of the representative right to speak on behalf of the entire island. Any members of the UN Security Council had to have perceived these factors.

The UN initiatives as an arbiter in bringing the Greek and Turkish Cypriot sides to the negotiating table started with a series of confidence building measures and Sets of Agreements, culminating in the Annan Plan (named after its initiator, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan). As Kofi Annan himself put it: “There is no other plan out there – this is it”. Experts on the Cyprus conflict agreed that the plan presented perhaps the best possible compromise. It had the backing of all the parties involved in Cyprus, the EU, the US and the wider international community. It gave neither side all they wanted, but it was workable if the will was there to create a new partnership state. On April 24, 2004, Annan Plan was put to referendum on both sides of the island simultaneously. In the case of a “double yes” from each community, a new state would have been established based on the principles of the Foundation Agreement - the basic document of the Annan Plan. The international community applauded, given the substantial compromises the plan required of both sides. 65% of Turkish Cypriot people voted ‘yes’, hoping for an end to the Cyprus question and their forty year long isolation. Yet 76% of the Greek Cypriot side chose to reject this opportunity to reunify Cyprus. The Greek Cypriot people, as well as the Greek Cypriot administration refused to accept the basic framework for a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem and in so doing; they prevented the termination of the abnormal existing situation. The Greek Cypriot attitude and vote prompted a range of negative feedback, including from the UN Security Council, which shared the UN Secretary General’s disappointment that an extraordinary historic opportunity to resolve the Cyprus issue had been missed.

The policy of another important international actor in the Cyprus question, the EU, also sheds light on the capability, or, lack thereof, to stand as a neutral arbiter in bringing the two conflicting sides towards a lasting solution. Prior to 2004 referendum, the world community, the UN and the EU made explicit promises to correct the violation of international law and end the isolation and suffering of the Turkish Cypriots. On the eve of Annan plan's referendum, the EU demonstratively announced that the party in favor of the plan would be rewarded whereas the intransigent party would face the consequences. In pressuring Greek Cypriots to accept internationally endorsed solution and by offering full membership as a reward, EU could use a powerful tool in its position as a mediator. Yet, on May 1, 2004, within mere weeks following Greek Cypriots' rejection of Annan plan, the EU “countered” Greek Cypriot intransigence by offering full EU membership to the Greek-run ROC. The EU’s promises to Turkish Cypriots on lifting their economic embargo were broken and it was the party who refused the solution, not the one with the goodwill, which was rewarded. Thus, the EU proved that it never sought a resolution of the problem as a condition of Cyprus becoming a full member and as a result,
there is no incentive for Greek Cypriots to move from its current intransigent position. As UN General-Secretary clearly stated, it was the Greek Cyprus’ membership to the EU that caused a permanent deadlock in the current peace process. Consequently, as EU member enjoying a veto power over principal EU decisions regarding both Turkey and TRNC, the ROC is more uncompromising in its stance than ever, and the EU, which was an "arbiter", has suddenly become "the other party" in the problem.

For the Greek Cypriot government, as well as for the Greek government, Greek Cypriot membership in the European Union has become an enormous asset. First, it bolsters the ROC’s status as the only legitimate government on the island, further discredits TRNC, and provides the ROC with an additional forum in which to put forward its cause. Second, it increases Greek Cypriot leverage on Turkey both because of an expected rise in EU pressure on Turkey and because of Turkey’s own aspirations to join the Union. Third, it yields critical security gains to the Greek Cypriot community, given the unlikelihood of a Turkish attack on an EU member state. It automatically doubles Greek membership in the Council of Ministers, European Commission and European Parliament. Thus, Greek influence in the European Union gets substantially enhanced, and, with no counterbalancing Turkish influence in EU (as there is at the United Nations and in N.A.T.O.) Greece's interpretation of events in the Eastern Mediterranean remains unchallenged. This danger was duly noted in the "Daily Brief," published in the Oxford Analytica on Dec. 22, 1994: “If Greek-controlled Cyprus became a member, there would be two Greek votes and two potential Greek vetoes in the E.U. Membership would constitutes a chance to exert international pressure upon the Turks and the Turkish Cypriots to bend to their will, and to intimidate them in a show of force.” The consequences were quick to show. Although article 3 of the Protocol 10 of the Accession Treaty under which Greek Cyprus was admitted to the EU provides that “nothing in this Protocol shall preclude measures with a view to promoting the economic development of North Cyprus”, the EU continues to refrain from exercising this article. A glaring example of Greek Cypriots' new role in influencing the EU's decision making comes in the following. In the wake of Annan plan referendum; the EU institutions expressed their support for honoring earlier promises of breaking the economic embargo and enabling the economic development of Turkish Cypriot side of the island. To this end, the EU Commission proposed a set of measures to enable direct trade with Turkish Cypriots under Aid and Direct Trade Regulations. Predictably, these regulations were blocked in the EU Council by Greek and Greek Cypriot administrations. Although the aid regulation was approved in February 2006 after long deliberations, the direct trade regulation, which will be the key to easing the economic isolation imposed on the Turkish Cypriots, is still pending for approval in the EU Council due to the Greek Cypriot obstruction.

Another important point is that the accession of Cyprus into the European Union constitutes an infringement of international law in the absence of Turkey’s membership in the EU. According to article I of the Treaty of Guarantee, the ROC cannot be annexed by any state and should not participate, in whole or in part, in any political or economic union in which all parties to the London-Zurich accords are not involved. Article II of the Treaty of Guarantee provides that the UK, Greece, and Turkey have competence to disallow such an action of the ROC. By accepting Cyprus, the EU made its decision based on political interests, irrespective of the violation of international agreements. In other words, power of politics and intense Greek lobbying gained an upper hand over just implementation of international principles. The lack of political will on the part of the UN, the EU, the rest of the international community, and
disregard for the promises made and international treaties signed in the case of Cyprus question set a dangerous precedent in how political expediency is readily placed before principle and rule of law.

2. Cyprus Question and Turkey
Since its declaration of independence in 1983, the TRNC continues to face international isolation. In this light, the support from its motherland Turkey is of tremendous significance in all possible aspects, be it in security areas or political and economic terms. A mistaken assumption is made by the international community and Greek Cypriot administration in particular that Cyprus question is merely a question of Turkish occupation, not of inter-communal conflict. Although the 1974 intervention's profound impact on the Cyprus conflict cannot be underestimated, it also became a convenient reference point in the Greek Cypriot perception of the conflict, according to which North Cyprus became the Occupied Areas of the Republic of Cyprus. Even TRNC's claim of statehood is challenged for North Cyprus is described as a local administration subordinate to Turkish domination and military power. European Commission of Human Rights confirms this widespread view of TRNC as a puppet of Ankara or its virtual off-mainland province. Not only has the presence of Turkish troops allegedly given reason for such a conclusion. The symbolic presence of Turkey in TRNC is reflected in everything, as evident in the flags of the TRNC and the Republic of Cyprus often flying side by side, same national anthems, portraits of Atatürk and so on. First president of TRNC Rauf Denktash himself never accepted the idea of a distinct Turkish Cypriot identity and viewed Turkish Cypriots as Turks living in Cyprus. As Denktash firmly stated in 1995: “I am Turkish with my culture, my language, my history, and my whole being. I have a state as well as a motherland...”.

However, the idea of Turkish Cypriots as a mere extension of Turkish nation and subordinated to the political will of the “big brother” is a deeply misleading assumption and has been contested by Turkish Cypriots themselves. Rather, the relationship between TRNC and its external ally is characterized by mutually beneficial interdependency, not imposed dependency. Cyprus question is largely perceived in Turkey not so much as a political but as a national cause, both by its government and people. Naturally, Turkey's engagement in Cyprus conflict bears a huge symbolic connection with the brotherly relationship and ethnic ties enjoyed with the Turkish Cypriots. This concept challenges the universal perception of TRNC as merely a strategic outpost of a regional power with its own independent political agenda. In summary, the TRNC-Turkey interdependency can be viewed as a relationship of two partners who became unwilling hostages of the emergency situation, yet it functions as a mutually beneficial arrangement, except at times, in order to assert their independence, Turkish Cypriots tend to slap the hand that feeds and protects them.

True, the role of Turkey can not be limited to providing security and financial aid to TRNC on merely humanitarian grounds. There have been political and strategic factors in play as well - 1. domination of Greek Cypriots on the island located in the soft underbelly of Turkish mainland
2. given the virtual over-night ethnic cleansing of Turks on the neighboring Crete island, Cyprus would be next in line making Turkey vulnerable in the eastern Mediterranean flank. Cyprus, which lies just miles off its southern coast, offers itself as a valuable strategic asset guaranteeing sea lanes in the Mediterranean and to the Middle East. Thus, the Greek Cypriots' accession into the EU is very important for Greece in that it brings Greece closer to the Eastern
Mediterranean and to the Middle East. However, it is not easy for Greece to establish its control over the Eastern Mediterranean. Turkey and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus together effectively control this area. Moreover, the extra-regional powers, namely the US, the EU and Russia are very much interested in this region, for great powers are interested in any region where there is considerable potential for generating wealth and resources. Yet, they have to cooperate with the regional actors as well in order to benefit from the opportunities existing in the region. Energy storage and its transportation through the Eastern Mediterranean needs a secure environment, and who provides that security and who transports the energy is an important question. Accordingly, Cyprus has a strategic position for providing sea transportation and the storage of energy generated in the Caucasus, Middle East and Central Asia and political control over Northern Cyprus allows reaping great benefits. The island's importance is expected to grow once Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan major oil pipeline from Azerbaijan to Turkey's southern coast starts operating. So, not only is Ankara guided by the principle of maintaining Turkish dignity and prestige in the face of previous land losses to the Greeks, the geo-strategic importance of Cyprus to Ankara is also of essence.

But, as I have mentioned earlier, there is more to this relationship than mere geo-strategic concerns of a “big brother”. To get to the heart of the issue, let's take a look at the evolution of TRNC-Turkish relations. When the Republic of Turkey was established in 1923, Atatürk denounced any claims of the new state on former Ottoman territories. Although, in 1974 the Turkish government did take advantage of the Cyprus issue to redirect public attention from serious domestic issues, it primarily responded to the mainstream Turkish voters' deep sensitivity on the subject. First of all, the prospect of Greek-imposed changes in the sovereignty of Cyprus and especially those concerning the status and security of the Turkish community would cut to the core of Turkish mainland public. In this context the statement of Serdar Denktas, TRNC's former foreign affairs minister, that “no Turkish government has the luxury of losing the TRNC, because our greatest supporter first of all is the man on the street in Turkey...” might not be an exaggeration. Secondly, on the political level, Ankara’s policy served to improve relations with the Turkish military which demanded decisive action on the Cyprus issue. And thirdly, Turkey’s reorientation towards Cyprus has been increasingly due to the activities of Turkish Cypriot diaspora and the TMTs (Turkish Cypriot resistance groups set up to counter EOKA's terror tactics), as they formed active campaigns and engaged in making the public and the press in mainland Turkey more aware of the Turkish Cypriot community's plight and struggle on the island. Consequently, apart from providing a sense of national unity among mainland Turks, Turkey’s intervention in 1974 was greeted among Turkish Cypriots and its diaspora as the peace operation liberating them from Greek yoke. The point is that in responding to the pleas of Turkish Cypriots, it was Turkey following Turkish Cypriot lead, not the other way around. When Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktas proclaimed the TRNC’s independence in November 1983, Ankara had little choice but to recognize it. Whereas leftist political parties of the Turkish Cypriot community and Turkey itself favored a federal solution, Denktas regarded unilateral declaration of independence as the best pressuring tool on the Greek Cypriot leadership. Having formal representation at the UN, the Greek Cypriots could easily lobby for support of their cause to the international community. For instance, one of the results of Greek efforts was UN GA Resolution of May 1983 which provided full support to the Greek Cypriot government’s sovereignty over the entire island and demanded immediate withdrawal of all occupation forces from the island, read Turkish troops. In response to the resolution viewed as a success of Greek Cypriot lobbying efforts, Denktas pushed the idea of
independence with the intention of proving the status of Turkish Cypriots as equal partners to Greek counterparts and to shift Greek Cypriots towards settlement based on bi-communal basis. In the years to come, Rauf Denktas played a significant part in reinforcing this national cause in Turkey. He acquired a symbolic capital in Ankara where he enjoyed a prestige as a defender of Turkish Cypriot interests and cultivated political ties with many influential political parties, media, and, most importantly, the Turkish military.

Turkey’s role in the TRNC’s state building has been substantial in security areas as well as in economic matters. Approximately 30,000 Turkish troops were stationed on the island after the intervention. Ankara rightfully insisted that until a peace agreement was achieved between the two communities the Turkish army had the right to control security forces in Northern Cyprus to provide protection according to the Treaty of Guarantee. Interestingly, the attitude of Turkish Cypriots towards Turkey’s role in providing security has been increasingly twofold over years, with this role being both appreciated and contested. Whereas presence of Turkish military forces is criticized by political opposition parties and pro-reunification segments of the population as undermining TRNC image as an independent entity, at the same time the Turkish army is viewed as the most trusted institution by many Turkish Cypriots. In economic terms, Turkey's support dates back to the 1960s, the time when the Greek-usurped Cypriot government “was obliged to fall back on economic sanctions as the best remaining means to break the Turkish-Cypriot resistance to its authority”. Driven from all over the island into tiny isolated enclaves constituting mere 3% of the island, Turkish Cypriots had to rely on financial aid from Turkey and Red Crescent relief shipments. Following the establishment of the TRNC, Turkish aid enabled the standard of living in Northern Cyprus to reach a higher level than in mainland Turkey. Within the period of 1974-2004 alone, Turkey spent US$3.07 billion, investing in numerous civilian infrastructure projects. For instance, while in 1994, 76% of the TRNC budget was covered by local funding; by 2000 only 55% was financed locally, the balance being sponsored by Ankara. However, it is noteworthy that TRNC's financial dependency on Turkey is a direct result of international isolation, i.e. Turkey is forced to assume the role of an international financial institution at the expense of its own domestic economy.

In international relations, Turkey’s protective shadow does represent a challenge in terms of the Turkish Cypriot leadership’s desire to improve its image abroad, at the same time serving as an indispensable asset in helping diminish continued political isolation. Turkey has conducted a successful diplomatic campaign to gain diplomatic legitimacy for TRNC in the Cyprus issue and, most importantly, to counterbalance Greece’ and ROC’s own propaganda war in UN and other international organizations. Consisting of 57 member-states, the OIC (Organization of Islamic Conference) is the second largest inter-governmental organization after the United Nations and has members from four continents. As a result of Turkey's efforts, in June 2004 at the foreign ministers’ meeting of the OIC held in Istanbul, TRNC's observer status was upgraded from Turkish Cypriot Community to Turkish Cypriot State. However, TRNC’s ties with OIC states are far from the expected level. There are factors related to domestic structure and foreign policies of Caucasian, Middle Eastern and Central Asian Muslim republics. Despite their strong relations with Turkey, most of these countries hesitate to recognize TRNC independence, aware of separatism issues at home and reluctant to set a precedent. For this reason, it is difficult to accept them to recognize the TRNC at this stage. Nevertheless, despite the fact that TRNC's bid for full membership in OIC was not accepted, the OIC provides an outlet for Turkish Cypriots to have their voice heard. It is worth
mentioning that Turkey's own efforts to strengthen relations with the Muslim world are to be regarded as part of a larger picture, in particular its alienation from its traditional Western ally following US invasion of Iraq which was carried out in complete disregard of Turkey's security concerns in that region. Newly shaped perceptions were observable in Arab public opinion towards Turkey after her refusal to open her soil to American troops before the Iraqi war. Turkey which was often condemned as a protector of Western interests in the Arab world began to be viewed from a much friendlier angle.

The 2002-04 UN-initiated round of peace efforts offered the prospect of a final breakthrough in Cyprus question. Turkey's Prime Minister and Islamist JDP (AKP in Turkish) party leader R.T. Erdogan's commitment to the solution was largely due to his government’s unprecedented commitment to EU accession (manifested also by its perseverance in pursuing domestic reforms) and its eventual recognition of the link made by EU institutions between EU-Turkey relations and Cyprus question settlement. Prior to Annan Plan referendum, Erdogan went a step further, when, during a World Economic Summit meeting in Davos, he declared to Kofi Annan that the UN Secretary-General had the authority to ‘fill in the blanks’ if the parties failed to agree on changes to the Plan. As later events showed, Turkish government remained committed to its pledges. While these positive developments on the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot sides were not sufficient to seal an agreement, as evidenced by the April 2004 referendum results, nevertheless, 'Turkish Cypriots' vote in favor of the Plan acquired them substantial symbolic capital in the international arena. Taking advantage of this new image, the goal of North Cyprus' pro-unification parties had been to prove to the world that the TRNC is capable of making its own decisions, even at the expense of nudging its protector aside. The consequent victory of a pro-reunification Republican Turkish Party (CTP in Turkish) led by Mehmet Ali Talat is also attributed to the moderate stance this party took in TRNC's relations with Turkey in order to dispel the misguided image of TRNC as “Ankara's puppet”, to diminish Turkey's involvement, however well intended, in TRNC's affairs, and to prove political equality of Turkish Cypriots in relation to Cypriot Greeks. As he remarkably noted: “We keep saying that the TRNC is a Republic on its own, a separate Government, democratic in its own right and with separate institutions. We must emphasize our independent institutions. We must become stronger through these. Supporting these by staying in the shadow of another country is not right... TRNC’s independence with Turkey’s shadow would make us look weak in the international arena.” (Cyprus Observer, Turkish Cypriot Weekly, 11-17, Nov. 2005)

reflecting his policy of convincing the international community that TRNC can stand on its own feet politically. Thus, Turkey’s engagement had constructive as well as deconstructive effects on the Turkish Cypriot sovereignty-building project.

As TRNC's primary lifeline and its window into the outside world, Turkey lends enormous diplomatic support to Turkish Cypriots, despite facing considerable pressure from the EU which links Cyprus question, among other issues, to the question of Turkey's bid for membership in this union. While Greece succeeded in securing the progress of Cyprus' EU membership application in the EU Helsinki Summit of December 1999, Turkey was officially recognized as a candidate state for accession to the European Union at the expense of important conditions imposed only on Turkey with regard to Turkish-Greek relations and the Cyprus question. For its part, Athens accepted the granting of EU candidate status to Turkey in the EU 1999 Helsinki Summit and removing its veto on the decision, attaching two conditions. First, Greek-Turkish difference had to be submitted to the International Court of Justice in The Hague by 2004 before other efforts failed and, secondly, the accession of Cyprus to the EU
would not be conditional on the resolution of the Cyprus problem. Furthermore, numerous cases have been filed by the EU members Greece and Republic of Cyprus against Turkey in the European Court of Human Rights, undermining Turkey's capacity to negotiate for membership and deliberately impeding progress in order to extract concessions on the Cyprus question. Though Turkey is superior to Greece in military terms, Greece is relatively stronger in economic capacity, flexibility of constituting political alliances and in terms of the adequacy to develop strategy. In this context, Greece's privileges, like the effective activities of the Greek diaspora and lobbies, pivoting of economic pressure and the interest groups, and being a full member of the EU, can be cited. Under Greek lobbying, Brussels repeatedly warned that it would be very difficult to start EU entry talks with Turkey without a reunification deal on Cyprus. Turkey government's well justified response was that the EU was applying double standards. Aptly put by a senior Turkish government official: “It is a contradiction that the EU asks Turkey to resolve its problems with the Greek Cypriots, while not demanding that the Greek Cypriots resolve their problems related to Turkish Cypriots before their accession”. Where traditional EU enlargement strategy maintains that candidates do not import their border disputes into the Union, this principle was considered rather flexibly during the accession of the Greek Cypriots to the EU. In Ankara's view, ROC’s EU membership amounts to a disguised enosis “through the backdoor of EU membership” and is contrary to the Republic’s Constitution of 1960, based on which, Cyprus cannot not be admitted to the EU unless Turkey itself does not become a member. What Greek Cypriots' EU membership did bring about was the hardening of the parties’ positions, in particular those of the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot side. Those in Turkey who were skeptical of Turkey’s EU membership (principally because of the domestic transformation it would entail) vehemently rejected any link between Cyprus settlement and Turkey’s accession. Nationalists argued that Cyprus was a national security issue, which could not be compromised for the sake of the EU. Thus, Turkish foreign policy depends heavily on who gains the upper hand within the Turkish establishment and how highly these players value the prospect of EU accession.

Turkey's refusal to recognize Greek Cypriot-run government of Cyprus is yet another pressure point used by the EU in blocking Turkey's membership bid. In 2005, French Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin appeared to place a new condition on Turkey starting EU accession talks: "A negotiation process of whatever kind cannot start with a country that does not recognize every member state of the European Union, in other words all 25 of them.” To this, Ankara argues that to admit Greek Cyprus to EU was equally unacceptable and in violation of EU's own agreements. Under EU pressure, Turkey eventually extended the customs union deal to Greek Cyprus, but it made clear that this move did not mean it was recognizing the Republic of Cyprus. Few in Turkey, however, think this whole question of recognition is really the issue. It is worth noting that approval vote of Turkish public opinion towards the EU membership has steadily gone downhill, particularly due to the lagged solution of the Cyprus issue and disappointment at the EU’s ignoring attitude and nitpicking. Instead, many accuse primary EU actors, particularly France, of being opposed to Turkey’s EU entry for other reasons while using Cyprus as a cover. The problem is if Turkish membership is effectively vetoed, then it kills off any chance of a settlement on the island and would not be in the long-term interests of ROC. The strategy may backfire, and Turkey may lose its appetite to become a member at such a high price.

In a larger context, an insightful look at the fateful triangle of Turkey-EU-Cyprus begs 2 questions - can the EU do without Turkey and is the EU willing to sacrifice Turkey’s
importance from a geo-political and commercial point of view for the sake of Cypriot Greeks? Concessions from candidate Turkey are demanded before the delivery of the actual benefits. This in turn creates uncertainty in Turkey and induces Turkish policy-makers to delay perceived concessions until the delivery of benefits is closer and more certain. The EU is not oblivious to the fact that Turkey is becoming the fourth energy supply route for natural gas to Western Europe. The EU is gas dependent on Russia, Central Asian states and Azerbaijan, and Turkey comes in as a strategically important transit country. Greece does not have enough economic and political power to become the regional power. The only superiority Greece has is in the Eastern Mediterranean is in the sphere of sea transportation. Together with the Greek Cypriots, the Greeks own the strongest sea transportation fleet in the region indeed. However, other than that, in the sphere of security, finance, information, Greece is not a significant power. Moreover, in order to become a regional power Greece must provide and/or distribute resources in the region, but this is not the case. So, the importance of Turkey as a valuable energy transit link is not lost on its old rival either. In 2004, Greece and Turkey, still divided over territorial disputes in the Aegean Sea and Cyprus, agreed to build the 285km-long natural gas pipeline between Karacabey in northern Turkey and Komotini in Greece. Greece presses for an extension to the pipeline that will run from its west coast, under the Adriatic Sea to Italy, giving central Europe access to natural gas from the Caspian Sea by 2012. In November 2007, Turkey and Greece inaugurated a pipeline that will pump gas from the Caspian Sea to Europe, reducing the continent’s dependence on Russian supplies. It will carry about 12 billion cubic metres (bcm) of gas a year - three bcm for Greece and the remainder for re-export to Europe - from the Shah Deniz field in Azerbaijan. For the transportation of oil and natural gas to the international area, particularly to EU, Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan oil pipeline was chosen for the transportation of Azerbaijan’s oil. Ceyhan port is a new oil terminal 70 km away from Cyprus, which increases TRNC’s strategic importance. The EU supports the project as it looks to diversify its energy suppliers and reduce its dependence on Russia, from where it buys about a quarter of its gas. Given these interests, there cannot be an abandonment of EU path for Turkey. At the same time, EU cannot abandon Turkey either. The risk is that Turkey may, as a result of all this pushing on the Cyprus question, simply walk off and become more isolationist. This would have major implications for the security of the whole Mediterranean region.

3. Cyprus Question and other conflicts within the region:
Comparative Analysis of Cyprus, Kosovo and Palestinian questions
In multiethnic societies, one often finds various communities which regard themselves not as an integral part of one nation, but as distinct entities either culturally, religiously or linguistically. A progressive plan for the future of these societies as a functional state must take into consideration its ethnic make-up. To accommodate various groups within one state, a policy based on consociational model must allow interests and rights of ethnic and religious groups to be protected and represented in the governing system. This model may succeed or fail, depending on whether partnering communities are willing or ready to share power and allow each other a certain degree of autonomy. Of possible formulas for state building, a “unitary state” is the least successful recipe as a solution, through which one group gains dominance over the other. Cyprus is one of such numerous failed cases, among many others, with Kosovo and Palestine-Israeli conflicts singled out for comparative analysis. Histories of these conflicts can be studied as histories of two respective communities that were unable to
build peaceful coexistence in their common home. While distinctly different in terms of historical and political background, these conflicts are shaped by a number of common factors and dimensions and consequently offer lessons that we may draw from. In order to understand the conflict and all of its causes, its dimensions cannot be studied individually and have to be taken into account collectively, as part of the whole picture.

Political dimension - reluctance of one dominant group to share power or allow political representation to other ethnic groups lead to affected community’s radicalization and gradual estrangement, forcing it to seek protection and security in a “mother” country - be it Albania, Turkey, or Arab states - in Kosovo, Cyprus and Palestinian cases respectively. The mobilization gathers strength as the victimized group threatened by the dominant groups’ demands seeks to reinforce its security and identity as a reaction to a central government’s policies.

Territorial dimension has been a decisive factor in all three cases, with the territory carrying a symbolic and emotional importance to concerned sides of the conflict. Cyprus question clearly shows that identity issues are closely related with the issue of territory. Definition of a nation often relies on territories from which that nation generated from. In this respect territorial origin of a society gain more significance in shaping perceptions regarding the course of the conflict than the objective account of historical facts. Most Greek Cypriots assume an uninterrupted Greek presence on the island dating back four thousand years. They regard the Ottoman conquest of the island in 1571 as the start of Turkish presence on the island. This strong link between territory and ethnic identity is not subject to compromise and therefore makes a peace settlement unreachable. In Cyprus case, Greek community views the island as an integral part of a much wider Hellenic world in which there is no room for non-Hellenic partners. In Kosovo, the region itself carries deep symbolic value to ethnic Serbs who regard this region as cradle of Serbian civilization and history. To Israeli Jews, their claim on Palestinian territory is based on Biblical promise of return to the land of ancestral forefathers and their claim to the land granted by Divine authority is therefore non-negotiable. Attachment to land is equally reflected in the attitudes of Turkish Cypriots, Kosovars and Palestinians and has been seared into their collective memory over a long historical period which cannot be easily erased. After all, goes the argument, were not Cypriot Turks once masters on their own island as part of the Ottoman Empire for 400 years, now to be reduced to a status of a mere minority? Were not Palestinians equally entitled to the land to which they brought enlightenment and prosperity in the 8th century, at the time Europe was plunged in religious intolerance, feuds and ignorance? The Holy City alone, known as Jerusalem to Jews and Al-Quds to Palestinians, carries enormous religious weight and is dear to both communities as the core of their national identity.

Religious dimension - during Ottoman rule in Cyprus (1571-1878), Kosovo (1459-1912) and in Palestine (1516-1918), all concerned communities, Greeks and Turks, Serbs and Albanians, Jews and Arabs, respectively, lived peacefully, side by side, mostly in mixed settlements, even though their religious identities were quite distinct from each other. Under Ottoman millet system granting religious freedoms and self-administration according to religious code of a given protected minority, open inter-communal conflict on the basis of religion was virtually non-existent. Years of British colonial rule became a period of identity transformation from cultural to ethno-religious basis. While Turkish Cypriots, under influence of Kemalism, were developing secular national identity, Greek Cypriot identity has been traditionally centered around Orthodox Church which led the struggle for liberation from Ottoman and later British
yoke. Therefore, building a common identity between the two groups was impossible, as Turkish Cypriots were rejected as indigenous inhabitants both on ethnic (“Turkish invaders”) and religious (“non-Orthodox”) grounds. Unlike the rest of the former Yugoslavia, the Kosovo conflict had both ethnic and religious components. However, for centuries, Islam, Orthodoxy and Catholicism have long existed together in Kosovo. Before the recent exterminations and forced "ethnic cleansing," 90% of the population of Kosovo was ethnic Albanians, descendants of the ancient Illyrian tribes who occupied this area since before the Roman Empire. Their language is unrelated to other Slavic languages in the area. A large majority of Kosovo Albanians consider themselves Muslims, while most Kosovo Serbs, even those who are not active religious believers, view Christian Orthodoxy to be an important component of their national identity. By the same token, the importance of Kosovo to Serbs is often presented as that of “the cradle of Serb Christian Orthodoxy”, a Serbian Jerusalem in which Serb nationalism was forged in a famous battle fought against Turks more than 600 years ago, whose memory has been kept alive by Serb nationalists down the centuries. Palestinian conflict’s origins take their root in the fundamentalist wing of Jewish religion, reinforced with a generous doze of Zionism, and are influential in Israel as the ideological basis of the Jewish settler movement in Jerusalem, the West Bank and Gaza. According to Israel Shahak and Norton Mezvinsky, authors of the book “Jewish fundamentalism in Israel”, the rational of this extremist religious branch for seizing Palestinian land is that the land is simply being redeemed by being transferred from the infidels to God's chosen people, and to further this process, the use of force is permitted whenever necessary.

External factors include the impact of 1) decolonization process leading to disintegration of previously existing political structures that used to provide a link between different cultural groups. Thus, the collapse of the Ottoman Empire allowed for defrosting of old Greek claims to the former Ottoman province of Cyprus, whereas fragmentation of Yugoslavia and the central Yugoslav government’s attempt to cling to its last vestiges of power by tightening control over its regions produced the opposite effect and set a breeding ground for conflict situation in Kosovo. In the case of Palestine, gradual transfer of control from weakening Ottoman empire to another colonial power, Britain, created favorable conditions for East European Jews to press their Zionist claims to the Palestinian land, at the same time awakening nationalism in the Palestinian Arab community which had hitherto associated itself as part of much larger Muslim umma (Ottoman empire), but was now forced to mobilize and assert its identity in the face of changes imposed by its new masters. Another external factor is 2) neighboring countries, bordering communities which often play a crucial role as actors competing for geo-political or territorial control and thus allying themselves with one of the communities in opposition to meet their own political ends. To begin with, the island of Cyprus has always been strategically important to all the international powers who have an interest in the region, therefore external interferences were inevitable. The “mother” countries - Greece and Turkey — continue to feel entitled to intervene and intercede on behalf of their respective “brothers” in order to ensure their rights and protection. Cyprus case vividly illustrates this in 1974 as Turkey rushed to prevent its brethren from being politically and demographically destroyed and this factor continues to play a crucial role in the current relative stability on the island, where Turkish Cypriot community, backed politically and financially by its “mother state” can negotiate with its Greek Cypriot compatriots on more or less equal terms, rather than be dictated to from the position of Greek Cypriot military power and political domination. Similarly, five Arab states’ military intervention in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict
came as a response to massive atrocities perpetrated against Palestinians by Jewish Zionist militia prior to declaration of Israel in May 1948. In the eyes of the terrorized Palestinian community, the Arab initiative was viewed as a fully legitimate action aiming to prevent ethnic cleansing on the lands illegally seized and designated for a vastly expanded Zionist state.

Cyprus and Kosovo

The question of Kosovo re-entered international debate in July 2010, following the ruling by International Court of Justice that Kosovo’s independence declared in February 2008 was not illegal under international law. The independence of the Republic of Kosovo was recognized by 22 states out of EU’s 27-member bloc and by a total of 69 states of 192 UN member states. While my goal is not to establish or disprove the legality of this action and its prompt recognition by the EU and US, the question remains - what arguments and criteria were used by the West in order to justify recognition of Kosovo and are they applicable to Cyprus case?

Most countries that oppose Kosovo’s independence argue that international law and territorial integrity of all countries must be respected and that the Kosovo issue should be resolved through peaceful means, consultation and dialogue between the concerned parties. Many governments fear that a decision to recognize Kosovo is like opening “Pandora’s box” and encouraging separatist movements within their own territories. For this reason, the EU does not have an official, unified position on the issue: Spain, Greece, Cyprus, Croatia and Romania do not recognize Kosovo. While the Spanish government fears further conflicts with its own Basque and Catalan regions’ independence movements, Romania and Slovakia have large Hungarian minorities that might demand further autonomy rights. Predictably, the ongoing dispute with the TRNC raises concerns of the Greek Cypriot government that recognizing Kosovo could undermine its own claim over the entire island. Greece supports Greek Cypriots in this, and Athens’ position is further bolstered by its long standing Orthodox alliance with Serbia. EU states that have recognized Kosovo also argue that it is a case sui generis and does not set a precedent for other cases.

Kosovo’s recognition is a unique decision dictated by a unique historical background to the conflict, according to German Foreign Minister Guido Westerwelle in his response to the angry inquiries of his Greek Cypriot counterpart, Markos Kyprianou. This argument is, however, rejected by those states that oppose the recognition and instead refer to the principle of state sovereignty, arguing that the recognition has set a dangerous precedent for international law and international security. Whether justified or not, the damage has been done, and the EU majority supports ICJ’s decision. If war crimes and deliberately perpetrated ethnic cleansing are determining factors in legitimizing secession of an ethnic entity from the state, then Cyprus certainly fits the description, given the well documented turbulent period of 1963-1974. Both Cyprus and Kosovo regions have witnessed massive atrocities against their respective civilian minorities, followed by humanitarian military intervention to prevent such grave violations of minority rights. Under Serbian President Milosevic, unilateral abolition of Kosovo’s autonomous status within former Yugoslavia was followed by systematic beating, jailing, and killing of Kosovars suspected of seeking restoration of their lost status. Around 10,000 Kosovars were killed by Serbian troops in an indiscriminate attempt to terrorize the Kosovars into submission. According to Human Rights Watch, the list of the major war crimes also includes abuses committed by the Kosovo Liberation Army, but “the vast majority of the violations over the past year (January 1998 – April 1999) are attributable to the Serbian forces and Yugoslav army. To name just a few, gruesome massacres committed in the villages of
Golubovac, Rogovo, Suva Reka, Bela Crkva, Pusto Selo, Rezala, Poklek, Cuska, mass graves and cremations were all part of Serbian government’s policy of state terror against Kosovo’s ethnic Albanians. Identity cleansing was another strategy used to this end - in order to block their return; expelled Albanian Kosovars were systematically stripped of identity and property rights.

Similarly, Makarios’ unilateral abolition of Turkish Cypriots status granted to them under 1960 Constitution and ensuing ethnic cleansing carried out in the name of enosis seems to play no part whatsoever in the world community’s consideration of “uniqueness” of both conflicts. The extraordinary importance attached to the bloody massacres of Kosovars stands in stark contrast to the indifference of the West towards massive atrocities perpetrated against Turkish Cypriots on the island. The natural conclusion to draw from this analysis is that humanitarian intervention by the world powers only becomes imperative and highly effective in punishing the perpetrator if and when this intervention is dictated by geo-strategic principles of the leading Western states, not by the principles of international law. Moreover, many Serbian leaders and military commanders responsible for these terrible crimes were charged and indicted by the International Criminal Court for crimes against humanity. However, those responsible for organized and state sponsored destruction of Turkish Cypriot community on Cyprus are yet to face such charges by international and EU’s judicial institutions.

EU’s rejectionist states consider the 1999 intervention in Kosovo as a serious breach of the principle of non-intervention in international law, which is contained in Article 2 of the UN Charter, stating that “the United Nations or its member states are not allowed to intervene in matters that are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.” Although the norm of non-intervention is one of the key principles of the UN Charter, in practice the principle is often superseded by the concept of humanitarian intervention based on the argument that the sovereignty of states also includes the responsibility to protect its citizens. If the state fails to do so, it is the responsibility of the international community to intervene in order to prevent genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and massive human rights violations. The “Responsibility to Protect” concept was adopted by the UN Security Council in April 2006 and commits the Security Council to act in order to protect civilians in armed conflicts. In other words, UN Security Council has the right to intervene in states in order to maintain or restore international peace and security, and could decide on enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the UN Charter.

In 1999, the US and the European members of NATO stated that Serbian actions were unacceptable, and waged a war of aerial bombardment to force Serbian troops from Kosovo, thus helping create a de-facto sovereign Kosovo state, with protection for the rights of the remaining Serbian minority (now just 120,000 out of two million). When Serbia steadfastly refused to accept the independence of a province it sees as the cradle of the nation, the U.S. and major EU states gave a green light to Kosovo to declare independence unilaterally. Given that for all practical reasons, NATO forces did not act as part of UN forces and its military intervention is not backed by any international agreement, Turkish intervention had full legal basis and was carried out within Constitution’s and founding Guarantee treaties’ framework. Nevertheless, while NATO action is termed as “humanitarian intervention”, Turkey’s move to protect Turkish Cypriots is labeled by the EU and UN as “invasion”.
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Cyprus and Palestine

What makes the Cyprus and Arab-Israeli conflicts appear intractable is above all its socio-psychological dimension, the barrier of years of antagonism and enmity, total lack of mutual confidence, suspicion bordering on paranoia, demonization of the other, the fear of being seen as selling out, the influence of radical nationalists on both sides and so on.

As is often the case in the present world where media manipulation and propagandistic methods are powerful tools of media warfare, many so called experts turn historical facts on their head, deliberately clouding the issues. In depicting the roots of Cyprus and Palestinian issues, often attempts are made to link these conflicts to a much larger "confrontation" between Western and Islamic civilizations, between Christianity and Islam, between "us" and "them", reducing the struggle for self-determination or survival to a mere myth put forth by disciples of Samuel Huntington's pseudo-theory on the Clash of Civilizations. In addition, comments from certain European Union leaders, and the European mass media, have singled out Turkish and Arab Muslims as having values different from those of the West. Both Cypriot Greeks and Israeli Zionists perceive their historical identity and destiny in terms of lifting the infidelity yoke of a Muslim oppressor from their chosen, far more civilized people and restoring to them the land sanctified by their religion prior to the advent of "backward Muslim infidels".

One of the most divisive elements of the Cyprus and Palestinian Israeli conflicts is the writing of these conflicts' history. Each one of the two communities, Greek and Turkish, Israeli and Palestinian, have presented opposite versions of the conflict, and these vastly differing narratives are the contributing, if not leading impediments to reconciliation. In each case, we have official vs. revisionist histories, and the latter often acquires the meaning of a "hidden truth" that official histories have denied. Nationalistic education in schools further exacerbates the non-acceptance of “the other” by having a traumatic effect on the younger generations of the conflicting communities. As a result, these rising generations are not interested in sharing power with each other, for they cannot get past the image of the portrayed “enemy”. This is particularly the case in the Israeli society. The older generations failed to tell younger ones: “yes, there was a time when we lived together peacefully, but all this peace was shattered because we have done terrible things to this community...”. Similarly, older generations of Turkish Cypriots have seen too much of violence in Cyprus to change their perception about Greeks. The younger generations on the Turkish side of the island have not been, relatively speaking, exposed to Greek Cypriot hostility, they may have heard stories, read books, but haven't observed it. Since 2002, with the goal of giving peace and coexistence a chance in the future, the TRNC government has taken steps to introduce a more moderate, less nationalistic interpretation of 1963-1974 events in history textbooks in order to eliminate racism and hate-mongering. This measure, unfortunately, has not been reciprocated in the South where historical narrative presented in the school curriculum is based on the year of 1974 as a start of conflict and everything else is built on it, as if all was well and aggressive Turkey came and invaded one third of the island to pursue its own interests. This type of brainwashing of young Greek Cypriots goes on to date, reinforcing the ages old racist image of an “ugly Turk”.

Forced Hellenization and realization of the hitherto dormant Megali Idea in the late 19th century were reflected in the Akritas Plan, a blueprint for annihilation of Turkish Cypriots and annexation of Cyprus to Greece. It was around the same period that the idea of restoring “the lost glory of the Jewish civilization” was just as zealously revived by Jewish Zionists pressing for a “return to the Promised Land” and removal of the non-Jewish population from Palestine. Zionism as the driving ideology was complimented by the Dahiya Doctrine calling for a
powerful retaliation against any sign of Palestinian resistance to the implementation of this ideology to make the point stick. Driven by these highly nationalistic ideologies, the brunt of Jewish Zionist and Greek Cypriot terrorism, respectively, was carried out against the British forces in 1940s and 1950s, and targeted the Palestinian and Turkish Cypriots as the primary obstacles in the realization of the vision of Greater Greece/Greater Israel.

In his interview to the Greek newspaper Ethnikos Keryks on June 15, 1965, Lt. General George Karayiannis states: “When Turkish Cypriots objected to the amendments of Constitution, Macarios put the plan (i.e. Akritas plan, my note) into effect, and Greek Cypriot attack began in December 1963.” Throughout the worst period of Cyprus conflict, the massacres and inhuman carnage, dumping of dead bodies in the mass graves and other acts perpetrated overwhelmingly against Turkish Cypriots have been the order of the day and are well documented in UNFICYP reports and by Western, primarily British reporters in a number of media publications. To name just a few of these horrid crimes, Turkish Cypriots of Tokhni and Mari villages in Larnaca, Ayios Vasilios village, Limassol, Ayios Sozomenos, entire Turkish population of Sandallas, Marataga and Atilar villages of Famagusta (Gazimagusa) region have faced the implementation of Akritas Plan by most brutal means. As Pierre Oberling, Hunter College professor and the author of “The Road to Bellapais”, observes in his book: “1963-1974 crisis was an unusual phenomenon. It was not a revolution by downtrodden majority against arrogant repressive minority, but a revolution by arrogant, oppressive majority against the downtrodden minority”. Over 25 000 Turkish Cypriots were displaced over this period, driven from all over the island into tiny, overcrowded enclaves, poorly protected by UN, where they were put under economic and political siege in the hope of encouraging Turkish Cypriots to leave Cyprus. Each of these enclaves was allowed to import only enough food for bare subsistence, and was denied all government services, except for the issuance of exit visas .UN reports that food quotas allowed for Turkish Cypriots pushed into enclaves by Makarios was less than what prisoners were allowed in the western countries. Severe restrictions were also imposed on Red Cross imported supplies for the relief of Turkish Cypriot refugees living in these enclaves. This policy indicates that Greek Cypriot preoccupation with the solution formula "that Cyprus should be a Greek Cypriot state, with a protected Turkish Cypriot minority" was completely unfounded. This policy of intimidation was strikingly similar the actions of militant Zionists which led to a a systematic depopulation and demolition of over hundreds of Palestinian villages and driving over 700 000 Palestinians from their homes, systematic expulsion and slaughters of unarmed civilians in a string of villages such as Lydda, Ramle, Quibya, Kafr Kassem, Shfaram, to name just a few. The method of warfare included burning down homes and destroying property bears the sole purpose of rendering the return of those who escaped, impossible. Justification of the atrocities committed with “we didn't expel Turkish Cypriots, they left on their own as ‘separatists” resounds with Zionist claim that thousands of Palestinians who have left their homes prior and in the midst of 1948 war have done so voluntarily. The economic embargo and siege of Palestinian occupied territories continues to date, putting Israel in complete and uncontested control with Palestinian economy's interaction with the outside world and severely restrained by numerous checkpoints, naval and territorial blockade. The recent international outcry over Israeli actions has further alienated the world from this pariah state when Israel launched a violent commando raid in the dead of night against a humanitarian convoy in international waters and executed nine of the passengers.
Given the above said, the “clean” images of the Israeli and Greek Cypriot governments, one as the outpost of democracy and Western values in the Middle East, and the other as the only legitimate and truly democratic representative administration of the island, respectively, are inaccurate and blur the unpleasant realities of ethnic cleansing, blatant discrimination and terrorizing of the targeted communities into submission that led to the establishment of these governments and states in the first place. Outright rejection of bi-communality and insistence on preserving the demographic nature of the state as ethnically homogeneous, that is, ensuring both demographic and political supremacy of one community over the other, economic isolation and ensuring economic domination are the principal common features of the Israeli state and the ROC. In view of Greek Cypriot and Israeli lobbying campaign in the UN, the international community failed to become fully aware of either factor and welcomed these states into its ranks as rightful members of the world community. The practices of discrimination, human rights abuses, ethnic cleansing and destruction of Palestinian homes for the purpose of creating “new realities on the ground” are still enforced by Israeli government in the Occupied Palestinian Territories and towards Palestinians in Israel proper and are well documented by a number of international bodies such as Amnesty International. For a country claiming to be based on “democratic values”, Israeli public stance, policies and laws are substantially out of line with the created image. According to the May 2003 report by the Israeli Democracy Institute, 53% are against full equality for Palestinians in the Israeli state, while only 31% support having Palestinian parties represented in the Israeli government. Over 57% of surveyed Israeli Jews agree that Palestinians should be encouraged to emigrate from historical Palestine. The poll showed half of those surveyed would not receive an Arab visitor in their home or would object to having an Arab neighbor. The Amendment 9 to Israel's Basic Law reads that a political party may not participate in elections if its goals deny existence of Israel as Jewish state; under this legislature Arab parties are banned from participating in the government and pressing for equal political rights for Palestinians which would politically turn Israel from a purely “Jewish state” into a bi-communal one. In this comparative analysis it may be interesting to note some of the results of a poll carried out in March 2000 in the ROC, according to which 75% of Greek Cypriots interviewed said that they would not agree to a marriage between a member of their family and a Turkish Cypriot. Over 80% said that in the event of a federal solution they would not live in the Turkish Cypriot zone. 30-40% of interviewees were opposed to working in the same place as a Turkish Cypriot, living in a mixed village or allowing their children to attend the same schools as Turkish Cypriot children. Figures on the Turkish Cypriot side would probably paint an even bleaker picture, given that the fear of coexistence is even more marked within the smaller Turkish Cypriot community. And finally, the label of Turkish intervention as being comparable to current Israeli occupation and termed “illegal occupation of territories under ROC sovereignty” needs special mention for, given the motivations, the purposes, the legal basis and jurisdiction, this comparison fails on all grounds. In the case of Cyprus conflict, one guarantor power (Greece) tried to unite the whole island with itself, and five days later another guarantor power (Turkey) intervened to prevent it, with the third guarantor power (Britain) abstaining from taking any action whatsoever. First of all, the purpose of the intervention was to save Cyprus from being annexed by Greece and freeing the Turkish Cypriots from Greek oppression. By contrast, the Israeli occupation was carried out with the whole purpose of territorial gain and is a form of colonialism that has suppressed and oppressed an entire indigenous people for decades, preventing them from the exercise of their right to self-determination and the establishment of
their state, Palestine. The Israeli occupation is not only inhuman and the cause of extreme suffering for the 3.5 million Palestinians living under its subjugation. The active intent of the Israeli occupation has been to negate Palestinian rights, to create new facts on the ground and to illegally expand Israel's borders. Secondly, the splitting of Cyprus into two ethnically homogeneous, self-governing states was not achieved by the Turkish military intervention in 1974, as is commonly believed, but by Makarios and Georgios Grivas a decade earlier in 1963. All that the Turkish intervention of 1974 accomplished was to consolidate Turkish Cypriot enclaves into a unified Turkish Cypriot zone in Northern Cyprus and to save their lives. The reports of international and Israeli-based human rights groups such as Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions, Peace Now, B"Tselem, Gush Shalom, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and many others abundantly testify that Israeli occupation has succeeded in splitting Palestinian land into isolated cantons disconnected from each and surrounded by Israeli barriers, by-pass roads for Jews only and Jewish settlements harassing the Palestinian inhabitants into leaving. Being divided by walls and fences, humiliated at checkpoints, bereft of jobs and freedom to move, it's impossible to deny the devastating effect that the occupation exerts on the life of the Palestinian people. Turkish “occupation” has brought peace to both communities of the island, whereas Israeli occupation continues to monger despair, hatred and fanaticism. Turkish occupation restored the power balance between the Greek and Turkish communities, while Israeli occupation has significantly reduced the shaky balance to the point of zero. As to the legality of the Turkish action, much has been said on this topic in earlier chapters of my presentation, so I will be focusing on what international law and related bodies specifically state regarding Israeli actions. To begin with, these actions are carried out in direct contravention of the Fourth Geneva Conventions of 1949 (signed by Israel) on Israeli conduct as the Occupying Power, a term the Conventions have not applied to Turkey. No other state has violated international law by its illegal occupation as Israel and no other state has so defiantly continued its repression of the indigenous people of the occupied territories. In the course of Arab-Israeli conflict, with each aggressive act of war in 1948, 1953, 1967, Israel occupied the land for the purpose of territorial expansion, against the wishes of the population residing in the occupied territories and without any legal premise whatsoever. Since the onset of the Israeli occupation in 1967, and in response to its brutal and illegal policies and practices, the UN Security Council in particular has adopted 60 resolutions that affirmed the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention to the territories occupied by Israel. On March 12, in his toughest message to date to Israel, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan said, appealing to Israeli government to end the occupation which he specifically branded as illegal and to stop "the bombing of civilian areas, the assassinations, the unnecessary use of lethal force, the demolitions and the daily humiliation of ordinary Palestinians." As a result of this policy, Israel has become a lawless country with demonstrated contempt for human rights and, probably, at least in terms of visibility, the most warmongering country on earth today.

Conclusions and Recommendations
Nearly six years have passed since the last promising attempt to settle Cyprus question based on the provisions of the Annan Plan. Despite the constructive attitude that the Turkish Cypriots demonstrated towards a comprehensive solution of the Cyprus question, the international community has not yet lived up to its promises of breaking the isolation of North Cyprus. It was this goodwill on the part of Turkish Cypriots that prompted the UN and many other world
leaders and international bodies to promise end the isolation of TRNC. The USNG report of 28 May 2004 to the UN Security Council clearly stated: “The Turkish Cypriot leadership and Turkey have made clear their respect for the wish of the Turkish Cypriots to reunify in a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation. The Turkish Cypriot vote has undone any rationale for pressuring and isolating them. I would hope that the members of the Council can give a strong lead to all States to eliminate unnecessary restrictions and barriers that have the effect of isolating the Turkish Cypriots and impeding their development”. The views of the UN were also reflected in the comments from various EU representatives. The EU Enlargement Commissioner Mr. Verheugen made the point in his 25 April 2004 statement: “A unique opportunity to bring about a solution to the long-lasting Cyprus issue has been missed…What we will seriously consider now is finding a way to end the economic isolation of the Turkish Cypriots”. The EU Parliamentary Assembly Resolution # 1376 (2004), stated: “The Assembly pays tribute to the Turkish Cypriots, who supported the Annan Plan by an overwhelming majority, thus opting for a future in Europe... The Turkish Cypriots’ international isolation must cease. The Assembly therefore welcomes the support expressed by several European political leaders for financial assistance for the Turkish Cypriots and an easing of the international sanctions against them. The United Nations should also consider whether the resolutions on which the sanctions are based are still justified. The Assembly considers it unfair for the Turkish Cypriot community, which has expressed clear support for a reunited and European Cyprus, to continue to be denied representation in the European political debate. Such continued isolation may help strengthen the positions of those who are opposing a unified Cyprus.”

In view of all the above said, there is no other possible explanation for the EU policies but its obvious bias and use of the Cyprus question as a tool for keeping Turkey at bay. This policy's rhetoric, however, lacks consistency. The EU still trades with Taiwan in spite of its non-recognition of Taiwan’s independence. Why, therefore, if not purely to exert pressure on the Turkish Cypriot side, does the EU continue a trade embargo on the Turkish Cypriots? The EU measures towards isolation of North Cypriot community will do little but contribute to the present stalemate of Cyprus Question. The EU policy makes the island’s peaceful reunification and equitable power sharing undesirable to Greek Cypriot government and only serves to widen political, economic, and cultural divide between the two communities and reinforces Greek Cypriot intransigence. At the same time, for the Greek Cypriot administration and people to continue to exercise the same dominance over the affairs of the whole of Cyprus will continue to have no incentive to establish the international vision of a federal solution. The prospect of EU membership, which proved to be a strong incentive for many Central and Eastern European countries to proceed with political and economic transformation and resolution of territorial and ethnic disputes, has not been the case with Cyprus question due to EU’s impartiality to the conflicting sides. Recognition of the rights of one side (the Greek Cypriots), whilst ignoring those of the other (Turkish Cypriots) is not only unjust, but also fails to create an incentive for the recognized side to reach an agreement. Is it any wonder that the Greek Cypriots rejected the Annan Plan in April 2004, when they had already been guaranteed a place in the EU irrespective of their voting decision? These practices are a consequence of intensive Greek and Greek Cypriot lobbying within UN and EU institutions and agencies. Why do Greek Cypriots seek to impose these embargoes? Their purpose was, and still is to bully Turkish Cypriots into accepting a settlement only on Greek Cypriot terms. The intensive lobbying of Governments, institutions and individuals has ensured many steer clear of North
Cyprus, which Greek Cypriot propaganda positions as a pariah state. Any efforts to create direct links between North Cyprus and the outside world are met by a wave of Greek Cypriot deterrents ranging from financial penalties to threats. Details of these efforts have been documented by many sources, including the internationally recognized Turkish Cypriot Chambers of Commerce. Greek Cypriots get away with such tactics through the continued indifference of the international community to the plight of Turkish Cypriots.

Taking into account all these odd factors, how should we approach an analysis of Cyprus Question? While trying to resolve the conflict issues, on what ground should the directly and indirectly involved parties build their constructive efforts in order to reach a coherent and durable solution? No doubt, numerous opinions can be put forth in this context. My suggestions would be:

From the legal point of view, the UN and the EU must continue to refer to the the unique constitutional conditions of Cyprus granted to Turkish Cypriots by the London/Zurich Guarantee accords and the 1960 Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus, as the only legal framework for any future solution to the Cyprus Question, thus sending a message to the parties in other ethnic conflicts raging in the Mediterranean region, particularly the Arab-Israeli conflict, that the norms of the international law and its binding documents cannot be overridden by national interest considerations or “the new realities on the ground” brought about by brutal use of force and outright aggression. The contradiction lies in the international community’s attempt to legitimize the aggressor while punishing the victim for resisting this aggression by keeping him in isolation, as is evident in both Cyprus and Palestinian questions thanks to the effective Greek and Israeli public relations and lobbying machine.

Of course, one may argue that the world is changing. Its institutions, norms and rules, political and military structures are changing. UN’s establishing documents and international agreements as the most important sources of international law can be violated or ignored during the 21rst century which began as a periods of large-scale tragic historical events. The argument goes that if the existing international laws, rules, norms and institutions do not provide enough room for political maneuverings and serve the interests of the dominant powers, they could easily be ignored or violated, and be given a 'legitimate' form or appearance. However, this argument is self-defeating for its sets a dangerous precedent of “each for himself” concept as a norm and leads to no accountability whatsoever either to institutions or to one's neighbors. Without accountability to the rule of law, the world walks a very dangerous ground fraught with further violence and warfare.

In stark contrast to US-allied Arab states' lack of action and general indifference to the plight of their Palestinian brothers (going beyond issuing condemning declarations on Israeli violations of international law and humanitarian principles), Turkey’s active involvement in ensuring security and economic sustainability of TRNC will continue as a the primary, if not sole counterbalancing and stabilizing factor in ensuring a just solution to the Cyprus question. Without the more credible EU commitments to Turkey, the stick of the linkage (between a settlement and Turkey’s accession process) will continue to have its limited effect. Under the existing circumstances of complete political and economic isolation, the status quo could evolve into an increasing Turkification of northern Cyprus (through the emigration of Turkish Cypriots to Western Europe and immigration of Turks to the island). If, however, EU member states reach the conclusion that such a scenario would not be in their interests, action may be taken to break the isolation of the north. As the comparative analysis of Palestinian and Cyprus questions shows, isolation as a punitive measure only produces reverse effect. Finding
ways to break the isolation of the TRNC will make it clear to Greek Cypriots that intimidation and economic strangulation will not bear fruit in resolving the conflict.

Based on the above said, the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots, who opted in favor of an internationally acceptable solution, cannot be sustained any longer. Either the island will reunite under a UN plan accepted by both sides or the status quo will need to change by some other means. Rewarding the Turkish Cypriots for their brave vote in favor of the Annan Plan, even though it would have resulted in considerable sacrifices on their part, would send a strong message to Greek Cypriots about their need to compromise. The EU should lend its unequivocal support for a “Direct Trade Regulation” that permits the free movement of people, goods and services between North Cyprus and the EU without the need for ROC as a costly intermediary, and admits Turkish Cypriot exports that are transported directly from North Cyprus air and sea ports into EU member states.

Besides, the world has significantly changed, and Turkish Cypriots are no longer caught up in the trappings of the Cold War, where Western powers are playing a zero-sum game with Greece and Turkey over Cyprus question. The disintegration of the Soviet Union brought new post-Soviet states to the international arena, particularly those of Turkic origin rich in energy resources and in need of transportation corridors to reach international markets. These states, Azerbaijan being one of them, have a different approach to the Cyprus question, offering TRNC a new window in breaking out of the international isolation. Since 2004, OIC meetings have produced a declaration with an appeal the international community to take concrete steps in order to put an end to the isolation of TRNC. A number of OIC member-states have been developing bi-lateral relations with the TRNC, although the political nature of these relations is often disguised. Among the Caucasus and Central Asian states, Azerbaijan has special place in terms of ties. In July 2005 a delegation from Azerbaijan came to visit North Cyprus on a direct flight. This was the first time there had been a direct flight to North Cyprus from a country other than Turkey. Apart from Azerbaijan, a parliamentary delegation from Kyrgyzstan has visited North Cyprus to meet the president and other officials. Cyprus Mail (Greek Cypriot daily) 28 July 2005 Enabling direct flights, postal and telecommunications links to and from North Cyprus, promoting cooperation with private sector in Central Asian republics and encouraging to invest in the TRNC, conducting cultural and educational activities will help ease its isolation and is expedient from the commercial and economic standpoint. Direct trade, direct travel, direct flights and increased contacts could be pillars of increased regional cooperation. The arrangements, if implemented in a genuine spirit of partnership, will greatly contribute to moving forward the UN process of settlement for Cyprus Question to its final phase.

It is generally accepted that the Annan Plan remains the basis for a solution to the Cyprus problem. The passage of time without any real efforts for solution is cementing the partition of the island to the detriment of both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots alike. What is needed, therefore, are initiatives to prepare the ground so that a new effort for a feasible solution can be successfully undertaken. Only a broadly comprehensive solution to the Cyprus question will construct a triangle of stability in the Eastern Mediterranean and create a momentum in resolving other outstanding Greek-Turkish problems.

Adversarial images often play an important role in both perpetuating and intensifying inter-communal conflicts. Any change in the realm of attitudes towards the past is fraught with difficulties, for clearly a friendlier, civilized and likeable ‘other’, worthy of respect, puts into question the cherished but insecure self-image and collective identity. Ultimately, the trick is to
be able to attain a sense of collective self-worth that is self-standing and far more self-confident and not dependent on belittling ‘the other’. But some would argue that this is simply impossible. Perhaps realistically, the only thing that can be done is a slight change in the extreme polarization, via greater knowledge and direct contact with the other. As was mentioned in the third sub-topic, the key to the Greek-Turkish Cypriot reconciliation, among other things, is debunking the clash of historical narratives which form the basis of collective identities that are irreconcilable today. A painful deconstruction of the historical record is in order by non-nationalist historians and other social scientists. Such interpretations of history will give us a very different and far more variable picture. This process is already under way among the academic community in TRNC, and will, hopefully, be implemented in both communities.

In the larger scheme of things, the future of Cyprus question is linked to the future of Turkish-Greek relations. Turkey and Greece share not only a common geography, but also a common history and cultural heritage. Both are neighbors and allies. Today Turkish-Greek Cypriot relations are neither prone to agreement nor likely to transform to a violent conflict. The improvement of bilateral relations between the two countries will significantly change the economic and political landscape of the entire region. Rapprochement between Turkey and Greece appears to constitute a cornerstone for security, stability and prosperity in the Balkans and the Mediterranean. To this end, friendly relations between Turkey and Greece based on mutual respect, understanding and trust, are of special importance. Additionally, positive developments related to Turkey's European Union membership will further enhance the spirit of cooperation between the two countries. True and genuine rapprochement will provides a good example to other conflicting parties in the region by debunking the alleged clash of civilizations and proving to the world that Greeks and Turks of Cyprus, could reach an agreement, could live together, could co-exist, could manage their affairs together, Muslims and Christians together, could be a model for the region of the Middle East, the Caucasus and the Balkans.
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