

Ivane Javakhishvili
Tbilisi State University

(PhD) Thesis

Cyprus Problem in the Integration
of
Turkey to the European Union

Fatih Mehmet SAYIN

Tbilisi - 2009

Ivane Javakhishvili
Tbilisi State University

(PhD) Thesis

Cyprus Problem in the Integration of Turkey
To the European Union

Prepared By:

Fatih Mehmet SAYIN

Applied Sciences: Department of Social Sciences

Scientific Department: International Relations

Supervisor

Prof. Zurab DAVITASHVILI

Tbilisi – 2009

ABSTRACT

The unsolvable integration problem of Turkey's to the European Union and out of these requested criteria, reckoned problem to-be in the integration process, the Cyprus problem. As known, Cyprus problem has been the theme of many research studies. A great amount of these researches done, according to the nationality of the writers, were about the determination of the just and unjust party. The presence of two ethnic communities in Cyprus and the problematic Republic they founded together is a subject to be a model for the other multinational countries. From the side of the disagreement among two nations and the efforts wasted to provide an agreement, and from the negotiation process between Turkey and the European Union, Cyprus matter worths for searching.

When we look at the reality in the past, after the acceptance of Lozan Agreement when Cyprus was left to England till 1947s, from the side of Turk-Greece relations, Cyprus was not seem as a problem. Besides, especially after 1950s, Cyprus has become one of the most important issues of Turkey's foreign policy. As known, in 1960s, with the withdrawing of England from Cyprus, Greece and the Cyprian Greeks insisted on handing the island to "the only owner", Greece. On the other side, Turkey objected to their demands and so as to protect the rights of the Turkish community on the island, wanted Cyprus to be given to them. With the result of a hard agreement among the three countries claiming authority over the island, two equal-nationed the Republic of Cyprus was founded. However, the problem could not be solved by this way. Because Greeks could not reach their dream of founding the Great Greece named "Megali-Idea".

In 1990s, the European Union, by becoming an important formation from the side of world economics and politics, started an only one sided membership process with the Greek part of Cyprus and helped them economically and in politics. While the Cyprian Greeks both after the war and as a candidate country to the European Union aided from outside was reaching to a high level of welfare more than several countries in Europe, Turkish part could not receive any pieces from the cake.

The supporting manner of the European Union about the Egean problems and Cyprus and being near Greece causes Greeks to use all their EU mechanisms and push the full-membership of Turkey into difficulty. Nevertheless, though the Egean problems and Cyprus, the political criteria

laid in front of Turkey, are solved in favor of Greece, starting the membership negotiations in the direction of the reports of the EU Commission may not be a matter of question for Turkey.

The aim of this study is to analyse the Cyprus problem and the incompatibility of Turks and Greeks from the viewpoint of the integration process of Turkey's to the European Union. Besides, in the study, the subjects thought as a drawback in front of Turkey's membership from the side of a political criterion are examined in their field with their main points. During the study, the problematic sides and the altering dimensions among the relations of the threesome Turkey, the European Union and Greece are discussed from the side of the international cyclic, inner and outer dynamics, the attitude and the thesis of the parties.

The difference of this thesis from the others is the manner of approach to the events. More than the rightness or wrongness of the parts, main reasons laying under the unsolvable problems, and depending on this, the political relations among the two nations are emphasized, too. The problem occurs not, as was claimed by some, because of insufficient efforts, but, as can be understood from the study, because of the profit-based struggles of the parts.

While this study was being carried out, to invaluable scientists of Georgia, especially to my counselor, who gave his essential time for the removal of deficiencies and their correction, and who offered his essential ideas for my thesis, to Prof. Dr. Zurab Davitashvili; to the Research Committee of Thesis; among them especially to Prof. Dr. Alexander Rondeli; beside their intense studies, giving their time whenever I go to Turkey and also answering my questions via e-mail, to Prof. Dr. Besir Levent Altuntop, Prof. Dr. Ismail Ozsoy, Assoc. Prof. Yunus Bekdemir for his assistance and my wife Betul Ayshe Sayin who is a teacher of English, for helping in translation and in computer writing process: I count it as my duty to present them all to my boundless thanks and deep regards.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	III
LIST OF TABLES.....	VI
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	VII
INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Topic of the Research and the Purpose.....	4
The Basic Question.....	5
The Hypothesis.....	5
The Theories.....	5
Innovation; Scientific and Functional Importance.....	8
Materials and Methods.....	9
CHAPTER – I.....	10
IMPORTANCE OF CYPRUS FOR TURKEY.....	10
1.1. Historical and Strategic Importance.....	10
1.2. Geo - Strategic Importance of Cyprus from Global Extent.....	12
1.3. Regional Geo – Strategic Importance of Cyprus.....	13
1.4. The Importance of Turkey for the European – Union.....	15
1.4.1. The History of the Developing Processes of Relations between Turkey and the European Union.....	16
1.4.2. The Aim of Turkey in the Uniting – Process to the European Union.....	17
1.4.3. The Expansion Process of the European-Union.....	17
1.5. Statement and the Process of Becoming the Plenipotentiary Member of the European – Union.....	18
1.5.1. The Criterion for the Membership to the European – Union.....	19
1.5.2. The Criteria to Become a Member of European – Union.....	20
1.6. Turkey in the European - Union.....	21
1.6.1. The European – Union Anxious about Turkey.....	22
1.7. Turkey is on the Road to the European – Union.....	24
1.8. The Cyprus Problem in the Membership of Turkey.....	25
to the European Union.....	25
1.8.1. Turkey and Cyprus Problem from European Union Perspective.....	29
1.8.2. How did Cyprus Problem Came into Light.....	30
1.8.3. Condition of Island Till 1974.....	31
1.8.4. Cyprus - Turk Federative State.....	32
1.8.5. Does the Island Consist of Only a Single Nationality (Can Turkish Folk be Taken as a Minority on Cyprus?).....	33
CHAPTER - II.....	35
THE STEPS OF THE TURKEY’S INTEGRATION PROCESS TO THE EUROPEAN UNION..	35
2.1. Historical Background of the Relations between Turkey and the European – Union.....	35
2.1.1. Developments in 1970 and Their Effect the Relations between Turkey and the European Community.....	38
2.1.2. Changing Tide of the Relations in 80s.....	41
2.1.3. Relations between Turkey and the European – Union in 90s.....	43
2.2. Turkey’s Application for Full Membership.....	44
CHAPTER – III.....	47

RELATION AMONG TURKEY AND GREECE, TURKEY AND CYPRUS, CYPRUS AND EUROPEAN – UNION	47
3.1. Greek – Turkish Relations after the End of the Cold War	47
3.2. Greece’s Policy towards Turkey after Became Full Member of European – Union	50
3.2.1. Aim of the Greek Part	52
3.2.2. Greek Policy toward Cyprus and Turkey	53
3.3. Greek Cypriot Application for Membership and Greek – Turkish Relations	54
3.4. The Turks and the Greeks in the International Law	58
3.5. Cyprus and European – Union Relations	60
3.5.1. Cyprus Association Agreement	61
3.5.2. Customs Union Agreement: Second Stage of the Association Agreement	62
3.5.3. Financial Protocols	64
3.5.4. Past and Future of Cyprus from Perspective of Europe	65
3.5.5. Present of Island	66
3.5.6. South Cyprus and European - Union	67
3.5.7. Possibilities of the Cyprus Membership Process to the European – Union without Turkey	68
3.5.8. Cyprus as a Member of the European – Union without Turkey	69
3.5.9. Membership Process of the Greek Government with the European – Union	71
3.6. European - Union Political and Economic Approach to the Cyprus	72
3.7. Relations between Turkey and Cyprus	82
3.7.1. The Position of the Turkish Part in Cyprus	84
3.7.2. Turkish Politics about Cyprus	85
3.7.3. The Factual Independence of the Republic of Turkey on Cyprus	85
3.7.4. The Military Factor of Turkey over Cyprus	88
CHAPTER - IV	90
THE WAYS OF SOLUTION APPLIED UP TILL NOW	90
4.1. What is Effective and Actual Guarantor	90
4.2. The Definition of the “Cyprus Plan”	90
4.3. Achenson Plan	91
4.4. Cuellar’s Report	92
4.5. The Map and the Plan of Butros GALI	92
4.6. The Federal System Offered by Turkey	93
4.7. Efforts Done for Settling the Question of Cyprus	93
4.8. Annan Plan for Cyprus	94
4.8.1. The Referendum in Cyprus, 2004	95
4.8.2. Greeks Say “No“	99
4.8.3. Greek Refusal	101
4.9. Greeks Think to Settle the Question in Cyprus Like That	103
4.10. Turkey Supports This Kind of Settlement for Cyprus	104
4.11. The Last Way of Solution Proposed by United Nations (Annan Plan for Cyprus)	106
CHAPTER - V	108
THE SOURCE OF PERMANENT SOLUTION IN CYPRUS IS EDUCATION	108
5.1. The Only Solution for Cyprus Problem is Education	108

5.2. What Kind of Education Should Be.....	109
5.2.1. Today's World and Science	109
5.2.2. Educative Role of Teachers in Education	111
Observation	113
Suggestions	114
Conclusion	114
Scanning Literacy.....	121
BIBLIOGRAPHY	126

LIST OF TABLES

The Expansion Process of the European-Union	18
Muslims Living in the European – Union	23
Distribution of Financial Protocols within the Two Communities, Greek Cypriots.....	65
The Economical Situation of Cyprus	67
Cypriot Annan Plan referendum Results	96

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EU: European Union

CU: Customs Union

ECSC: European Coal and Steel Community

EAECEURATOM: European Atomic Energy Community

ECE: European Community of Economics

EC: European Community

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

USSR: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

USA: United State of America

UN: United Nation

GAP: Project of South – East Anatolia (Güney Doğu Anadolu Projesi)

US: United State

COREPER: Committee of Permanent Representatives

EDF: European Development Fund

OEEC: Organization for European Economic Cooperation

CFSP: Common Foreign and Security Policy

ESF: European Social Fund

EFTA: European Free Trade Association

EAEC Treaty: Treaty Establishing the European Atomic Energy Community

TEU: Treaty on the European Union

ECU: European Currency Unit

SWP: Labor Socialist Party-England

SEK: Labor Socialist Party-Greece

TRNC: Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

INTRODUCTION

The studies carried out until today about the integration of Turkey to European Union and about Cyprus examined the history, evolution and the today continuing extents of European Union and Cyprus. And in this study, it is specified that whether the Cyprus problem, left unsolvable with the aim of solving, will be a hinder for Turkey's integration process, if so, what can be these obstacles, and what can be offered as a solution for them. What is also stressed in the study is that the education can be the mere solution for the multinational states to live together. Beside my belief for education as a permanent solution depending on concrete cases, that can also be greeted with tolerance, I hope that considering the political life, it can recently be a new dimension for some of the heading politicians and for this reason I tried to define it from my point of view.

Owing to being a Turk, the treatments practiced on Cyprus and Turkey in the name of the European Union and the integration made my job difficult more than facile to carry out this study. For example, as an observer, evaluating the facts I sympathize and live objectively has been very hard for me. Yet, with the flash of the data I obtained, this difficulty was reduced to the least. Beside these all, as a researcher and a political scientist, I meticulously tried to be objective, and also I was aware that I should breast this when I was choosing my thesis topic.

As it is known, Cyprus problem takes the lead among international problems with its insoluble position. The primary reason for this is the geo-politic and geo-strategic importance of Cyprus. Day by day, the essence of the problem of Cyprus is being noticed. When Cyprus is examined, what takes attention is the indefinite beginning date of the problem, which for one side started in 1963, while for the other after 1974. However, the real matter is not when it started, but why or how it occurred and the unsettled process of it.

If we look through Cyprus deeply, we will observe that though the basic differences depending on language, religion and culture, islanders of both sides desire peace on the island. But because of the attitude of some outer powers and politicians, the problem came to an insoluble stage currently. Islanders were never so close to each other, until the referendum process. In spite of the fact that the Greek side uttered "No" in the referendum, before this process, both nations wanted to integrate with the EU as one government accepting to be together.

Depending on this development, I affirm that even though the Mediterranean Sea rises and leaves Cyprus under water, the problem there will not be settled with the known resolutions but with a radical reform in education. This is because that nowadays, Cyprus is not only important for its geo-politic and geo-strategic position but also for economic reasons. According to a recent research, they stroke petrol reserves valued as \$400 billion in Cyprus. ¹

This is because that Cyprus locates in such an important territory that whatever government wants to be the power in the world, would like to benefit from the island and due to their selfish wishes, there will never be peace on the island. Likewise, European governments, by establishing their sovereignty in the sea of Cyprus, will be the effective potency in 21st century world, by the control achieved in the Middle East.

Let's dream for a Cyprus without the obstacle of Turkey for just a second; it is really so precious for the EU and the USA, since they will reach the possibility of controlling the Middle East via Cyprus without Turkey. Thus, both USA and the EU should consider the presence of Turkey once more. I believe that the presence of an unsteady Turkey will cause to alter the whole plan and the projects of Washington-Brussels Line.

Turkey with its new formation process, which started in 1991, gained more geo-political and geo-strategic importance. Because the vital blood vessels of the countries, who want to be the global, super power, pass through Turkey. It is an obligation for USA who plans to settle on Eurasia for a long time, to find a faithful ally companions to cooperation. The continuity of the good relations with Turkey and Georgia is going to guide USA as an important road map for its stabilization in the region.

At this work, you will also find out the examples of the meaningful campaign of Cyprus alongside Turkey for the integration of European Union. For this reason, the topics I convicted essential from the efforts of Turkey for the integration and from Cyprus problem are underlined and stressed.

Thus, the reality revealed that the importance of Cyprus for the integration of Turkey to the European Union and the efforts of Turkey for the Cyprus problem will not easily be solved with only good wills. I believe that this study, beside the Cyprian Greeks and Turks, will enlighten all the multinational communities live together.

¹ http://www.dispolitikaforumu.org/index2.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=144&Itemid=6

I can summarize the technique I used to collect data like that: In the process reaching today from the history of the integration of Turkey to the European Union with the foundation of Cyprus, the classical resource scanning method was used to obtain data. The thesis of bachelor's and post-graduates written in this branch are scanned at, too. The data acquired from those are used by mentioning in the references. Adding to these, as cited in the references section, many books on this topic were also passed over. Furthermore, researches from many websites were given place. And also, for more than a 5-year period, especially between the years 2004-2007 when the topic of Cyprus was densely on agenda, the information I gathered from the debate programs broadcast on TV held by professional participants, the articles I read, news programs, the newspapers and magazines I followed and their news and comments guided my studies excessively. However, since the European Union and the Cyprus question have been a lively agenda both in Turkey and in the world, and because of frequently held negotiations, the changes in agenda brought many difficulties accompanying.

Cyprus, with its insoluble position, will be a continual field for the students who are going to be required to prepare their Ph-D thesis. Likewise, I cover the historical process of Turkey-EU relations, Turkey's integration with the EU, and the Cyprus question in this context. The thesis consists of five main chapters and six abstracts, and starts with an introduction.

In order to understand the current events and the near past well with the idea of explaining the historical process superficially, the first chapter comprises the topics "Cyprus's importance for Turkey and Turkey's importance for European – Union" and "the history of Cyprus till today" In the second chapter, corresponding with the title of the part, the steps of the Turkey's integration process to the European – Union are issued. In the third chapter, Relations among Turkey and Greece, Turkey and Cyprus, Cyprus and European – Union are mentioned. In the fourth chapter, I stress on the solution ways. The ways of solutions applied up till now in Cyprus. In the fifth and the last chapter of the thesis, it is stated that the source of permanent solutions in Cyprus is education.

There are many researches and publications about Turkey's membership process and the Cyprus problem. The European-Union and the Cyprus problem have been the topics of many university students and the researchers who do their Ph-D. In my thesis, I have made use of these researches and I have mentioned the summaries of these studies at the end of my thesis.

The reason for me to study on this topic is that I do my Ph-D. in Georgia and to provide the Georgian people to look over Cyprus from the point of view of Turkish resources and the articles of Turkish writers. As far as I know, Georgian researchers have always examined Cyprus from Russian and English sources and looked from that side.

Since the topic of Cyprus is a current event and in the agenda of Turkish and worldwide politicians and also the press, the contribution of the panel discussions and political speeches in the thesis cannot minimize. The thesis ends with a conclusion and the suggestion parts.

The Topic of the Research and the Purpose

The basic subject matter of the research is whether Cyprus will be a hinder in the integration process of Turkey to the European Union or not. While the opinions of various researchers and politicians are being compared and analyzed in respect of this question, the points stated below are tried to be replied through the process:

- The general state of Cyprus to date
- The relations between Turkey – Cyprus and Cyprus – Greece
- The continuing process of Turkey with the European Union and the relations with Greece
- The overlook of the United Nations, the USA and the European Union to Cyprus
- The Geo-strategic and the geo-politic situation of Cyprus in the globalizing world
- The importance of the European Union for Turkey and Turkey for the European Union
- The futility of the solution ways introduced in Cyprus as per date and the Annan Plan

When the questions expressed above are solved, the research will reach its leading purpose and this will prove that Cyprus does not poses a problem in the membership of Turkey with the European Union. In this context, the confirmation of our hypothesis and its detailed analysis will gain essence. At the same time, this will prove the contributions provided for the European Union by the member-to-be country, Turkey, in a clear way.

According to us, we aim that the provisions set forth to enable the membership of Turkey to the European Union to be overviewed and analyzed once more. These provisions and analysis will aid to define that Cyprus does not cause a problem to the membership of Turkey.

The Basic Question

The basic question is set by taking the aim of the researcher into consideration and the aim is to find the answer of this question: What kind of factors are composing reasons whether Cyprus is occurring a problem for the integration of Turkey to the European Union and if so, what is the degree of these factors.

The Hypothesis

In my study, I will try to prove whether Cyprus is occurring a problem in the integration process of Turkey and if so, the reasons for this and the necessity of its not being considered as a hinder. The Cyprus factor as a handicap for the integration of Turkey to the European Union, the overlook of the United Nations, the USA and the European Union to the Cyprus together with the politics of Greece.

The European Union accepts the countries compatible with its own norms to the union and even though these norms show diversity depending on the country, they are same in origin. In this type of unities, each party behaves by particularizing their own benefits though they cannot culminate up to the mark.

According to us, this agent does not alter the admission provisions since the unsteady conditional terms will impede the improvement and expansion of the unity. My thesis relies on these assertions: The admission terms of the union for a country should not cause any kind of ethnic discrimination and in the frame of democracy and human rights, from the criteria of the union, with the accompany of modern and democratic measures admitting the positive values is important. The improvement of the union can be possible with the expansion of the union.

The Theories

With the purpose of commenting about the research topic in a wide range and so as to bring strong evidences, I aim my study to be analyzed from a critical point of view in the light of the international integration theories, classic geo-politic theories, globalism and global theories.² Besides,

² Arı Tayyar, Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri, İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti. Yayınları, 2002, s.452

we think that the assertions and assumptions classified by Karl Deutsch under four headings as the aims and the benefits of integration: 1) to protect the peace, 2) to reach bigger and multi-functional capacities, 3) to fulfill particular and specific duties, and 4) to earn a new image and identity are all the types of assumptions that can be tested.³

While the two-poled system and the international developments about the resolution of the system have been bringing the USA to an active power position as a country, it has also accelerated to originate areas so as to provide raise in economic and politic impact for the other effective countries of the international system; their actors in the area of self-benefit and their own surroundings. The said developments have gradually increased the importance of “integration” concept in the international relations. Divergent national and international actors and their international integration actions improved with their supra-national effects, shaped with the economic realities and are named after the states represented them. (Dedeoglu, 1996: 15) Especially, founded after the World War II, the European Economic Society, the North Atlantic Agreement Organization, the European Independent Interchange Union, the African Union Organization, the Organization of American States, Warsaw Treaty Organization, and the Union of Arab Emirates can be counted among such organizations that were effective about the use of the term “integration” in international politics (Ari, 2002:446). Integration or unification is defined as the process that the political actors direct their allegiance, expectations and political acts from the national countries to an executive new central core. In this context, a natural result of unification is the existence of a new political community authorized over pre-existed units (Haas,1958:16),(Viotty ve Kauppi, 1987:207). According to a similar definition, integration is a process that the countries give up the wish of governing the inner and outer politics themselves in an independent way and choose to take common decisions and to endorse over the decision-making authority to new central organs (Lindberg,1963:6). In the frame of the mentioned definitions, with the cease of the World War II, depending on economic reasons or with the pragmatic approach of alienating the probable power of Germany to an upper executive formation and relying on the idealist realities like not to experience the pains of war again, an integration process like in the United States of America who was supported by outer governments started to surround the Western Europe. Today, it is not possible to talk about a European or World United States since the governments do not want to share their independency and wealth with the

³ Ari Tayyar uluslararası ilişkiler teorileri İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti. Yayınları, 2002, s.452

others; however, the United Nations is the first important step in this integration process, yet just a step. (Goldstein, 2000:440). Integration is a concept that defines both the acts of the national governments unified for self common interests and the methods and institutions they used to reach this. Despite the fact that it is an action occurred from the mutual economic necessity of the countries, the economic and politic approach seems to be combined in this act; neither of them can be handled alone. At this point, it is possible to explain the integration by using the conceptions like establishing a partnership, union ship, consisting a unity, becoming a community (Dedeoğlu, 1996: 22). The notion of integration is related with alternation and is used to describe a ‘political group’ or a ‘unified community’. Integrations are the structures pursuing the goal of mutual dependency, common benefits and cooperation among their members contrary to conflict and violence (Hopkins ve Mansbach, 1973:279). The integration theory is the examination of the formation of a political group composed by two or more political community from divergent levels. Unifications conveys the meaning that two or more states integrate to form a new and a big government (Hodges,1978:237). The communities come together through integration are not religious and cultural groups but political and economic unions. By voluntarily coming together, a new political group is formed and whatever the strength of the members, an executive decision-making authority takes place in the distribution of the community advantages. ⁴

Geopolitics, handled as a political science over geography, throughout the history, has focused on either what geographic regions should be controlled for the universal sovereignty or the probable geographic reasons for the expansion of the governments. The ones who aimed to provide the universal sovereignty through the check-over of geographical regions mainly looked for the ways to take the control of the Middle East and the continent of Asia. In this thesis, at the base of the geo-politic approaches examined, the endeavor of controlling the Middle East and the whole Asia and determining the strategic way going to the desire of controlling the world with those possibilities is aimed to be fulfilled. Cyprus, beside the providing the security of the Middle East, Middle Asia and Caspian Region with strong economic potential of rich natural resources and petrol reservoirs, carries a big essence with its geographic position from a geo-politic extent for the security of Turkey locating as a passage and combining the most developed regions of West with the tip points of East.

⁴ http://www.odevarsivi.com/dosya.asp?islem=gor&dosya_no=101521

Innovation; Scientific and Functional Importance

In the globalization process, working on the topic of education strategies of multi-national states from an interdisciplinary dimension shows on its own the scientific value of the thesis study. Beyond this, keeping the education system of multi-national states in the forefront during the globalization process is very crucial in order to determine the strategies in Cyprus in this field.

In my study, utilizing the strategic and applied analysis methods is an innovation for according to the data we obtained, up to date; these kinds of methods have not been much used in education field. For the multi-national countries, employing various factors and dimensions in their strategies of living together, new education methods, issuing a discipline for the universal, humanistic values and cultural diversity is a renewal.

In 2005, so as to see the piercing traces of the war happened in Bosnia, in the 1990s and to understand the relations of the people in the region, I went to Bosnia. There, I had the chance to see and observe the national and international schools founded by Turkey. In the light of the knowledge I get from the Bosnian society, I learned that due to the things encountered in the war, they do not like the Serbians and the Croatians. But despite this fact, while I was visiting the national and international schools they called as the amity schools opened by the enterprisers from Turkey, I witnessed the Bosnian, the Serbian and the Croatian children receiving education together by sharing the same class, using the same language and living the beauties together. The data I get from the school administration amazed me. In Bosnia, only in these schools those divergent nations share the same classroom and the other schools do not give co-education; they all educate in their own schools.

Again with the same purpose, when I went to Albania in 2006, I met the same scene and beauty in the school founded by Turkish enterprisers. In order to share and perpetuate the beauties I obtained as a result of that research, we founded the International Nikoloz Tsereteli School at the capital Tbilisi, in Georgia, in 2006, and I worked at the administration of the same school as the principal. In this education building, which I consider as an extremely developed laboratory, I started to make analysis and observe the events. In the first year of the school, Georgian-Russian, Armenian-Azerbaijani, Turkish-Greek, Israelite and Latvian students started their education in the same classes. Early on, the teenagers were glancing at each other with strange eyes, while in the

course of time, I observed that a Georgian with a Russian, an Azerbaijani with an Armenian, a Greek with a Turkish student, they were all sharing things in a friendly manner.

Materials and Methods

I can summarize the technique I used to collect data like that: So as to determine the dimensions of the potential power of a society and to direct this to a beneficial point by developing the concept, we aimed to make synthesis of the international relations, international education methods and in the process reaching today from the history of the integration of Turkey to the European Union with the foundation of Cyprus, the classical resource scanning method was used to obtain data. The thesis of bachelor's and postgraduates written in this branch are scanned at, too. The data acquired from those are used by mentioning in the references. Adding to these, as cited in the references section, many books on this topic were also passed over. Furthermore, researches from many websites were given place. And also, for more than a 5-year period, especially between the years 2004-2007 when the topic of Cyprus was densely on agenda, the information I gathered from the debate programs broadcast on TV held by professional participants, the articles I read, news programs, the newspapers and magazines I followed and their news and comments guided my studies excessively. However, since the European Union and the Cyprus question have been a lively agenda both in Turkey and in the world, and because of frequently held negotiations, the changes in agenda brought many difficulties accompanying.

CHAPTER – I

IMPORTANCE OF CYPRUS FOR TURKEY

1.1. Historical and Strategic Importance

Turkey wants to have people of the same culture, speak same language, and have common ancestors living on the island. Turkish Republic cannot afford itself indifferent attitude to Turkish people living 40 miles away from its own border, watching them being suppressed, murdered and deprived from their rights. Primary aim of Turkey is to provide peace, freedom and security for the people of the island. One cannot expect from Turkey, a country with international responsibilities, to ignore the processes developing against agreement. Cyprus plays an important role of the tool to prove the faithfulness of Turkey for international agreements and responsibilities. Cyprus occupies very important geographical position in Eastern Mediterranean Sea region and plays a vital strategic role in security of Turkish south coastlines. During history, pirates, who had their bases on Cyprus, attacked trade ships, periodically making sudden rushes over southern coasts of Anatolia. To let Cyprus exist under the authority of an enemy country would mean to let them cut supply ways of Anatolia and putting Turkey into a dangerous position. Founder of Turkish Republic, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, paid lots of attention to this fact. Once watching military maneuvers on a south coast of country Ataturk asked general staff of army:” Let’s assume that Turkey got occupied once again. South shore is the last place where resistance battles take place. What could be the supply ways and chances we would have?”

While officers were giving variety of ideas about possible solution of the puzzle given by their commander, Ataturk reached his hand to the map and pointed at Cyprus:” Gentlemen there would exist no ways for supply of this region, unless Cyprus is in the hands of our enemies. Cyprus

is the place on which lots of concentration should be given. This island is of great importance for us.”⁵

As Mustafa Kemal Atatürk confirmed, Cyprus is a vital piece of land in the middle of Mediterranean Sea. It is not only important for Turkey but for other countries as well, who wish to get control over Mediterranean coasts, Cyprus would be a great choice for that purpose.

In the next 5-10th years Caucasian, Middle East and Caspian petroleum and natural gas will be being transported through pipes to Iskenderun Gulf and marketed to the world. Iraq oil flows into this region as well. Water that spills into the sea around this region will be diverted to Middle East. The resultant products of sudden increase in production that would be experienced with GAP will be marketed to the world from these sea ports. Cyprus is situated at a point from where it can control this strategic area.

The announcement made by Minister of Foreign Affairs Ismail Cem on 6th April 1998, includes statement that says that East Mediterranean would be the most strategic area during 2005-2010 and Turkey, for the sake of its national security and profit, will never give up its positions about Cyprus. England, USA and European Union make attempts to own this area.⁶

English admiral Lord John Hay once mentioned in his speech that Cyprus would be the best place for sea military base. Beaconsfield - English parliamentary once told Queen Victoria that Cyprus is “the key for the front Asia”. Both, what was said by Turkish Foreign Affairs Minister Ismail Cem and Admiral Lord John Hay are already enough to prove importance of Cyprus for Turkey and rest of the world. What was said by Beaconsfield to Queen Victoria about Cyprus is also significant. This is why Cyprus is considered to be a valuable strategic place from national security and world trade point of view, thanks to its geographic position. It was also already mentioned that Atatürk once informed his general staff about geo - strategic and geopolitical importance of Cyprus.

5 <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kkctc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru37.htm>

6 <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kkctc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru37.htm>

1.2. Geo - Strategic Importance of Cyprus from Global Extent

Nejat Esten

“If I were asked to show a geo-strategic center, I would point out Cyprus” (n.e)

In order to understand the meaning of geo-strategy one has to grasp geopolitical concepts given by Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan.

Admiral Mahan, made an attempt to define the role of sea on the fate of nations by building sea geopolitics and forming sea-related strategy. Mahan studied to the origin of “geopolitics” concept development, the idea of global dominance based on sea power. To define sea power, Mahan made use of economical and political dimensions beyond some military concepts. Mahan, who viewed sea power, major components of which are sea trade ways, as an important element that plays a big role in wellbeing of the country, made the first efforts for Globalization and changed the fate of USA. Mahan, in his book titled “The influence of sea power on history of 1660-1753 years” wrote about England that used to be an island state and had the control over continental countries without having much land power and got wealthy by the help of sea and colony trade, and purposed an idea that USA could reach a high income by following the same concept tactics as England. By influencing USA President T. Roosevelt and politicians, Mahan succeeded in changing the view in history totally.

Trusting Mahan’s “Geopolitics” definition, one can assert that Cyprus has a huge geo-strategic potential for countries with global ambitions like USA. The reasons why Cyprus can be considered as an important component for global geo- strategy are listed below.

According to Ahmet Davutoglu:

- It can be stated that island occupies a geographically central position due to its equal distance to Europe, Asia and Africa, and takes place on the crossroad of sea routes like Crete. Cyprus which lays between the gulfs that separate Asia from Europe and the Suez Canal, and that divides Africa, has an opportunity to Caspian basin catchments, waterways of Aden and Hurmuz, could also be perfect air and marine military base. Keeping Cyprus under control would ease strategic expansion from Europe to Asia and Africa.

- Cyprus occupies a position from which it can control energy resources of Persian Gulf and Caspian basin catchments. It would be possible to control these resources with the help of air forces placed on island.
- The fact that Cyprus lies on an oil line extended from Persian Gulf to Europe makes it rather important for the safety purposes of the pipeline. If this pipeline becomes unfunctionable then Europe will have to import oil from South Africa.
- Cyprus has a chance to get a high status in the perspective of global and continental energy security, because of its ability to hold the control over already functioning and planned pipelines transporting oil from Caspian basin catchments and Persian Gulf to Mediterranean Sea.
- Air forces can be used to control tankers carrying oil from Russia and Caspian catchments basin to the world market, the task can be brilliantly accomplished from airbases that will take place on Cyprus. This is one of the main reasons why Cyprus is very important for global energy safety in terms of geo-strategy. USA is one of the countries that has a great interest in Cyprus, and who wants to get control over energy resources and transportation lines, which results in achieving global control over world economy and total dominance.
- Power that has global ambitions has not dismissed Cyprus from its target's list, the island that is able to control Middle East, Persian Gulf, Caucasian, Balkan, Eastern Mediterranean, Turkish Gulf, Aegean and Suez Canals, Red Sea.

1.3. Regional Geo – Strategic Importance of Cyprus

- Cyprus, as well as being a geo-strategic center, is also the mass center of Balkans, Caucasians, Persian Gulf and Africa.
- Cyprus is the key for Mediterranean Sea safety, while Kih could be made responsible for Eastern Mediterranean safety. Geo-strategic axis, comprising Malta-Crete-Cyprus islands which cover an important region of Mediterranean, “promise” safety of Europe from south and Africa's security from north. Presence of air forces on island would provide a possibility to control Eastern Mediterranean without any need for Navy. It would be possible to

keep Caucasians, Balkans, Aegean Sea, Turkish Gulfs, Red sea, Suez Canal and Persian Gulf under control with the help of the same air bases.

- Cyprus-Caucasian geo-strategic axis has the potential to control water resources of Eastern Anatolia and energy resources of Caspian catchments basin that become highly important with increasing rates of global warming, special interest including oil pipelines that reach Mediterranean Sea and energy terminals.
- As geo-strategic importance of Cyprus increases, the possibility to control “Plentiful Crescent” region earns importance. This island is vital for safety of Israel which is situated on the Eastern shore of East Mediterranean. Israel, being geographically isolated from East, North and South would not feel itself secure without owning Cyprus, which is situated in the “backyard” of Israel. To reach “promised land” and to be able to control water resources of Mesopotamia-Israel has to be sure of Cyprus.
- The power on Cyprus can transform island into a military base and expand from Balkans to Persian Gulf, Caucasian and Middle East. This is more or less how the plan of the USA looks like.
- If US succeed to place its military troops to Poland, Romania, Bulgaria and Cyprus, it will limit geo-strategic expansion of Russia to Eastern Europe, south of Turkish Gulfs and Caucasian.
- Cyprus plays a guard role for Baku-Tiflis-Ceyhan pipeline, Ceyhan terminal and Suez Canal, which is the main point for petroleum that go to the Mediterranean Sea. The island has the potential to keep an eye on both energy delivery lines. Safety of European energy is totally depends on the security of the energy traffic at this region.
- From global and regional perspective Cyprus represents a geo-strategic mass center. The power, controlling this mass center would lead to the achievement of great geo-strategic advantages and geo-strategic expansion. It has already mentioned that Ataturk, who told to keep an eye on Cyprus, realized geo-strategic importance of the island. Geographical position in Eastern Anatolia is vital for national security of Turkish Republic. Turkish army would minimize the danger of being encircled. Turkey would be able to influence the decisions made about the security of Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East. If Turkish troops are taken away from the island and some other army is emplaced instead, then Turkey will lose the advantage listed above and Anatolia will be encircled from the South. If Mora-

Crete-Cyprus line were used by the same powers, then Turkey would be encircled from the South and Aegean Sea, thus the ways to Mediterranean Sea would be closed.

- Air forces emplaced onto Cyprus will be able to control whole area of Turkey, influence Turkish Gulfs, energy transportation lines extending from Eastern Anatolia to Mediterranean Sea and GAP region which gains high importance because of the coming up global warming issue.⁷

Cyprus is extremely important for powers, which try to reach global dominance. That is why USA wants to own Cyprus. By owning Cyprus, USA will get control over sea energy transportation line extending from Persian Gulf to Cebelik as well as Baku-Tiflis-Ceyhan petrol line and Middle East oil in general. Second important issue is to be able to protect Israel. Presence of NATO troops on the island could be of great advantage for Israel.

1.4. The Importance of Turkey for the European – Union

It's obvious that the Governments of different nations, religions and languages will have the permanent relations to the inside and outside factors of the country according to their geopolitical and political situations.

Turkey lives in the new World already. The geopolitical surroundings of Turkey had the important changes (several years later) after Gorbachov took his office. In Northern and Western Parts of the World the new geopolitical system was created.

In the Balkans, countries belonging to Yugoslavia, achieved their independence with the price of their own blood. With the separation of the USSR, the power of Turkey did not reduce, but increased greatly after 1990s. The Europeans for their first time belt themselves to be out of danger and began to revalue relation they had with their strategic partners in the Cold – War period. Germany managed to avoid the process of decentralization in the World War II and united. The European Governments began revaluing relations they had with USA and Turkey, as there was no more

⁷ Dr. İrfan Kalaycı, Kıbrıs ve Geleceği: Ekonomik Politik Bir Tartışma, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2004, İstanbul: Atlas Yayın Dağıtım, 2004, ss. 91-95.

danger of the Cold – War. Besides, one of the main factors Europe faces is energetic crisis. Europeans, who gained the control over Arabic oil in 1920s, gave it to Americans; there was another trail for controlling over the Caucasus, Middle East and Middle Asia’s energetic resources again.⁸

Nowadays, Turkey has got the greatest resources of its young, dynamic 70 million populations. The important factor for the European Union is the energy and water resources that are more important in the country than the oil resources in the Middle East. Turkey is the strategic partner for the Middle East as for the Europe also. In case Turkey unites to the European Union it will grow up politically and economically. If the GAP project is put into practice, the greatest economical and political potential will be created in the Middle East. Beside many political difficulties, this project is considered to be the most important by the European Companies.

1.4.1. The History of the Developing Processes of Relations between Turkey and the European Union

The question of association is defined following to the convention of Rome 238 article it’s been given to this form. The Union can form the agreements with government, government union or with the international organization according to the principles of the interaction and relation processes.

Since the establishment of the Republic, (also in the earlier periods) Modernization and Europeanization have been determined as unique indivisible processes. Particularly after World War II Turkey became the member of the European Union OECD and NATO. With this sane factor Turkey could not be indifferent towards this ideal project of the European Integration.⁹

⁸ <http://instituteus.com/news/turkish/index.php?p=19>

⁹ Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ramazan Kılıç, Türkiye-AB İlişkileri ve Gümrük Birliği: Ekonomik Entegrasyon Teorisi – Gümrük Birliği Teorisi, Ankara, Siyasal Kitabevi, 2002, s. 111.

1.4.2. The Aim of Turkey in the Uniting – Process to the European Union.

The European Union is founded in 1957 with Rome Agreement so as to cease the battles between the countries situated geographically in the European lands. When the year 1960 came, Turkey applied to the union as a member. With the process working from 1960 and gaining speed after 10th December 1999 with the Helsinki Summit and 7th December 2000 with Niche, the EU came to the threshold of a new term.

There were two important factors in this situation; the first one is Europe rejected Turkey to join to this union. But finally, for the benefit of Turkey the half of the member countries from this union has changed their opinion and the arguments, and objective reasons of the antagonist countries have been changed too. The second is the changes of the same kind that took place in Turkey, especially through the Islamic part of the population. There was a question about the factor of Islamic religion. According to the idea of some of the inside circles the question of the religious factor would be settled in case uniting process with the European – Union was solved. What the European – Society asks was the following question: how would the government, whose official religion was Islam, managed to integrate with the European Institutions.¹⁰

1.4.3. The Expansion Process of the European-Union

Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg and Holland signed the Rome Agreement in 1957 and established the European Economic Union. The First steps towards the integration were made in 1973 by England, Ireland and Denmark.

Later, in 1981, Greece, in 1986-Spain and Portugal and in 1995 Sweden and Finland united to this Union.

The historical mission of the European-Union is uniting the continent peacefully, then developing and arising the level of stability and welfare together with the new member governments. There was marked about this direction, at the European Copenhagen meeting in the year 1993, that

¹⁰ Ali Bulaç, Avrupa Birliği, Feza gazetecilik A.Ş Yayınları, 2001, s.7-8

“the Central and the East European Countries would have the possibilities of uniting with the European-Union.” In December 1997, there began the process of expansion in Luxembourg. As a result of the meetings held in January 2007, it was expanded (last expansion) by 27 member governments.

Government	Bilateral Agreement	Plenipotentiary Member-Ship Ap-	Starting Date of the Negotiations	Final Date of the Negotiations	Membership
Cyprus	December 1972	July 1990	March 1998	February 2002	May 2004
Malta	December 1970	July 1990	February 2000	February 2002	May 2004
The Republic of Czechoslovakia	October 1993	January 1996	March 1998	February 2002	May 2004
Estonia	June 1995	October 1995	March 1998	February 2002	May 2004
Lithuania	June 1995	October 1995	February 1998	February 2002	May 2004
Latvia	June 1995	October 1995	February 1998	February 2002	May 2004
Hungary	December 1991	March 1994	March 1998	February 2002	May 2004
Poland	December 1991	April 1994	March 1998	February 2002	May 2004
Slovenia	June 1996	June 1996	March 1998	February 2002	May 2004
Slovakia	October 1993	June 1995	February 2000	February 2002	May 2004
Romania		June 1995	February 2000	June 2004	January 2007
Bulgaria		December 1995	February 2000	June 2004	January 2007

In January, 2007, Bulgaria and Romania have become memberships of EU. Croatia and Turkey still wear the status of membership candidacy.¹¹

1.5. Statement and the Process of Becoming the Plenipotentiary Member of the European – Union

Statements for the complete integration with the European-Union are defined in 1957 with the 237th article of Rome Agreement, 98th of Paris Agreement and 205th Agreement that have established EURATOM. In 237-Rome Agreement that represents the basement of the European-Union, were made the changes according to the articles of 1987 year-Europe and 1992 year Maastricht EK-

¹¹ <http://www.deltur.cec.eu.int/default.asp?lang=0&pId=3&fId=10&prnId=1&hnd=0&ord=0&docId=311&fop=1>

O Agreements, but they have not caused the principle changes. There are three main principles for the membership of the European-Union:

- 1) Existence of the territorial unity on the continent of the Europe
- 2) Common European Ideas (Democracy, Market-Economy, Human Rights and Freedom)
- 3) The necessity to reach on an agreement within the whole member countries.

After accepting these given statements, the government who is the member of the union should also accept and obey to (*aquis communotaire*). The agreement of the Euro-parliament is also necessary there.¹²

The government who has a desire of uniting with the European-Union makes the statement for its plenipotentiary membership, addressing to the European-Committee. Only the two members will be satisfied after the European-Union hands over this business to the European-Committee. The Commission will discuss the political, economic, social and democratic spheres of the candidate governments and will make the decisions according to this. Accepted decisions will be informed to the Council, but beside the positive decisions made by the Council, the candidate government will not become the member of the Union in case the Euro-Parliament doesn't make a statement for its membership with this Union.

1.5.1. The Criterion for the Membership to the European – Union

According to the negotiations and the statements, the European-Union has got some questions that have to be realized by the candidate governments, these questions are:1) Free product transportation 2) Free movement of individuals 3) Free service providing 4) Unlimited movement of the finances 5) Juridical base of the business industry 6) Regulating policy of the competition 7) Agriculture 8) Fishing 9) Transportation 10) Customs system 11) Financial and economic unity 12) Statistical data 13) Social policy Providing 14) Energetic 15) Industrial policy 16) Small business 17) Scientific-Research works 18) Education 19) Telecom and Information technologies 20) Cul-

¹² Doç. Dr. Haydar Çakmak, Avrupa Birliği Türkiye İlişkileri: Ankara: Barış Kitap Basım ve Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti. Yayınları, 2005, s.76

ture 21) Coordinating the regional and administrative apparatus 22) Ecology 23) Health of the customers and people 24) Collaboration between the Law and the Interior organizations 25) Customs Union 26) Foreign Affair Economic Relation-Ships 27) Common, Foreign and Security Policy 28) Financial Control 29) Budget and Finances 30) Information Society and Media 31)Administrative System 32) Customs Union 33) Trans-European Webs 34) Instances 35).¹³

There are enumerated another 31 questions, but according to the observation, the number of questions seem to be more than they are given here. The criterion of the membership of the European – Union is changing according to the time without making the principle changes in the ideological essence of the European-Union. The reasons of the changes, mentioned before, are the private specificity of each of the country which they have got. These differences are considered for the concrete governments and for their specificity of course. In other words the amount of the given numbers (31) can be considered as conditional.

1.5.2. The Criteria to Become a Member of European – Union

As anticipated on article 237th of the Agreement of Rome, the countries that have the right to join to the EU are demanded to have some certain criteria. These criteria were stated at the Summit of state and

Government presides, in Copenhagen, the capital of Denmark, on June 21st – 22nd 1993, under the name of the Copenhagen Criteria, membership criteria of EU were mentioned before on the Summits held in Luxemburg, Cardiff and Venice and every time, new articles were added without changing the base. The reason of these minor changes was the changes and the complexity of the problems of the ex- Eastern members.

¹³ Doç. Dr. Haydar Çakmak, Avrupa Birliği Türkiye İlişkileri: Ankara: Barış Kitap Basım ve Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti. Yayınları, 2005, s.78

The Copenhagen Criteria: Determined in 1993, the Copenhagen Criteria was published and explained on July 20th 1996 at the report called Agenda 2000 by the European Commission, the criteria that the new members must absolutely obey are examined under 3 subtitles. There are:

“A - Political Criteria”: Demanded criteria on this range are: a – the superiority of the democracy law. b- Human rights. c- To observe the minority.

“B - Economical Criteria”: There are two main conditions in these criteria: a- member-to-be country must have a well-running bazaar economy suitable to EU rules.

b- Member – to-be countries must have a well economical power to rival to other member countries of EU.

“C- The obligation of adaptation to the EU Acquire (Aces Communitarian)

Adding to these, member- to-be countries must obey to many important criteria like the economical union, common foreign and security policy, agriculture, environment, act. And EU Acquire.¹⁴

1.6. Turkey in the European - Union

Turkey is the sixteenth unofficial member of the EU. As a result of a 43- year – old migration 3 850 000 Turks live in the countries which are members of the EU among whom 1 300 000 are citizens of the countries they live in. This figure is rather serious. It exceeds the population of Luxemburg by 7 times, equals 70 per cent of the population of Denmark, equals one third of the population of Belgium and Greece.

So the European Union has some experience in accepting Turkish population within its bounds that gives us the ability to see clearly the possibility of integration.¹⁵

After all above-mentioned the matter concerning the membership of Turkey in the EU is for you to decide, though everything is perfectly obvious. But the forces who are trying to fulfill their

¹⁴ Doç. Dr. Haydar Çakmak, Avrupa Birliği Türkiye İlişkileri: Ankara: Barış Kitap Basım ve Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti. Yayınları, 2005, ss.79-80

¹⁵ Prof. Dr. Faruk Şen, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, s. 74

intentions by causing unfair and confrontational situations, will fail because they will be opposed by the forces who have realized that no one can stop the policy of peace in the historical process of the world.

1.6.1. The European – Union Anxious about Turkey

Turkey with its 67 million populations is considered to become the biggest government of Europe. This is the argument that fears some of the member governments of the European – Union and the opponents of Turkey. Beside this, Turkey is near the borders of Armenia, Georgia, Iran, Iraq and Syria.

The former prime minister of France and the author of the European Constitution – Giscard D’Estaing, German thinkers Helmut Schmidt, Peter Glots and European Christian – Democrats have written in their thesis that “the European – Union represents the union of the Christian values. Because of the religious factor, it’s inadequate for the government of Turkey. This is the problem that’s been still remaining.”¹⁶

This question possibly harasses European, but Europe must not forget that its own existence is based on those governments, who are rejected to join the union. They are the governments whose natural resources are widely used by Europe but Europe still tries to keep a distance and ignore them. Evidently, the European – Union has got some problems with its neighbors.

To my opinion the European – Union must solve these problems and react adequately. There must not be allowed those conditions and circumstance that will evoke an attack between the civilizations, it will not be good for anybody. According to the convention of 237th article of Rome, none of the governments bordering to Europe has rights to determine their membership clearly and not to be ignored. It would disregard those people who took part for the establishment of the European – Union. Europe looks suspicious at Muslim Turkey. But out of 376 Million population of Europe, 14 million is Muslim, with whom they live. If we look through the differentiation of the popu-

¹⁶ Prof. Dr. Faruk Şen, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, s. 73

lation according to their religion, there are 5 million Muslim populations in France, 3.5 million in Germany, 2 million in England, others live in Spain, Holland, Austria and so on...

Muslims Living in the European – Union

Governments	Amount of Muslims / year	Amount of the common population	Percentage amount the population
Belgium	370.000(1998)	10.192.240(1998)	3,7 %
Dania	150.000(2000)	5.330.020 (2000)	2,8 %
Germany	3.400.000 (2002)	82.440.300 (2002)	3,9 %
France	5.000.000 (2002)	61.387.000(2002)	8,1 %
Finland	20.000(1999)	5.171.302(1999)	0,4 %
Greece	370.000(1999)	10.000.000(1999)	3,5 %
England	1.591.000(2001)	58.789,000(2001)	2,7%
Ireland	10.000(2002)	3.917.336 (2002)	0,2 %
Italy	700.000(1999)	57.596.097 (1999)	1,2%
Luxsemburg	7.000 (2000)	435.700 (2000)	1,6%
Holland	695.600(1998)	15.760.225(1999)	4,6 %
Austria	350.000 (1999)	3.102.600(1999)	4,0 %
Portugal	38.000 (2000)	10.000.000 (2000)	0,4 %
Sweden	300.000 (2000)	8.876.611 (2000)	3,4 %
Spain	400.000(1999)	40,202.160(1999)}	1,0%
Totally	13.401.600	378.200.591	3,5%

Muslims living in Europe belong to those parts of the population who are easily adaptable to the countries they live in. They have not got radical tendencies. The thesis, by Professor Basan Tib, consisting of 5 articles is about the question of the European – Islam religion. There, the Muslims living in Europe who adjust the values of the Industrial society are indicated. On the second part, they admit the constitutions of the European society. On the third part, they also admit the principles of democracy and the principles of majority. Fourth, Muslims of the European countries acknowledge the religion of liberal Islam. Fifth, they don't accept the principles of the law of "Shariat"¹⁷

¹⁷ Prof. Dr. Faruk Şen, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, s. 73

There are not any objective reasons of mistrustfulness towards Muslims, according to the observations of professor, except Mass – Media who is keen on spreading distorted information about Muslims. But people who have close relation – ships with Muslims we hope will not be provoked on this kind of information, except rational diplomats and corrupted Media Organs.

1.7. Turkey is on the Road to the European – Union

The issue of Cyprus is the most important issue in the process of accepting Turkey in the EU. According to the treaty between London and Zurich (if we look at the historical side of the process) the Republic of Cyprus has no right to participate or join any international organizations, where Turkey and Greece (guaranteed states) are not members, but England does not implement the treaty; furthermore, England avoided its participation in the process which had to be peacefully implemented, the process concerning the events of the 1974. As for the Greeks, they were given a chance to undertake armed aggression against the Turkish population living on the island.

Despite the fact that the destruction of the federal system in Cyprus was carried out by the Greeks, the EU recognizes the Greek side, as – “the Republic of Cyprus” and that simplifies the Greek’s situation. The defector government of Cyprus applied for membership in the EU on July 3rd, 1990. In other words, this happened ignoring the Turks living there. If we observe the earlier events, we will see that, Turkey and Greece applied for membership in the European Union in 1963, but Turkey failed to become a member of the EU because of the unstable political situation inside the country. As for Greece, it managed to become a member of the EU in 1981. As a result of these events, the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus became isolated, that caused serious, depressive situation among the Turkish population living there. The fact that the annual income of the Greek population is 4 times bigger than the income of the Turkish population proves the hardest social situation of the Turkish people.

1.8. The Cyprus Problem in the Membership of Turkey to the European Union

Cyprus problem within EU discussion of Turkey: Is it Enosis or just permanent solution?

Dr. Veysi Akin

1) Brussels Summit (16-17 December 2004) and Cyprus insistence

Being the only source of the problem between Greece and Turkey, Cyprus became one of the main troubles for EU while Greece becomes a member of EU and Turkey is in the process of admittance to the membership. The wrong policy of Turkish government on Cyprus that sees membership in EU as a primary aim together with the Europeans who follow pro Cypriot Greek-Greek policy could be shown as a cause for that. Second reason is that UN could not find some just and proper solution to the existing problem.

Since Turkish-Greek crisis came into scene there was no trustful relationships between two countries, the pressure applies upon both sides was not the same as well. During those bloody days, troops which were responsible for keeping and protecting peace on island, in reality were protecting Greeks, who became the cause of the lost blood and tears, watching the dying Turkish people, distraction of the houses and even whole villages. UN recognized Cypriot Greek government as the “Island Republic» by making decision in favor of Cypriot Greeks, who abated Cyprus Republic built on agreements just after the 1974 Cyprus Peace Campaign. Cypriot Greek Government was the only one who hindered the peaceful solution of the problem and made use of the statement made by UN, asserting that they can be the only ruling party on island and implying that it is also only them who can own the land of island, eagerly supporting and protecting their position during discussions initiated by UN. UN and Europeans characterized Turkish side as an “agreement-resistant” party, and created wrong public opinion about the situation by giving unjustified reasoning. Turkey, in its own turn, failed to introduce the claims of Turkish people to the public. It seems as if Turkish government’s preference is to follow so called “no-trouble” policy, doing so it takes the problem into more critical state.

Attempts to resolve the crisis introduced by UN such as “Gali Plan” and “Annan Plan” cannot be brought into life by the initiators themselves. Conflict escalated higher and higher as a tiny

snowball turning into avalanche, getting broader than discussion topic for UN and “guarantor countries”, becoming a severe battle subject for EU and USA.

“Annan plan” became nonfunctional after the negative outcome of referendum made by Cypriot Greeks, but it still remains to be a current issue opens for discussions. This is probably the reason why solution is searched in the frame of UN... Situation got even more severe after Cypriot Greek part of the island became a member of European Union, EU was part of the affair now. Consequently, EU opinion would certainly play very important role. This is the reason why Turkey cannot neglect the existence of EU. It is also not affordable to follow all the demands made by European community. Europe still makes its policy relying on subjective decisions as it used to act in the past. European Union deviated from own principles by accepting South Cyprus as a member, neglecting agreement that used to be a basic stone for the philosophy of Cyprus Republic, violating international laws and adding a structure that would turn into a source of big political troubles.

But nothing can be changed in the past, neither for Turkey nor for Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. There are some countries in the structure of EU that find enough courage to assert that Europeans are going to be held responsible for mistakes they made by splitting the island and accepting one part of it. Cyprus question was mainly discussed from this perspective. The summit, held in Brussels, on 17th December 2004, is the first meeting (excluding Copenhagen 12th December 2002 and Lahey 10-11th March 2003 meetings) where Cyprus conflict has been discussed extensively. From the message given to the country leaders, before the beginning of the meeting, it became clear that negotiations are not going to be that easy the summit. Signs of the “storm” were already obtained at the meeting held on 13-14th December. Very serious discussions took place after the report of Holland Parliamentarian, Camiel Eurling was introduced, resultantly, pro-Cypriot Greek parliamentarians insisted on recognition of South Cyprus by Turkish government, before new date for the summit to take place were assigned. The document also included such aspects as recognition of “Armenian genocide”, recognition of Cypriot Greek Orthodox Patriarchate as Ecumenical, creating Heybeliada Ruhban school and the statement of new minorities.

After all what happened in the parliament, taking into consideration the fact that there would be a huge opposition presented in the summit, Turkey decided to send to Brussels rather more delegations. Delegations consisted of Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, Foreign Affairs Minister and Vice-Prime Minister Abdullah Gül, Government Minister Beshir Atalay, members of political parties and consultants. Fears of Turkish government about the size of opposition turned out to be real. Parliament decision totally reflected desires of Europeans and were mentioned in a

text written by EU term President, Holland Prime Minister Jean Balkanende. Variety of limitations, definitions that would question membership in European Union, ultimatums that were not applied to any of member countries, were included into the text. Everything mentioned above left a mark on the summit held on 16-17th December. The whole world community, including Islamic world and even USA, was impatiently waiting for result. The reason for such an interest in summit was because that Turkey was the first Islamic country to become a member of European Union.

Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan could not get support from European leaders, whom he was considering as a friend. Those who recently were on the Turkish side, suddenly started to make a pressure on Turkey, demanding acceptance Cypriot Greek view on Cyprus question. Unfair attempts were made to decrease Turkish diplomacy power by wrongly interoperating Recep Tayyip Erdoğan: “Actually we are ready to recognize Cyprus but still need some time to make parliament accept it”-once announced publicly by Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi.

Turkish committee that felt the attitude of European leaders, who would not dare to force Turkey, with a population of seventy million people, would recognize the body of a country like South Cyprus of seven hundred thousand, and express their indignation to the members of EU committee.

But the Prime Minister of Turkey Recep Tayyip Erdoğan reminded to the committee about existing diplomacy rules, and did not let himself get into trap. The meeting turned Cyprus question into a knot of hardly solvable problems. Prime Minister of Turkey Recep Tayyip Erdoğan spent whole day meeting with England Prime Minister Tony Blair, German Prime Minister Gerhard Schroder, Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, Greece Prime Minister Kostas Karamanlis and the term President Balkanende. Papadopoulos insisted on the point of recognition. Conflict showed up between EU committee and Turkish representatives. The answer to Cyprus question could not be found yet. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan believed that acceptance of the Camiel Eurling text would result in political confrontations as well as in problems related to compliance with law. Negotiations were almost interrupted because of the Cyprus conflict. There were even rumors around that Recep Tayyip Erdoğan would leave the summit before the official ending. The aim of leaders of different rank and government representatives was to create a kind of shuttle between Cypriot Greek delegation and the delegation from Turkey. Finally a compromise was found for both parties but still was kept open for discussions. The statement that was subjected to discussion sounded in the following way: “Since Turkish Republic government has to fulfill certain requirements as a future member of EU, it must sign additional protocol-“Ankara Pact” before start of discussions about the future at-

tendance. The statement takes place in 19th paragraph of Brussels Summit announcement text. The agreement finally reached an end, whose first statement was handwritten and signed by the term President-Minister of European Affairs of Holland Atzo Nikolai, a high-level commissar Olli Rehn, who is responsible for the expansion of EU commission and the Government Minister Besir Atalay from Turkish side. Compromise found during Brussels Summit at the end of the meeting. Turkish delegation flied back to Ankara with the feeling of a victory after debates about recognition of Cyprus and next meeting dates, the point of vital importance for European Union. Delegation members were convoyed to the main street of Ankara-Kizilay, where celebrations have been started before the delegation's arrival. Prime Minister of Turkey Recep Tayyip Erdoğan got on the podium and announced that Turkish delegation not only gave up its diplomatic position about Cyprus but also deserved the right to assign the date for future summit - this was a real glory for the folk of Turkey. But some were rather confused about the matter of recognition of Turkish government that was not quite clear about the related situation and this resulted in contradictions in people's minds. Two types of speculations existed. First party of folk and politicians thought that comment made in the text did not exactly mean "recognition". Others stickled to the idea that Cypriot Greek government was given the right to rule the whole island. Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus people were quite confused as well. Each person had his or her own idea about the existing situation.

Prime Minister of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus Mehmet Ali Talat and President Rauf Denktaş shared the same idea. Prime minister of Turkey persuaded president of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus Rauf Denktaş that agreement did not include such a statement as "recognition". Words of Turkish Prime Minister could stand for a guaranty for Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus government. Meanwhile, certain events were taking place in Cypriot Greece as well. Cypriot Greek media was stating that Cypriot Greek leader Tasos Papadopoulos could not achieve such an expected recognition, so impatiently, while Papadopoulos and President of Greece Kostas Karamanlis asserted that they reached the goal: Turkey signed the recognition.¹⁸

¹⁸ Derleyen: Şenol Kantarcı, Kıbrıs Laboratuvarı: İstanbul: Aktüel, Alfa Akademi Basım Yayım Dağıtım Ltd. Şti, 2005, ss. 71 - 76.

1.8.1. Turkey and Cyprus Problem from European Union Perspective

Membership in European Union is one of the most important topics in foreign policy of Turkey. Although the first discussions were assigned to take place in 2005, 2002 is the year when Copenhagen Summit, the leaders of whose recent reports can create some troubles, was held.

Turkey, as a result of the decision taken on 17th December 2004, would start meetings about full membership, in order to become a member on 1st January 2014, which now came to a critical point about Cyprus.

While some members of EU stick to idea that Cyprus problem should be solved before the beginning of discussions about membership of Turkey, others say that Cyprus and membership are two different topics that should be reviewed separately.

South Cyprus Greek Government that became a member of European Union in 2004 represents Whole Island in EU with official name of Cyprus Republic.

Turkey will have to negotiate with a country, which it does not officially recognize; in addition to that, Turkish Republic can be seen as an occupant in the eyes of European Union. What is all discussed above describes that how critical it is to find a solution for this problem.

At a strategy report prepared by European Union committee in 2003, Turkey was accused of not being willing to negotiate and to come to a consensus, which was threatening for its future membership with EU as well. After referendum that was held on 24th April 2004, EU had to change its position about Turkey. Turkish army on Cyprus was said to be a barrier for the solution. According to the report, the first step that needs to be taken to reach a common solution should be to move Turkish military troops out of island. Referendum showed that Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is rather positively motivated about solving Cyprus dilemma; government, in its own turn, ready to make steps to resolve the problem. In comparison to this fact, the old leader of EOK Papadopoulos and his party kept on following the same hard politics.

European Union Committee, European Parliament, leaders of EU countries, reconsidering the place of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus in this affair, simultaneously started to believe that giving membership only to one part of Cyprus will lead no-solution as a result. EU is stuck and can hardly do any situation improvement steps. In 2004, there were two parties living on the same

island; on one side was Cyprus Greece-full member of European Union, internationally recognized country with a population of 670 and national income over 18700 dollars, on the other side, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus on the northern part of island, financially supported by Turkey since 1971, with a population of 204 thousand people and national income of 5700 dollars. This is the value that was reached after the borders were opened.¹⁹

1.8.2. How did Cyprus Problem Came into Light

The World becomes smaller with each passing day, but existing problems grow even bigger. Turkey is left with the big trouble of having inherited part of the island. Turkey cannot ignore those problems because of their geopolitical importance, living within the world of profit-relations; the world changes with changing politics. Cyprus is considered to be of vital importance for number of countries, Turkey is one of them. It is not only location but energy resources as well that makes it so attractive. These are just a few reasons why Cyprus is in the task list of the past and present days. Ataturk signed out crucial importance of the island as well: “Gentlemen, supply traffic leading to the island. It is stuck because of the enemy troops. Cyprus is the island that should be paid lots of attention. It has a vital importance for us.

Turkish people living on the island became victims of globalization, oppressed by the claws of politics. There exists some couple of periods in the past where fortune turned its face to Turkey and to the Turkish folk living on the island. Annan and UN plans attract attention from this point of view. The reason of Turkey’s interest in Cyprus consists not only of Turkish folk living on it but its geostrategic position as well.²⁰

¹⁹ Prof. Dr. Faruk Şen, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, ss. 2000 – 2001.

²⁰ Derleyen: Şenol Kantarcı, Kıbrıs Laboratuvarı: İstanbul: Aktüel, Alfa Akademi Basım Yayım Dağıtım Ltd. Şti, 2005, s. 34.

1.8.3. Condition of Island Till 1974

Cyprus used to be part of Hittites in 15th century B.C. Then Egyptians, Phoenicians, Persians, Romans owned the island as well. In 647 A.D, island was in hands of Arabs. Byzantine gained dominance over Cyprus in 964, as Byzantine Empire weakened Venetians who conquered this island. On the 1st of 1571 Cyprus was conquered by Ottoman Empire; Cyprus remained as a part of Empire for 308 years, till 1878. In 1878 island was rented by England for 92 thousand coins.

From geological and geographical point of view Cyprus is considered as continuation of Anatolian land. Island is natural part of Anatolia.²¹

There were lots of nations throughout history lived on Cyprus, the island that has very important geographical position from strategic point of view. Island that was crude for civilizations diversity of cultures, religions and languages coexisting together, had a function as a Trade Bridge as well. Cyprus was the point of interaction of Egyptian, Asian and Anatolian civilizations, fusion of people belonging to different identities, witnessed to military and political battle scenes. History of humanity and civilizations always followed the same path. Cyprus is important not only for its safety and protective purposes but al so for its geographic and strategic position favorable for world trade as well. Ataturk made a stress on this point as well. It is a well known fact that Turkish people have already been on island since 1571. Turkish population of island was quite unhappy when Enosis was given a start to initiate by Cyprus Greeks just after the government on island was changed in 1878. Lots of people left after this event. Turkish people who could not pull themselves together against Greek Enosis had no choice but to work on fields or as civil servants living in rural areas in order to earn some money. During First World War Turkish side could not undertake any activities against Greek discrimination, which grew even bigger after Second World War. Turkish people did not have enough strength to rise against Greeks. In 1955s, Greeks speeded up Enosis activities by undertaking terrorist activities against Turkish and English residents of the island. Turkish population could no longer stand this kind of cruelty and started to fight against Enosis. Finally Turkish people had to give the lands that belonged to them under the pressure of Greeks.

²¹ Dr. İrfan Kalaycı, Kıbrıs ve Geleceği: Ekonomik Politik Bir Tartışma, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2004, İstanbul: Atlas Yayın Dağıtım, 2004, s.332

All kind of industries and offices, where Turkish and Greek people used to work together side by side, now were all occupied by Greeks. Turkish population started to build their own national business structures.

1.8.4. Cyprus - Turk Federative State

Three “Guaranty countries” recognized the existence of two governments on Cyprus in a conference held in Geneva after Cyprus Greek’s strikes. According to Cyprus Greeks autonomous Cyprus-Turkish government, existence of which was recognized in 1974 by Geneva Declaration could not meet needs of Turkish folk, after existing for 11 years without any governmental structure. Autonomous Cyprus-Turk government was reconstructed into a Federative government on 13th February in 1975 to satisfy political, economical, social and governmental needs of public, to prepare base for the future Federal Cyprus Republic with the appearance of a new - born freedom. Cyprus -Turkish Federal government became ancestor of Temporary Cyprus-Turkish government, which in its own turn was constructed as a result of expelling of Turkish representatives out of government in 1963.²²

Reconstructed republic was named after the island. Economically depressed Turkish people were extremely happy to have their own state that would protect their constitutional rights. Even after this event, that formally justified the rights of Turkish people in front of Cyprus Greeks, they still went on discriminating Turkish population. After 1963 Turks started to live together in separate regions. Events of aggression against Turkish population went on with increasing rate till 1974. Finally when Greeks exceeded all possible limits in order to hinder further oppression, Turkish government sent military troops to support peace in the region. The Army, which was sent in 1974 was made responsible for protecting property and life of Turkish people and successfully fulfilled their duties and contributed their own help in construction of Turkish state on the Northern part of the island. Socially, politically, culturally and economically exhausted people of Northern Cyprus were waiting for a helping hand of Turkey and they did not have to wait long. People were given

²²<http://www.trncinfo.com/TANITMADAIRESI/2002/TURKCE/TARIH/tarih.htm#Kıbrıs%20Türk%20Federe%20Devleti>

not only material but moral support as well to struggle against problems and build their future life. Even though people got their peaceful life back, there still existed some friction between two parts of island. It was clear that the only way to reach consensus was to reorganize two states existing on island into a single one. Turkish side always favored the idea of mutual understanding and existence of a single common state on island. Cyprus Greeks were not quite fond of the idea, and kept on insisting that they are the only possible owners of the island.

Turkish side could see that situation was getting worse with each passing day and announced their sovereignty in 1983; thus a basement was made for the future Cyprus-Turk Republic. Greeks and lots of other countries were quite unhappy with this new state. Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus was not recognized by any of the country except Turkey. Governments of both countries show care for geopolitics and people. This is probably the reason why international affairs and politics have been the most discussed issue for the past half of the century. For fifty years Turkey has been looking for the way out of critic situation, following friendly politics, bearing a hope for peaceful solution, while Greeks did not step to reach a consensus. There have been times when Greeks initiated negotiations, which turned out to be an attempt to make their egoistic wishes to come true rather than finding a compromise. The Annan Plan was a clear example of this type of behavior. Even after referendum, where Greek people vividly expressed their negative opinions about union ship, Turkish population still felt like living in a single common state together with Greeks and have a common government. The Annan Plan was only a welcome for Turkish people and government.

1.8.5. Does the Island Consist of Only a Single Nationality (Can Turkish Folk be Taken as a Minority on Cyprus?)

If one looks at the situation from the point of view of Cyprus Greeks, there are representatives of only a single nationality living in Cyprus: Cyprus Greeks. According to their way of thinking Cyprus considered to be Greek island, people living on island are considered to be Cyprus Greeks, Turks living on island are remnants of Ottoman occupants and can be collectively called

ethnic group-minority, same way as Turkish folk living in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Greece and Romania.

It is only Armenians, Morenits and Latinas who should be considered as a minority on the island. Statements about Cyprus Greeks are the only residents of the island and to ignore the presence of Turkish folk would mean a struggle against the right of self-determination of Turkish people, attempting to increase the dominance of Cyprus Greece.

Asserting that, there is only one nation in Cyprus means to protect the self- determination right of only a single nation. In other words, the use of determination right by both, will further-impose the will of Cyprus Greeks, who are greater in number, over Turkish folk and the acceptance of the Greeks wishes. This situation refers to Enosis, which is against the presence of two nations with individual determination in Cyprus.²³

²³ <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru85.htm>

CHAPTER - II

THE STEPS OF THE TURKEY'S INTEGRATION PROCESS TO THE EUROPEAN UNION

2.1. Historical Background of the Relations between Turkey and the European – Union

Turkey began "westernizing" its economic, political and social structures in the 19th Century (Show1983: 9). at the end of the Crimean War in 1856, Ottoman Empire was admitted into the Concert of Europe. In time of the Republic of Turkey, the Country joined the Council of Europe in 1950 and it became an Associate Member of the European Economic Communities (EEC) in 1964 after signing Ankara (or Association) Agreement. At that time and for many years afterwards, it was frequently mentioned that this status was granted mainly to improve Turkey's economic performance and living standards.

Müftüler argues that "The choice made by Turkey, her leaders and her social forces to link her future to that of Europe is not a recent one: it can be traced back to the beginning of the 1920s when the country decided to cast its lot with Europe." (1993: 1-2). The legitimacy of the political and military elite's 'Kemalist' project of westernizing the country has depended on a plausible prospect of the European Union (EU) membership. Kemalism- the state ideology bequeathed by Kemal Atatürk, founder of modern Turkey- rests on six pillars:

- Secularism (removing the direct influence of religious leaders on political decision and education);
- Republicanism (organizing the policy as a modern state, as opposed to the Ottoman Empire);
- Populism (not accepting class divisions, but making the well-being of the people as a whole the central aim of politics);
- Nationalism (establishing a single, unified Turkish nation beyond religious or ethnic allegiances);
- Etatism (securing state influence in the economy);
- Reformism (continuous adaptation of the state to new conditions)

The promoters of Kemalism justified their program partly on the grounds that it was a path leading to eventual membership of the EC/EU. At the same time advocates of Turkey's EC/EU candidacy, both in Turkey and in EU member-states have considered it something of a sacred truth that membership is a necessary anchor for westernization (Buzan 1999: 44). When the Turkish Republic was proclaimed in 1923, Western Europe was chosen as the model for new secular state. As a matter of fact the Swiss civil code, the Italian criminal code and the German commercial code were adopted with only few amendments, The Turkish society has tried to reshape itself in all aspects from education to clothing in accordance with European understanding (Bilgiç 1999: 5). Between 1923-1945, a neutral foreign policy was followed, as the new state was stabilized¹. After World War II, however, faced with the Soviet threat, neutrality was given up by applying to the newly emerging European organizations in an attempt to gain ratification for Turkey's European status. Turkey became a member of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 1948, the Council of Europe in 1949 and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1952. Its membership in these organizations was seen as a consolidation of Atatürk's dream of Turkey as a part of Europe. Finally in 1959, Turkey's European campaign culminated in the application for Associate Membership in the European Community (Müftüler 1993: 3).

Meanwhile, the pattern of extremely close bilateral relations with the United States began with the agreement signed at Ankara in July 1947 to implement a policy launched by President Harry S. Truman in a speech the previous March - a policy that became known as the Truman Doctrine. In this address Truman asked the United States Congress for an initial allocation of US\$ 400 million to aid Greece and Turkey (Nyrop 1980:58).

In the early 1960s, suitable external economic conditions helped Turkey get a favorable response from the Community to its endeavors to become associated with the EC. However, it is

widely agreed that the Turkish-EEC Association was more of a product of apolitical, indeed a strategic, choice than an economic one (Güvenç 1995: 5).

Turkey's hopes for EU membership go back the early 1960s, when it followed Greece in negotiating an association agreement with the six founding members (France, Germany, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg and Italy). The French and the Germans hesitated before going into this arrangement, but Chancellor Erhardt in particular seems to have been concerned with the need to maintain equilibrium between Greece and Turkey (Barchard 1998: 4). The ensuing negotiations resulted in the signature of the "Agreement Creating an Association between the Republic of Turkey and the European Economic Community" (Ankara Agreement) on September 12, 1963. This agreement, which entered into force on December 1, 1964, aimed at securing Turkey's full membership in the EEC through the establishment in three phases of a customs union which would serve as an instrument to bring about integration between the EEC and Turkey.

The Ankara Agreement envisaged the progressive establishment of a customs union, which would bring the parties closer in economic and trade matters. In the meantime, the EEC would offer financial assistance to Turkey. Under the First Financial Protocol that covered the period between 1963 and 1970, the EEC provided Turkey with loans worth 175 million ECU the trade concessions which the EEC granted to Turkey under the form of tariff quotas proved however not to be as effective as expected. Yet, the EEC's share in Turkey's imports rose from 29% in 1963 to 42% in 1972. Although the Ankara Agreement envisaged the free circulation not only of goods but, of persons, services and capital between the parties, it excluded Turkey from the EEC decision-making mechanisms. The Customs Union dictated the abolition of a common external tariff to imports from third countries and envisaged harmonization with EEC policies in virtually every field relating to the internal market. The Ankara Agreement still constitutes the legal basis of the association between Turkey and the EU (Barchard 1998:4).²⁴

²⁴ Arzu Bensus Eken, *The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey's Relations with the European Union*:Ankara, June 2003, ss.7-10

2.1.1. Developments in 1970 and Their Effect the Relations between Turkey and the European Community

In the early 1970 s. Turkey began to see association with Europe in terms of economic development strategies rather than as a matter of foreign policy (Eralp 1993: 28). The Additional Protocol signed on November 23, 1970 between Turkey and the EC became operative on January 1, 1973. The ultimate aim of the Protocol was the establishment of a customs union between Turkey and the EC by December 31, 1995 (Müftüler 1993: 5). According to the Protocol, the Customs Union would be established as follows:

- The gradual creation of a customs union;
- For industrial goods, the EC was to abolish all duties on imports from Turkey with the exceptions of refined petroleum goods which were to be subject to a tariffs quota and various restrictions for textiles whilst Turkey was to divide its imports into two lists and then to reduce tariffs in stages over 12 years for one list (55 per cent of imports) and over 22 years for the other (45 per cent); similarly Turkish quantitative restrictions were to be phased out;
- For agricultural goods same 80 per cent of EC imports from Turkey received preferential treatment whilst Turkey was to adjust its agricultural sector gradually to the EC's common agricultural policy over a 22-year period;
- The EC's common external tariff was to be adopted by Turkey over 22 years;
- Free movement of labor (and capital) between the EC and Turkey was to be phased in between the 12th. And 22nd year;
- There was to be closer alignment of economic policies'; the treaty specifically refers to competitive policy, taxation, economic (presumably principally macroeconomic) policy in general and commercial policy, in relation to third countries (Articles 43-56);
- A second financial protocol provided loans of up to ECU 300 million over a five and a half-year period to assist with Turkish development (Redmond 1993: 27-28).

However, same problems occurred when the Protocol was put into practice.

Firstly, for Turkey harmonization meant joining the Common Agricultural Policy (CA.P); for the community, it meant trade liberalization. Especially Italy and France which were the Community members opposed to offering Turkey more generous agricultural concessions in fear of

hurting their own farmers. Secondly, after the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) crisis in 1975 the Community's Mediterranean Policy was adopted. In this new order, Turkey did not receive any priority or preferential treatment over the other Mediterranean countries. Thirdly; the inability of the Community to meet Turkish demands for further concessions for 'agricultural and industrial exports and the entry of more Turkish workers led to the worsening of the relations between the two sides (Müftüler 1993: 8-9). In addition to these, political and economic reasons such as weak coalition governments. Increasing political polarization and rapid economic deterioration blocked Turkey's foreign policy flexibility.

As balance of payments difficulties increased, especially after the 1973 oil crisis (Eralp 1993: 29), Turkey was unable to keep her obligations in the stepwise reduction of its customs duties so that in 1978 the Turkish government officially requested a five-year freeze in Turkey's commitments (Aydın 2000: 15). While Turkey was freezing its relations with the EC, Greece applied to the Community for full membership in 1975. The Turkish decision-making elite did not pay much attention to this move (Aydın 2000:16). Turkish public opinion also regarded the West had been on Greece's side traditionally, but the Turkish people had at least hoped to have the Western factor neutralized after the 1950s. However, in 1964 the -Johnson letter² clearly underlined the American attitude to Turkey. At the time of the 1963-4 Cyprus crisis, the Turkish government was seriously considering military intervention. President Johnson bluntly told the Turkish Prime Minister that he was not entitled to use US-supplied equipment for this purpose, and that Turkey could not rely on NATO's assistance should the intervention trigger Soviet aggression. Then again in 1975, the American arms embargo and the attitude of the European Community have all been regarded as indications of the continuing traditional stance of the West.

In 1972, the summit of heads of governments agreed to move rapidly to completion of the internal market and to the adaption of a common currency. (Williams 1993: 50) The new economic climate affected the EC's Mediterranean relationships, so the entire context for the ECs development had changed in a *number of ways*. *First, the more difficult competitive environment and especially the challenge offered by Japan and the newly industrializing countries, led to a wave of protectionist sentiment throughout northern Europe. This was particularly evident in the more sensitive sectors: cars, steel and clothing! textiles. The last of these had serious consequences for the non-member Mediterranean countries. Second, rising average EC unemployment led to attempts by individual governments to restrict further immigration from outside the EC. Again, this had implications for the Mediterranean region, which were compounded by the improved access obtained by*

the new member states. Third, there was continuing growth of agricultural production and surpluses so that the CAP accounted for 78 per cent of the EC budget by 1978. This squeezed the scope for other policy expenditures and for structural assistance to member and non-member Mediterranean states.

In trade with the Community most of the non-member Mediterranean countries have specialized in light industrial products, especially textiles and clothing, leather items and footwear. These were all covered by the preferential access provided under the Global Mediterranean Policy (GMP). The Community responded by 'persuading' the principal textile producers in the Mediterranean region to sign voluntary export restraint agreements. It suggested that otherwise it would invoke the safeguard clause in the GMP. Turkey refused to accept self limitation and had unilateral import restrictions imposed upon it. Turkey had the highest proportion of production and 44 per cent of Turkey's exports were considered to be vulnerable. The problem centered on the high proportion of Turkish exports destined to the Community and the predominance of cotton yarn within its export profile. Despite these limitations, the Mediterranean region still maintained a favored relationship with EC. The state-trading economies and the Asian producers had much tougher and less flexible quotas imposed on their textile industries (Williams 1993: 53).

Parallel to these developments, in 1979 Greece had signed an Accession Treaty to the EC that caused confusion among the Turkish governmental officials since Greece was now in, while Turkey was out. Thus on February 5, 1980 the two sides- EC and Turkey met in Brussels to discuss the ways to put new life into their political and commercial relations with a view to facilitate Turkish entry to the EC at a later date. On June 30, 1980, the Turkish foreign minister, Hayrettin Erkmen announced in a press conference in Brussels that Turkey would forward a formal application by fall. However, on September 12, 1980, the military took over the Turkish government, as a result of which, the relations with the Community as well as the Association Agreement were effectively frozen (Müftuler 1992: 15).²⁵

²⁵ Arzu Bensus Eken, *The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey's Relations with the European Union*: Ankara, June 2003, ss. 10-14

2.1.2. Changing Tide of the Relations in 80s

In the 1980s, the economic breakdown of the Turkish-EEC Association was followed by a political breakdown. The military coup in Turkey in September 1980 marked the beginning of the political demise of the relations. (Güvenç 1995: 9) The Community's attitude to Turkey began to harden following the National Security Council's degree dissolving all political parties on October 30, 1981. (Birand 1985: 422-423; Eralp 1993: 32). Among the many indications of this hardening of attitudes was the Commission's decision to delay the implementation of the Fourth Financial Protocol (Eralp 1993: 32).

Immediately after the military coup, the Commission made an official declaration, stating that it wanted to see democratic institutions restored to Turkey as soon as possible. The Foreign Ministers of the EC decided that the Community would adopt a policy of co-operation with Turkey only if the new military government were to fulfil three conditions:

- 1) to re-establish democratic institutions quickly
- 2) to observe human rights, and
- 3) to guarantee the lives of political prisoners.

In terms of determining Turkey's place in an integrated Europe. Turkish officials were at least prepared to listen to the Community's criticisms and to take certain actions to resolve the problems between the Turkish government and the European Community. After that in 1985, the European Parliament decided to reevaluate the political situation in Turkey. They selected a British MEP, Mr. Richard Balfe to prepare a report on democracy in Turkey. The Balfe Report, adopted in the Parliament on October 23, 1985, concluded that Turkey did not have a democratic regime and that serious violations of human rights were still taking place there. The report had two major recommendations: first, that martial law be lifted in the larger cities and second, that political restrictions be lifted and all political parties be permitted to participate in elections. Essentially, holding the 1983 elections early and only three parties had been allowed to participate. Since these elections had been criticized by the Community as being undemocratic, an election without restrictions could be a factor influencing the Commission's decision over the Turkish application for membership (Muftuler 1997: 75-83).

In addition to these developments in 1980, the new military rulers of Turkey, facing isolation in Western Europe, and susceptible to American inducements, gave their consent to the 'Rogers Agreement'. This facilitated the return of Greece to NATO's military wing but not an improvement in Turkish-Greek relations. Although the two sides had agreed to start negotiations based on an interim solution to the airspace dispute in the Aegean, these were never implemented (Gurel 1993b):

Shortly afterwards, in 1981, Greece became the tenth member of the European Community. Greece's full membership in the European Community ended the balance between Turkey and Greece in the Cold War institutions of the Western world and later had a direct impact on Turkish-Community relations (Güven 1995: 9).

On the ground, the 1981 accession of Greece gave the Community a strong presence in the eastern Mediterranean and a new dimension to relations with Turkey. Furthermore, as part of the internal EC compromise leading to the agreement over the 1986 accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community, the countries with existing Mediterranean interests negotiated the introduction of a new package of structural measures, the Integrated Mediterranean Program (IMP). This affected a further resources distribution from the northern core of the European Community to the Mediterranean regions. Meanwhile, the enlargements of the 1980s led the Community to reexamine its relationship with the other Mediterranean non-member states, including Turkey (Williams 1993: 46-48).

On the other hand, taking the West as a reference point in bilateral relations also resulted in mutual attempts to use bilateral problems and confrontations as leverage in gaining better advantages in the Western world. For example, Papandreu's electoral victory in Greece again in 1981 prepared the background for the Greek policy of linking the bilateral disputes to Turkish-Community relations. Moreover, Greece's threat perceptions were supported by the West and this support consolidated Greece's position. Papandreu frequently repeated the slogan that the threats confronting Greece are -from the East and not from the North". (Gurel 1993b: 167) This suspension delayed the new Greek government's change to test its ability to use its seat in the Community against Turkey as it had already tried to do within NATO upon Greece's return to the organization's military structure (Güven 1995:10),

Parallel to this development; in 1982 Belgian Foreign Minister Tindemans, as President of the EC Council of Ministers, produced a critical report voicing serious concern regarding human rights situation in Turkey. Furthermore, the European Parliament passed a resolution on January 22, 1982 suspending the joint

Community-Turkey Parliamentary Committee and the Association Council did not call for another meeting. The 1983 elections did not produce any change in EC attitudes towards Turkey, in spite of the fact that the Council of Europe resumed relations with the Turkish Parliament in the spring of 1984 (Eralp 1993: 32). Moreover, the impression that the association had seemingly reached an impasse was furthered by the recurrent Greek veto blocking financial aid and reactivation of the Association Council Meetings (Aydm 2000: 21).²⁶

2.1.3. Relations between Turkey and the European – Union in 90s

The decision taken by the European Commission in 1989 ruled out the possibility of Turkey's full membership in the near future. In fact, at that time, nobody in Brussels thought that Turkey could have joined the EEC before the year 2000 at the earliest (Müftüler 1992: 19). According to some experts, there were two significant points about the Commission's decision: Turkey's low level of economic development by EC standards and the issue for many Europeans is whether Europe can or should embrace an Islamic country of 57 million (Lesser 2000: 9).

However, since 1990, Turkey has emerged as an important player in international and regional politics in the Middle East, the Balkans, Central Asia and the Caucasus. In geopolitical terms, Turkey was located for many decades at the southeastern periphery of Europe. The events of the 1980s the Gulf Crisis of 1990 - 1991 the conflict in the Caucasus, the emergence of the resource-rich Central Asian republic and the civil war in the former Yugoslavia have all demonstrated that Turkey is indeed in a pivotal position in a region of potential instability (Müftüler 1997: 4).

²⁶ Arzu Bensus Eken, *The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey's Relations with the European Union*: Ankara, June 2003, p. 14-17

What is more, The EU had an extensive agenda for the 1990s. This agenda could be seen in terms of the issues of widening and deepening the EU and also the deepening of integration was a major task. The gradual transformation of the European Community resulted in a unified Europe with the Maastricht Treaty of 1991 that came into effect on November 1, 1993. The CSCE (Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe) has made the transition from an inefficient process to a body that secured the future of European security with the - Paris and Prague Documents of 1992.¹ The political and structural transformation of Europe amounts to a revolutionary but uneven change, creating and manifesting new asymmetries and inequalities in the domestic and external capabilities of individual countries and in the political structure of the European system (Müftüler 1997: 34).

In addition, with the end of the Warsaw Pact in 1991 following the collapse of the Soviet Union's control of its Eastern European members, NATO clearly emerged as the most successful structure based on the traditional concept of security: a state-centric model based on military power. In 1994, the heads of state and government of the former Soviet Union participated for the first time to the NATO Summit which was held in Istanbul. The aim of this summit was to expand the concept of Partnership for Peace (PFP): the end result was a reformulation of NATO's function in including Eastern Europe and the territories of the former Soviet Union. The 1994 NATO summit in Istanbul was a tribute to Turkey's new centrality in relation to an enormous geographical region (Müftüler 1997: 34-35).²⁷

2.2. Turkey's Application for Full Membership

Under such conditions, Turkey applied for full membership on April 14 1987 on the basis of the EEC Treaty's Article 137. Turkey's request for accession was filed under the relevant provisions of the Treaty of Rome (instead of the Ankara Agreement) and underwent the normal procedures (Gökakın 2001: 10).

²⁷ Arzu Benu Eken, *The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey's Relations with the European Union*: Ankara, June 2003, ss. 20-22

The two traditional factors shaping Turkish foreign policy, Westernization and Greek international action contributed to this decision. The "Greek factor" functioned as a suitable lever for the Community's unwelcoming attitude toward Turkey and to set Turkish Community relations onto a course short of full membership. That Greece would have an advantage over Turkey in furthering its policies in Cyprus and the Aegean by being inside the Community only became apparent to Turkish policy-makers after the event. These political advantages have been accompanied by the economic gains that accrued to Greece as a result of full membership. As Eralp states, at that time "Greece not only received funds through the Community's regional and social policies but was also able to gain a competitive edge over Turkey with whom a similar export portfolio was shared." (1993: 33-35).

The Commission took two years to evaluate the Turkish application and gave a negative response in December 1989. The decision amounted to a recommendation that accession negotiations with any country should not start before 1993 at the earliest except in exceptional circumstances. The Commission underlined the overriding importance of realizing the objectives of the Single Act. In fact, by the early 1980s there was growing realization in the Community of a loss of global competitiveness. The Community's principal response to these economic weaknesses was to launch the Single Market Program in the Community. The Program aimed to eliminate internal barriers which were physical, fiscal and technical barriers. The Single Market Program was also launched against a background of unease relating to economic and social inequalities in the EC at both the national and the regional levels.¹ The Treaty of Rome had considered these to be temporary phenomena which would be eliminated or at least reduced during the process of integration.

In sum, the problem for Turkish application was that, by the late 1980s, it had become linked to larger global issues and to the internal politics of integration. The Single Market Program was also being implemented at the time that the decision was taken on the Turkish application. Apart from diverting attention from the application, it also made the terms of any likely accession far more difficult; for example, the competition liberalization and harmonization rules, and the reductions required in state procurement and state subsidies significantly increased the problems of adaptation for any new member (Williams 1993: 55, 57, 60).

Except economic problems; the Commission stated that there were also a number of factors that made it impossible for Turkey to join the Community at the present time such as the need to expand political pluralism, the ability to sustain the improvement in human rights, the rights of minorities, the persistence of disputes with Greece, and lack of solution to the Cyprus problem.

On the ground, Greek public opinion and politicians of all parties have been united in perceiving Turkey as an enemy country and responsible for the occupation of the northern part of the Greek island of Cyprus since 1974. The Greek state has sought to balance Turkey's greater military resources by increasing military spending. It has sought to avoid direct diplomacy by internationalizing the Cyprus issue, invoking support against Turkey first from the UN and in this decade from the EU, and by seeking to bring the various Aegean disputes to the International Court at the Hague. In addition to this; Greece has been prepared to use its veto power in the EU to prevent payments legally due since 1983, to minimize payments from the MEDA (Mediterranean Development Assistance) funds and to keep loans from the European Investment Bank (EIB) to a level only slightly above that of the Republic of Cyprus (Brewin 1999: 152).

At last, the Commission Report resulted in mixed interpretations in Turkey, leading to controversies over whether or not Turkey was still eligible for full membership. The comments by Abel Matutes, The Commissioner for Mediterranean Affairs, implying that Turkey was eligible for membership, and formulation of proposals to increase relations between the Community and Turkey (in the Commission Report), led to the optimistic interpretation that the Commission's proposals could be thought of as part of a more comprehensive program which would eventually lead Turkey to full membership. However, the fact that no date was specified in the report for the resumption of negotiations created dismay in official circles (Eralp 1993: 37).²⁸

²⁸ Arzu Bensus Eken, *The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey's Relations with the European Union*: Ankara, June 2003, ss.18-20.

CHAPTER – III

RELATION AMONG TURKEY AND GREECE, TURKEY AND CYPRUS, CYPRUS AND EUROPEAN – UNION

3.1. Greek – Turkish Relations after the End of the Cold War

In reality, for both Greece and Turkey the end of the Cold War and especially the disintegration of Yugoslavia meant the collapse of secure regional environment. Not only for Turkey and Greece, but for all the actors involved the Cold War provided a structure interwoven with common meanings. - Experiences and understandings which helped make sense of the world around them and define their identities and interests accordingly. This structure's collapse deprived many actors on the world scene of this conceptual framework, producing a sense of disorientation.

The main problem for Greece and Turkey in the post-Cold War era has been "a strong amount of lag in adjusting self-definition to current circumstances" or "a rear-view mirror self-perception." Both Greece and Turkey were going through a very difficult period of readjustment and in this process both of them felt themselves isolated by their Western partners. In Greece, the Balkan crisis led to an increase in the feeling of insecurity by adding a new element to the old threat from the East (Le., Turkey). Turkey went through a similar feeling of isolation with the end of the Cold War and many people started to think that she had lost her strategic significance for the NATO alliance. Furthermore, her uneasy relations with the European Union led to the feeling that she was also marginalized in the European continent (Gündoğdu 2001: 2-3).

Particularly, at the end of the Cold War, issues that included Cyprus. Minorities in Western Thrace and Istanbul the delimitation of the Aegean continental shelf airspace and territorial water issues. NATO operational and command areas, search-and-rescuer areas in the Aegean, and the legal issues with clear security implications concerning the militarization of certain Greek islands in the Aegean dominated the Greek - Turkish agenda. Each issue affecting Greek - Turkish relations has its own dynamics and implications (Coufoudakis 1996: 30-31).

The 1996-2000 rearmament plans had the specific purpose of attempting to regain Greek qualitative superiority over Turkish forces. As a result Greece's defense burden has been the heaviest among the Euro-Atlantic countries, averaging 5.6 percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Moustakis and Sheehan 2002: 82). It is argued that the arms race has also given rise to the development of a major defense industry in Turkey with the participation of Western arms producers. That also threatened the Greek- Turkish military balance. The United States and NATO observing the growing militarization and tension in the region, called for confidence-building measures (CBMs) to reduce the possibility of accidental war in the region. It is ironic that under NATO's cascading policy, the two countries have been flooded with weapons systems contributing to rather than reducing the risk of conflict (Coufoudakis 1996: 30-31).

It can be said that outside powers, such as the EU and the United States can play a limited role in this phase. They can offer sticks, or punishment designed to remind both countries of what they stand to lose from prolonged tension (Zahariadis 2000: 108). Despite this manner, in the period 1981-1994 outside powers have served Greece both as a diplomatic lever and as a restraining mechanism. For example, Greece adopted a stance of 'conditionality', by using its membership in the EU as a lever designed to convince Turkey that Turkish-EU relations cannot be normalized unless the occupation of Cyprus is terminated.

The 1990's Greece's main problems with Turkey stem from Turkey's aspiration to enhance its role as a regional military power. Paradoxically, Greece has stake in Turkey's westernization because the process would tend to strengthen the latter's democratic institutions and minimize its as. Western neighbors so, Greece could support Turkish entry in the EU if the outstanding issues between the two states were resolved (Larrabee 1994: 129). Indeed, George Papandreu has followed a very 'new' policy in Greece's relation with Turkey since he replaced Teodoros Pangalos as the Foreign Minister of Greece. Mr. Papandreu wanted to show to the Greece's EU partners that Greece could establish good dialogue with Turkey even assist Turkey on its European vocation. In a way the Greek Government tried to repair its reputation and image both in the domestic and ex-

ternal arena. Greece tried to ensure that it did no longer want to be use d as a convenient scapegoat to justify EU's unsympathetic policy towards Turkey (Gökakın 2001: 85, 87). So, it has been argued that there has been a change in Greece's policy against Turkey the reality might be interpreted quite differently. Greek interests and policy have never changed. The change in Greek foreign policy *vis-a-vis* Turkey initiated by the Mr. Papanderou can be described as a change of tactic rather than substance.

It can be argued that Greece perceived that it is not in her interests to define Turkey in hostile terms such as "Asiatic", "barbarian", "uncivilized". Thus, she has come to the realization that her security and interests lie not in a "clash of civilizations" with Turkey, but rather in entering into a dialogue with a "European Turkey." PASOK's electoral victory in April 2000 confirmed this new policy's continuity with the re-election of Prime Minister Kostas Simitis and Foreign Minister George Papandreou. Self-binding commitments must be rewarded in order to institutionalize norms of positive identification. This seems to be most difficult stage of the transformative process in Greek- Turkish relations. Papandreou reminded everyone that the Cyprus issue is a problem Turkey is obliged to face as a result of being officially name d a candidate country seeking entry into EU. Turkey's "Accession Partnership" with the European Union once more showed that Turkey's membership is significant interrelated with the resolution of the border disputes in the Aegean and promoting solutions of the Cyprus issue.

The Draft Document of the Accession Partnership for Turkey, publicly announced on November 8, 2000, emphasized that: Turkey as a candidate state should "make every effort to resolve and outstanding border disputes and other related issues" and in case these efforts fail, the dispute should be brought to the International court of Justice within a reasonable time. The European Council aims to settle the dispute at the latest by the end of 2004. Regarding Cyprus, the Accession Partnership "encourages Turkey, together with all parties, to continue to support the UN Secretary General's efforts to bring the process, aiming at a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem, to a successful conclusion."

So the Greeks are hoping the EU will ride to the rescue. EU candidates should seek international arbitration for territorial disputes would put things straight on the Aegean, Papandreou says. If EU countries made clear that Cyprus could join their club, even without a settlement, Greece would willingly embrace Turkey as a candidate.²

The Turkish argument that a clear prospect of membership would strengthen the internal reform process- especially in the area of the rule of law, human rights and respect for minorities- now seems to be accepted by the governments of most EU member states. However the certain decision will be depended on for one aspect how far both Turkey and Greece are prepared to go diplomatically.²⁹

3.2. Greece's Policy towards Turkey after Became Full Member of European – Union

The European Council declared in June 1975 formally that the examination of Greece's membership application would not affect relations between the Union and Turkey, and that the rights guaranteed by the association agreement with Turkey would not be altered (Barcbard 1998: 4). However; as a full member of the Community, Greece was able to use the Community platform to voice her demands and cast her veto whenever cooperation between the Community and Turkey came on to the agenda. Thus, it seems that Greek membership in the Community has aggravated rather than alleviated tension between the two countries. Greek membership, especially her use of veto power on issues related to Turkey, has also led to greater isolation of Turkey in Europe. It had resulted in more problematic relations between the Community and Turkey (Eralp 1993: 38-39).

In fact, the basic aim of the 1963 Ankara Agreement and the procedure outlined in the 1973 Supplementary Protocols has been achieved and a Customs Union has been established between EU and Turkey as from the beginning of 1966. However, most of other features of the Ankara Agreement and the Supplementary Protocols have either been partially implemented or simply ignored by EU. Since 198 L EU has suspended the financial protocols and disregarded without any compensatory system, the social provisions of the Agreement (Taşhan 1998: 7).

²⁹ Arzu Bensus Eken, The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey's Relations with the European Union:Ankara, June 2003, ss. 78-82

The Community also decided to resume its financial aid to Turkey. Which have been withheld temporarily due to the military coup in Turkey, Greece objected to that. Denmark and Luxembourg opposed the defreezing of the relations between Turkey and the EC by using the Turkish policy of Cyprus as a pretext. The first Greek veto on Turkish-EC relations came out on this issue (Gökakın 2001: 66).

Under these circumstances, the Turkish government applied directly for membership in the EC in April 1987. A number of developments in the 1980s also helped application for full membership. These were; the cooling of relations with the United States since 1985, and especially the inability of Turkey to find a receptive market for an expansion of its exports in the United States, has increased Turkey's interest in developing stronger ties to Western Europe, Turkey's desire for Western credits had made ties to Western Europe more attractive, the fall in the price of *oil* has led to a reduction in Turkish exports to the Middle East and made it clear that the Middle East option is no alternative to Europe and finally the entry of Greece and Portugal into the EC has intensified Turkish fears that the EC's "southern expansion" would be stopped, leaving Turkey the only member of NATO not a member of the EC.

In the view of the EC, the entry of Turkey would strengthen the growing divergences between North and South within EC and push the center of gravity more to the south, thus contributing to the development of a two-tier EC and sharpening its political-cultural heterogeneity at a time when it is already finding the absorption of Greece, Spain and Portugal problematic. Turkey's entry could also further weaken the decision-making process and diminish the ability to achieve consensus, already difficult, within the EC. Finally, much fear that Turkish entry would result in importing the Greek-Turkish conflict into the EC ranks, thereby transforming the Greek-Turkish conflict from a marginal problem into a significant internal issue (Larrabee 1990: 185-186). Thus the Commission suggested that the customs union were to be completed the financial cooperation to be revived and intensified, the technical cooperation to be improved and the political and cultural links to be strengthened. (Aydın 2000: 25).

In those days, Turkey and Greece once more came to the brink of war in the Aegean because of the continental shelf at the end of February 1987 a consortium called the Northern Aegean Petroleum Company announced that it would start drilling for oil on the continental shelf ten miles off the island of Thasos. It was also announced that a new law was being formulated to grant the Greek government the sole authority to decide where the drillings would take place. The Greek government considered the Bern Declaration "inoperative" Therefore it would decide to drill when

and wherever it liked in the Aegean. To Ankara this meant that Greece felt entitled to drill beyond its territorial waters, in violation of the agreement reached at Berne. In effect, Greece decided on a unilateral change of the territorial *status quo* in the Aegean. After Greek ships were about to arrive at zone in question, Ankara responded by ordering drilling ships - escorted by a destroyer - to set sail to assert Turkish rights in the Aegean. Before long the two countries found themselves in the midst of a severe crisis, poised for a military confrontation in the Aegean.

The 1987 confrontation in the Aegean that brought the two neighbors to the brink of war served as a reminder of the instability in Turkish-Greek relations and the great mistrust between the two nations. While the two countries demonstrated their interest in avoiding war, and proved adept at crisis management, they repeatedly failed to improve their relations and make their actions more predictable. The two countries had come very close to exchanging fire and getting caught up in an unwanted war (Akıman 2002: 26- 28).

Weeks after the incident Turkey submitted an application to join the EC. Greece then applied to join the WEU. This move of Greece was interpreted by Ankara as another Greek attempt to shield Greece against Turkey. This was, in a sense, a sign that Greece did not still feel enough under the EC umbrella (Gökakın 2001: 68). The net effect of this development was to bring the Greek- Turkish dispute into the heart of the muddled debate on security in the EC. WEU and NATO, in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Hili1996: 191).³⁰

3.2.1. Aim of the Greek Part

The efforts of the Greek part for uniting with the European – Union bears a political aim than an economical one. These followings represent the aim of the Greeks.

1) To form the political circumstance for presenting. Turkey is the government making “Annexation” and trying to use the force against the countries belonging to the European – Union. Furthermore, Greek part wants to evoke constitution between Turkey and European – Union, fol-

³⁰ Arzu Bensus Eken, The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey’s Relations with the European Union:Ankara, June 2003, ss. 82-86

lowing the Model of Germany. Greek part tries to unite the South part of Cyprus to the European – Union at first and then the North part as an indivisible part of the Greek government will unite.

2) With the support of Greece and plenipotentiary membership with the European – Union act against Turkey and the use of the European – Union to attain their aims.

3) To make de-facto status real.

4) To settle the question according to the principles of the European – Union that considers restoring the conditions before the year 1974 with the help of the Union.

5) With the plenipotentiary membership of the European – Union giving the minority status to Turkish – people living in the Republic of Cyprus and abolishing the principle of equal rights. (According to the example of the East Turkey)

6) With the help of the European – Union strengthening economically laying the North part of Turkish population under the economical stress on Cyprus and making their migration from the North to the South weaken (according to the examples of the East Germany)

7) Destroying the social fundament in the Turkish part of Cyprus for getting the European Passports.

8) Annuling Coalition Guarantee Agreement and manipulating the 1960 year constitutional system made between Turkey, Lozan and Greece for the benefit of the Greek government. As a result destroying the security of the Turkish – people, and gaining a strategic advantage towards them.

9) With the participation of the Greek government realizing the idea of “Enosis” in the bounds of “Megalo – Idea”. They have been continuing actions in that direction for 200 years.

10) Expanding the borders of Greece till the East Mediterranean Sea. Strengthening the South Coasts of Turkey, twining the Middle East with the status of the “Government” and fulfilling the important role through the regions with a large amount of oil.

3.2.2. Greek Policy toward Cyprus and Turkey

Turkey should probably change its politics about Greece and Cyprus; otherwise, it cannot make plan about EU membership, unless Cyprus dilemma is solved and Greece stops following its hard policy. Subjectivity and non flexibility of Greece makes all effort in vain. Turkey should make

a plan to take into consideration the present situation and to stop all the attempts to find a solution in EU frame, but look for it under NATO leadership. In addition to this, US should be persuaded about consistency of decision. Solution should be found in NATO frame, otherwise question will still be left open. The other advantage is that interests of Turkey will be protected by NATO. One cannot expect from NATO members to support duality and guaranty system. It can even seem useless to find a solution in the frame of NATO will have thesis of high concentration of military power on a post-peace island. There are only 3 guaranty countries on the island of whose; members of NATO have the right to keep an army. They are Turkey, Greece, and England. The only “force unit” that can legally exist on island is the “police”. The idea of disarming the island that has so eagerly been supported by Greeks could become an issue for discussion. Turkey will get the right to place troops on the North (near Troops), while Greece in its own turn will be able to have same number of soldiers on Southern part of island. England will have military bases on island as well. There will be no need for federation army anymore. These actions will be characterized as rather adequate by NATO. Exchange of military troops is practiced very often under NATO structure.

I stick to the idea that problem of Cyprus origins from lack of trust between nations, rather than some economical reasons and this existing question should be solved under NATO frame. Trying to extend the area of its influence in Eastern Europe, NATO explains its policy as an attempt of contribution to regional security. It is NATO’s duty to build peace and safety for both countries, Turkish and Greek Cyprus, who have been members of organization for 45 years. The solution decided in the frame of NATO and approved by USA will not be against Turkey and Cypriot Turks. NATO will not let the process stop because Turkey is a member of NATO and has a right of “veto”.

3.3. Greek Cypriot Application for Membership and Greek – Turkish Relations

In 1988, the second Greek Presidency of the European Community provided the opportunity to build on the commitment to the Customs Union to promote Cypriot membership. The political decision to apply for full membership with Greek support had been signaled by the Cypriot Prime

Minister, Vassiliou, in 1987-8, well before the end of the Cold War. The driving force behind the application however came from the Greek Prime Minister Papandreou (Brewin 2000: 67).

Papandreou's replacement by Mitsotakis Government did not change Greece's opposition to Turkey's further integration to the Community without making any concession. On 29 June 1990, during the Dublin Summit, the European Council endorsed Greece's policy of linking the Cyprus question to the Turkish Community relations by 'reiterating that the Cyprus problem affects EC-Turkey relations' (Gökakın 2001: 70-71).

Today still Cyprus or Aegean issues are matters of high concern both for Turkey and Greece as well as for Western allies. Both EU members and US are embarrassed by Greece's unscrupulous behavior in using Greek Diaspora as lobbies and its use of its position as an equal partner in NATO and EU against Turkish interests. Yet, they are hardly in a position to counterbalance this influence. Particularly in EU, the institutional voting system is used mainly by Greece to block any EU gestures towards Turkey: and the backing received by Greece from other EU members as part of membership solidarity contribute to the hardening of Greek attitude in their refusal to enter into meaningful negotiation with Turkey in order to solve the problems between the two countries (Taşhan 1998: 3-19).

Greek Cypriots applied in July 1990 for full EU membership on behalf of Whole Island as Republic of Cyprus. The EU followed UN practice by not recognizing the TRNC, accepting that the Republic of Cyprus was entitled to sovereignty over the whole island. The Greek Cypriots believed that if the application succeeded, it would show that Turkey was occupying territory within the European Union and would reinforce the view that Turkey was responsible for the Cyprus issue. Membership of the EU would also deter Turkish aggression, it was thought in the South without provocation must be regarded as very doubtful, despite large numbers of Turkish troops in the North. It would be a major diplomatic blunder very difficult to justify to the international community (Dodd 2001: 38). Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot Government declared that this move by the Greek Cypriots was illegal according to the Zurich and London Agreements.¹

With Greek assistance the Greek Cypriots' application moved fast. In 1993 the EU issued an Opinion on the application. It was inaccurate as to the North, and biased in favor of the Greek Cypriots. Turkey repeated its opposition in 1993 as the Commission declared a positive opinion on 'Cyprus's' eligibility for membership; however, the definite answer to Greek-Cypriot application of 1990 was left to 1995. If the inter-communal talks failed it was decided to reassess the situation in 1995 in the light of the positions adopted by each side. In the June 1994 Corfu European Council,

as a result of the pressure of the Greek officials, Cyprus and Malta were involved in the next phase of enlargement of the EU. However; while nothing that Cyprus was to be involved in the next enlargement The EU still pointed to the need of a settlement.

In January 1995 the European Commission reviewed the holding decision it had made in 1993 on the accession of Cyprus. The EU might have been minded to wait further, but in March 1995 was maneuvered into agreeing to a date for the beginning of accession negotiations with the Republic. This accrued because Greece was threatening to veto the conclusion of a customs union with Turkey unless a date was given for negotiations to start. The conjunction between these two events is routinely denied. The EU made a virtue out of necessity by claiming that the accession negotiations would be a 'catalyst' to solve the problem of Cyprus (Dodd 2001: 38-39).

In January 1996 the Kardak Imia crisis caused Greece hardened its policy toward EU- Turkish relations. As a result, Athens vetoed the conclusion of the financial protocol foreseen in the context of the Customs Union Agreement. The EU made a declaration on July 15, 1996 that pressured Turkey to agree to international legal arbitration of the International Court of Justice in the Aegean issue. This further strained Turkey-EU and Turkish-Greek relations (Gökakın 2001:75).

In fact, EU governments were reluctant to get dragged into any war between Greece and Turkey. In 1992, the Western European Union made it clear that it would not defend Greece in a conflict with Turkey. In the light of the Kardak Imia crisis, the European Council avoided inserting references to the territorial integrity of the European Union into the WEU declaration that was part of the conclusions of the June 1997 Amsterdam summit (Barehard 1998:8).

"The European Council recalls that strengthening Turkey's links with the European Union also depends on that country's pursuit of the political and economic reforms on which it has embarked, including the alignment of human rights standards and practices on those in force in the European Union; respect for and protection of minorities; the establishment of satisfactory and stable relations between Greece and Turkey; the settlement of disputes, in particular by legal process, including the International court of Justice; and support for negotiations under the aegis of the UN on a political settlement in Cyprus on the basis of the relevant UN Security Council resolutions." (Kramer 2000: 196).

Another summit meeting was held in Cardiff on 15-16 June 1998. The Cardiff Conclusions spoke of the European Commission's work program as "the platform for developing our relationship on a sound and evolutionary basis," which could be "enriched over time, taking into account Turkey' s own ideas," Greece, which had repeatedly blocked financial protocols under the Turkish

Association Agreement, arguing that it could not authorize aid to Turkey so long as that country continued to spend massive sums on maintaining its troops in Cyprus, vetoed the aid under the special action (Keridis and Triantaphyllou 2001: 132-133). Once again an attempt to improve Turkey-EU relations was overshadowed by Greece veto and Turkish-Greek differences.

However, neither of Greek vetoes nor some members resistance did not prevent the Helsinki decision. Actually the Helsinki European Council was held on 10-11 December 1999 and Turkey was officially recognized without any precondition as a candidate on equal footing with other candidate states.

However, Greece still kept some conditions on exercising its veto, except aid for Turkey worth 150 million euro plus 500 million euro in European Investment Bank soft loans. These included:

- Resolution of bilateral disputes in the Aegean, if need be by reference to the International Court of Justice, with a review of progress by 2004 that would impinge on the Turkish candidacy
- Insistence that applicant states (without naming Turkey) comply with the so-called Copenhagen criteria relating to civil and human rights and adequate civilian control over the military
- Commitment that the Republic of Cyprus can accede to the EC without their first having to be a constitutional settlement on the island. (Keridis and Triantaphyllou 2001: 134-135)

Drawing a conclusion, Turkey was accepted as a candidate at the EU's Helsinki Summit. Nevertheless, Turkey insisted, she is right, that it had an unconditional right to become a candidate. In addition to this it was the only nation for which no date was set for commencement of negotiations.

On this point; it is important to note that especially from mid-1990s until today the EU started pressuring Turkey on every aspect of its relations with Greece by way of 'carrots and sticks policy'. This term can be explained with Gökakın's statement that: "The EU policy towards Turkey because while offering one thing to Turkey, the EU demanded a concession from Turkey in favor of Greece." (2001: 82). Actually; majority of the members of the EU do not want Turkey inside the Union, exactly. However, they prefer to give mixed signals to Turkey by hiding behind Greece's vetoes, instead of rejecting Turkey altogether. The Community gave green light to Greece in its demands against Turkey and then turned around and said to Turkey "We are sorry but Greece is

blocking your way to full membership. We have nothing to do ... "It can be very well argued that the EU used Greece as a scapegoat in its relations with Turkey (Gökakın 2001: 82-83).³¹

3.4. The Turks and the Greeks in the International Law

The famous American Diplomat Kissinger accused Greek government about making ratification in 1960, about the constitution system in Cyprus. But it was Turkey who was considered to be responsible for the events taking place from 1963s.

The international Commonwealth revealed their impatience about the problem of Cyprus and took wrong decisions as a result. Clinton played a main role about settling the problem of Cyprus. He wished to solve this problem till the end of his second presidential term, but could not realize his idea and handed it over to Holburk who was the initiator for setting the conflict of Bosnia.

We must mention to the fact that there are not any massacre or special circumstances in Cyprus. All of the problems there can be settled by compromising to the Greek government, thus life will go on its usual way. Turkey faces the problem to be recognized by the International – Commonwealth Countries.

Beside the existence of embargo and economic problems, people have safety and freedom for a living with the support and friendship of Turkey.

The former Vice – Chairman of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Cyprus, German professor Laurger Christian Heinzeth has got interesting observations about the problem of Cyprus. He thought the peace would not be established if the existing conditions did not change in Cyprus. Because of the real possibilities of the parts and their aims were so different. The Greeks, who sees themselves as the real authority of the island, tries to impose and convert the part of the Turkish population under their authority as well. Turkish part has got the complete Democratic Republic at the North Part of the island, though the world does not want to recognize the existence of it.

Nowadays there are two factors made with the efforts of the United Nations. The main factor of the first one is the existence of two parts, and the second one is, setting the problem of the

³¹ Arzu Benu Eken, The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey's Relations with the European Union:Ankara, June 2003, ss. 86-92

federal system. According to the decision (N 649) made by the Security Council in the year 1990, the existence of “the leaders of two party” are underlined. This hinders the possibility for the Greek part of the government to be the only and the real leader of the island.

According to the decision, both of the parts are said to settle the question of the federal system. But this question may show its other face next year. After satisfying the request of the Greek – Government for the integration process, the demand was discussed whether to be fulfilled equally according to the norms of the International Law.

As it’s known, the European – Union is going to carry on the negotiations with the Republic of Cyprus 6 months later, to become the member of the European – Union is not a corresponding attitude for several reasons, though. 1959 – 1960 Agreements, that are the basis for the establishment of Cyprus, are indicated the idea about the necessity of agreement of both of the parts for this kind of the international affairs. It’s clear that the Greek government did not consider the opinion of the Turkish part about the uniting process with the European – Union. Moreover, the agreements stated that Cyprus cannot become the member of any international unions, if Turkey and Greece are not members of these unions equally.

In 1992, General Secretary’s considerations in the Paragraph 92, the uniting process with the European – Union is allowed according to the referendum consequences.

It’s supposed that avoiding the negotiations with the Greek part of the government will be profitable in two ways. The existence of two regions and the resistance of Turkey are real guarantees. The European – Union continue on running two-standards policy towards Cyprus. Greek Government is the plenipotentiary member of the European – Union; on the other hand, Turkey is out of the borders of this union.

As Olgun says, Justice is on the side of the Turkish population who claims this with the compensations from the Greek government and with the damages and wrong – doings of their towards them. The Greek government warns European – Union and says that if they resist for Cyprus to join their union, by using the VETO rights, Greek government will reject Baltic and the East Europe Countries to unite with this union. Because of this, Germany and the other powerful countries try to have an influence upon Turkey.

Turkey asks for the equal rights in two regions and for the given opportunities. The Greek part wants to dominate on the island and gives the minority status to the Turkish population, not for Turkey’s sake but for the establishment of the multinational, Unitarian government.

These are the future plans of Cyprus. Here, it must be noted that they will not change the existing situation. Now, we see a Turkey, who is unable to assure the World Commonwealth for the positive decisions and they even do not care for the cooperation to solve the problems together. These unions perceive Turkish population with minority status and recognize the Greek part as the real authority of the island. They refused the foundation of the Turkish Government in 1983, but claimed that the reason why the Turkish Republic stopped its functioning in 1963 was not because of the Greek part but because of Turkey's itself. There is Greece, who lives in the political isolation but plays the role as if under the pressure of the Turkish government because of its small territories. Though they face each other, Greek government has not got any compromise. And there is the EU, who accepts the application of the Greeks for membership and causes a great misunderstanding on Cyprus.³²

3.5. Cyprus and European – Union Relations

Cyprus; has close cultural. Political, social and economic relations with Europe, it has developed special trade links with Europe for more than 100 years especially with the UK after being a part of the British Empire Since the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus in 1960. UK was the major trading partner of Cyprus since UK had been applying preferential tariffs to imports originating from Cyprus. When UK applied for membership to European Community in 1961 Cyprus in fear of losing UK market had applied to EC for membership in 1962 with the consent of both communities on the island. However when France opposed to the membership of UK the interest of Cyprus for membership has declined until 1970's. But since the beginning of 1970's, Cyprus's interest for membership has again intensified.³³

³² <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru122.htm>

³³ Ebru Kaptan SERTOGLU, Cyprus and European Union relations, international Relations Hacettepe University, September 2000, p. 34

3.5.1. Cyprus Association Agreement

By 1973, UK became a member of the European Economic Community (EEC). But Cyprus's interest has started to increase just before the entrance of the CK to the Community. First major agreement between Cyprus and the Community was the Association Agreement. The Association Agreement between the Community and Cyprus was necessary because of the accession of the CK to the EEC. Cyprus as a member of the British Commonwealth enjoyed the privilege economic relations. The islands economy was greatly dependent on the UK market. Big majority of exports, especially agricultural exports were going to the [JK market. The accession of Britain to the EEC meant that it would suffer a great transformation of its market, with important effects on the competitive position of Cyprus' exports because:

- It would have meant either immediately or after a short transitional period. The adoption by Britain of the Communities' common customs tariff and the unavoidable simultaneous termination of the Preferential Commonwealth tariff regime that Cyprus exports enjoyed upon to enter into British market.
- It would also have meant the adoption by Britain of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and the introduction of the preference price system, which would prevent Cypriot agricultural exports from entering the British market while agricultural exports from Italy and France would enjoy preferential treatment" (Tsardanidis 198-1: 352)

The Association Agreement was signed between the EC and the Republic of Cyprus at the end of 1972. EC signed this agreement only with the Greek Cypriot authorities, which excluded the Turkish Cypriots from the government of the Republic by illegal force after 1963. However the EC aimed at serving to all the citizens of the island. Article 5 of the Association Agreement states that "the rules governing the trade between the contracting parties may not give rise to any discrimination between the Member States or nationals or companies of Cyprus". Bıcak 1996:245-260).

The Association Agreement, which entered into force by the beginning of June 1973, aimed at establishing a customs union, which involved free movement of goods and services between Cyprus and EC, and Cyprus would apply the "common external tariff" of the EC to the goods and services coming from non-member countries in two stages. The

first stage was to be completed by the end of 1977. The European Community and "Cyprus" started negotiations for the establishment of the second stage on 16 May 1977 the negotiations were completed on June 1977. The Commission delegation submitted a proposal to the Council of Ministers on 3 May 1977. In accordance with the proposal, the transition to the second stage was not possible. The three reasons forced the Community to go to the extension of the first stage: (Tsardanidis 1996:358 — 359)

"1st the difficulties on the islands economy caused by the invasion, it was believed that the Cyprus economy would not be able to afford the responsibilities, which the second stage required.

2. The division of the island into two parts and the confrontation between the two communities.
- 3rd the inability of the European Community to proceed to certain further concessions for Cypriot agricultural products " So the first stage of the Association Agreement continued until 1987 with, annual protocols because of the problems, which are mentioned above. But by 1987, two sides is ere ready to start to the second stage of the Association Agreement.³⁴

3.5.2. Customs Union Agreement: Second Stage of the Association Agreement

Negotiations for the implementation of the second stage of the Association Agreement was carried out by the Greek Cypriot Administration and the EU and a new Customs Union agreement was signed in 1987 between the two sides. In these negotiations Turkish Cypriots were again kept out of the official meetings.

It involved two phases in which in the end, a full customs union would be achieved between the "Republic of Cyprus" and the EU on all manufactured products and some agricultural products

³⁴ Ebru Kaptan SERTOGLU, Cyprus and European Union relations, international Relations Hacettepe University, September 2000, p. 34-36

like citrus. This agreement contains arrangements on trade and financial and technical cooperation which would be a very important step for the relations between Cyprus and the EU.

First phase of the second stage would last 10 years (1988-1997) in which Cyprus would reduce the tariffs on manufactured products and those agricultural products in a progressive way. Also it would apply the Common External Tariff of the EU for the products, which are included in the agreement and coming from non member countries. On the other hand the EU is required to act in the same manner as well specially for the agricultural products coming from Cyprus.

The second phase of the second stage of the Association Agreement would last for five years covering the period 1998-2002. By the end of this phase, in 2002, the Greek Cypriot Administration and the EU would achieve full customs union. It can be seen that the Greek Cypriot Administration and the EU are successfully implementing their responsibilities according to the agreement. Greek Cypriot Administration and the EU are presently at the last phase for the completion of a Customs Union to be finalized by the year 2002.

The first phase provides:

- Reduction by Cyprus of customs duties and quantitative reductions on industrial and 43 agricultural products covered by the agreement;
- Adoption of Common Customs Tariff by Cyprus;
- Harmonization of accompanying policies, for example competition, state aids, approximation of laws.

The second phase, or the years from 1997 to 2002, provides for the "free and unrestricted movement of industrial and agricultural products and the adoption of the accompanying policies required for the completion of the customs union, including, in principle, the abolition of the origin rules applicable to manufactured products".³⁵

³⁵ Ebru Kaptan SERTOGLU, Cyprus and European Union relations, international Relations Hacettepe University, September 2000, p. 36-37

3.5.3. Financial Protocols

For many years (since 1978), the EU has provided financial loans and grants to Cyprus in order to increase the productive capacity of the economy. They were provided for the benefit of the whole population of the island.

First Financial Protocol, which covered the period 1979-1983, aimed at providing the essential infrastructure of the island. Projects which are financed under the First Financial Protocol were mainly on the southern part of the island and mainly contributed to the economic development of the Greek Cypriots. Namely they were Vassilikos, Podoskinos Irrigation and Water Distribution Project. Extension of the Dhikelia Electric Power Station and Nicosia Sewage Project, The first two projects were in the southern part of the island thus had no benefit for the northern part. Nicosia Sewage Project in the North was financed mainly because without it the project would not be complete.

The Second Financial Protocol which covered the period 1984-1988. aimed at helping Cyprus's industrialization, improvement of agriculture, improvement of business management and providing scholarship for training purposes. It is important to note that the share that the Turkish Cypriots in this protocol was less than the share in the First Financial Protocol.

The Third Financial Protocol covering the period 1989-1993, also aimed at financing the projects which would help the competitive sectors Cyprus to adjust to the terms and conditions of the Customs Union Agreement. On the other hand Turkish Cypriots had benefited nothing from this protocol. The Fourth Financial Protocol began in 1996 and is expected to last until the end of 1998. It aims at financing 74 m. ECU for further integration of the Greek Cypriot economy with EU and promotes the settlement of the Cyprus problem.

EU not only discriminated Greek Cypriot Administration against the Turkish Cypriots in allocating financial resources, but against the other Mediterranean Countries. The GCA having the second highest GNP per head after Israel, Received the second highest financial aid per head after Malta (Bicak 1997:11).

Table 4: Distribution of Financial Protocols within the Two Communities, Greek Cypriots.

Financial Protocols	Greek Cypriots		Turkish Cypriots		Total	
	m. ECU	%	m. ECU	%	m. ECU	%
First(1979-1983)	24.0	80	6.0	20	30.0	100
Second (1984-1988)	41.8	95	2.2	5	44.0	100
Third (1989-1993)	62.0	100	0.0	0	62.0	100
Fourth (1995-1999)	74.0	100	0.0	0	74.0	100
Total	201.8	96	8.2	4	210	100

Source: Bicak, H. (1997), "Recent a Developments in Cyprus-EU Relations". Proceeding of the First International Congress on Cypriot Studies: Center for Cypriot Studies, EMU, and Famagusta 20 – 23, November 1996. p. 254. & Gilles Anouil (ed) (1996), Avrupa Birliği ve Kıbrıs, European Commission-Cyprus Delegation, Imprinta publications, Nicosia. p.25.

As it can be seen from the above table, nearly all of the financial aid went to Greek Cypriots. Specially third and fourth protocols were provided for the preparation of South Cyprus economy to EU.³⁶

3.5.4. Past and Future of Cyprus from Perspective of Europe

Since 1960, the year Cyprus was founded; it has been source of problems not only for Greece, Turkey and England but for UN, EU and USA as well. Cyprus state which was founded as a result of London and Zurich agreement in three years time came to a dead end as a result of Greek attacks and pressure made on Cypriot Turks during 1963-1974. Turkey used its right as stated in London and Zurich agreements and interfered into island. After interference in 1974, Cyprus took its place in the history as a source of un-resolvable problem. An important step was taken in Febru-

³⁶ Ebru Kaptan SERTOGLU, Cyprus and European Union relations, international Relations Hacettepe University, September 2000, p. 37-39

ary 2004. Two sides were forced to sit around a negotiation table, a process that was initiated by international pressure, but unfortunately did not have a “happy end”.

In April 2004, UN General Secretary presented his own plan to island residents a through referendum. Both Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus president Rauf Denktash and Cyprus Greek president Papadopoulos felt sure of negative result; however, it was only the South Cyprus population who expressed their no willingness to follow the plan. Turkish side that has always been seen as a party that is hard to negotiate supported Annan plan with the privilege in voting with 64.9 %, while the Greek side gave negative votes with the outcome of 75.8 %.³⁷

3.5.5. Present of Island

60 % of island, which is a divided state since August 1974, is being ruled by Greek government, 36.3 % belongs to Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, the rest 3.7 % is in the status of region that is under UN control. As a result of division, 180 thousand Cypriot Greeks and 65 thousand Cypriot Turks had to leave their homes. Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus was built on 15th November 1983 as a result of meeting held. Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus was recognized by the only country, Turkey was set an economical embargo that had a cost of 700 million dollars for Turkish economy. If 30 years period is calculated, it can be seen that the burden on Turkish economy costs around 20 billion dollars. The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus that has been held under embargo can support its economy only by the help of Turkey. Cyprus Greek’s economy hosted Arabian money after Lebanon crisis and Yugoslavian money found its place here as well, as a result of a war. Russia, after 1991 has chosen South Cyprus as an investment target. Off-shore banking and “black money” made contribution to South Cyprus’ economy as well.³⁸

³⁷ Prof. Dr. Faruk Şen, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, s. 195

³⁸ Prof. Dr. Faruk Şen, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, ss. 197-198

The Economical Situation of Cyprus

	Turkish Part	Greek Part (2002)
Population	211.000	730.000
GSMH (Million \$)	1.208	13.650
Rate of Reel increase	6.9 %	2%
GSMH per individual(31.12.2003)	5.700 \$	18.700 \$
Unemployment	20%	3.2%
Export (Million \$)	45,4	628
Import (Million \$)	309,6	2.528

Source: Economist magazine, KKTC state planning group, Cyprus Greek statistics organization

3.5.6. South Cyprus and European - Union

Since its foundation, South Cyprus government has been following “pro-European” policy. Cyprus that was a member of European Consensus in 1961, signed a partnership agreement with European economical group in 1972. The aim of South Cyprus, that entered customs bureau union by signing the agreement with European Minister Consensus on 22nd March 1987, is to become a full right member of European Union.

In 1993, EU commission stated that South Cyprus Greek Government meets all the criteria and made an announcement that was prepared in the same year by EU consensus, saying that guaranty agreement does not comprise any barrier for the membership application of South Cyprus Greek Government, made membership to EU for South Cyprus Greek Government possible. As a result of this event on 10th November 1998, meetings on membership between EU and South Cyprus Greek Government started. The agreement reached between Greece and EU played a role of initiator for the discussions. By taking off the veto for membership of Turkey in EU, EU dropped out the condition of “Cyprus problem” for South Cyprus Greek Government membership in EU. Cyprus Greek government signed the “EU attendance” agreement on 16th April 1998 and with that signature, EU approved South Cyprus Greek Government as a representative of the island. Despite the announcement of EU consensus for acceptance of South Cyprus Greek Government alone or

together with Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, they stated that the plan of making the whole island a member of European Union at once, on 1st of May 2004, was proffered the most.³⁹

3.5.7. Possibilities of the Cyprus Membership Process to the European – Union without Turkey

Following the date 1964, March 4th, the decision taken by the security Council of the United National Organization, Greek part, the United Nations and other resembling international unions considered the Greek part de-facto authoring as the real government of Cyprus according to 1960 Agreement and Constitution.

Though these agreements consider the existence of Turkish Prime Minister, 3 Turkish Ministers, 15 parliamentarians, about 70 / 30 Turkish government officers, 60 / 40 Turkish Military Officials, they also finance from the budget, use the voting principle and VETO rights.

Greek part will not have the right of participating to the European – Union’s negotiations for the uniting process without Turkey. Beside the decision taken together, the European – Union, the United Nations and Greek part, also the constitutions of Cyprus are not considered to use the VETO rights in the international unions where Greece and Turkey are united. Using of these rights are allowed in case one of the sides does not take part in the process of the negotiations to keep the balance in the Correlation Force Guarantee Agreement which has the same idea. This question was discussed at the meetings in Zurich and London, where the ministers of Greece and Foreign Affairs aware of the announced idea of protecting this principle for the necessity of the Correlation Force.

Equal to the International – Law norms, it’s supposed that:

- 1) Greek part does not represent the real authority and the constitution of Cyprus according to the agreements in 1960. Because of this, Greek part has no right to make any decisions or any actions instead of Turkey. It follows that Greek part cannot make a statement for the membership process in the name of “Cyprus”

³⁹ Prof. Dr. Faruk Şen, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, s. 199

- 2) If the Constitution of Cyprus is recognized, the recognition of the Turkish part about the VETO rights must be accepted automatically.
- 3) The Guarantee Agreements prohibit any kind of political or economical membership of the Greek part if both parts do not take participation in this union. VETO rights are given to the Turkish part according to the Constitution Article No: 50

With the agreements of all the parts, considering the demands and the conditions of the Guarantee Agreement, they must act according to the norms of the justice. The difference of the International Law and its advantage over other laws is the unsatisfied requests of the Greek part.

3.5.8. Cyprus as a Member of the European – Union without Turkey

Two Governments consisting of federal types of systems can survived if both the parts admit their existence with the confidential statement prepared in 1984 by the special commission of the United Nations in order to make the federal type agreement to be recognized as the real government of Turkish part of Cyprus in about 24 hours.⁴⁰

In spite of this fact, the Government of Greece considers itself to be the legal authority according to 1960 year's agreements and constitutions on Cyprus. They use the decision made by the Security Councils of the United Nations Organization on March 4, 1964 as an argument, though this decision is not adequate for the norms and requires of the international law.

Agreements mentioned previously considered the existence of Turkish Prime Minister, 3 Turkish Ministers, 15 Turkish Parliamentarians, 70 / 30 Turkish Government Officers, 60 / 40 Military Officers also financing the governments budget and having the VETO and polling rights. On the south Cyprus regime none of the Turkish people have high status in the governmental services nowadays.⁴¹

According to the Greek Pact, supported by the European – Union, they have no rights to ask for the plenipotentiary membership and uniting to the European – Union without the acceptance of the Turkish part according to the constitution of Cyprus because the Prime Minister of Turkish part has VETO rights for the international negotiations following the Constitution Article 50 of Cyprus.

⁴⁰ <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru122.htm>

⁴¹ <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru122.htm>

In that article, VETO rights which are determined to use for the participation process are not considered for International Organizations belonging to Turkey and Greece. Using of these rights is allowed if one of these parts does not take the participation in order to keep the principles of equal rights. The agreement for Guarantee is based on the same principles.⁴²

The Agreement for Guarantee Article I

According to the agreements of London and Zurich, Cyprus cannot become the member of the International Unions if Turkey and Greece is not the member of this union too.⁴³ This fact is underlined by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Greece Averoph (VEROF) is necessary for the correlation of forces on Cyprus. Beside the agreements, conditions and resistance of Turkey, the Greek part of Cyprus became the member of the European – Union, though they could not achieve their aim to unite the whole Cyprus with this union, but only the Greek part. They were informed that forming an agreement without the support of the Turkish part from the Northern Cyprus would be impossible for them, while the process of changes and globalization everything was possible to happen. In 1997, December 12-13th, it was decided to begin the negotiations with the Greek part of Cyprus about the plenipotentiary membership in Luxemburg Meeting, which was held by the Euro-Council. The Turkish part stated that this case ignored all the international agreements and annulled the old parameters.

Following to this fact, the negotiations must be carried on at the governmental level. Borders and territorial securities must be discussed on the base of the equality of rights. If some of the social classes do not found the federal system with any of the governments, they will not be able to carry on the negotiations considering the principles of the equal rights.⁴⁴

⁴² <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kkctc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru122.htm>

⁴³ <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kkctc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru122.htm>

⁴⁴ <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kkctc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru122.htm>

3.5.9. Membership Process of the Greek Government with the European – Union

After changing their methods about using the military operations that was an impediment to realize the idea of NOSS, the Greek government has made a statement on July 3rd, 1990, in the name of Cyprus to unite with the European – Union.

Therefore, the Governments with the statements of uniting with the European – Union have decided to establish the Parliamentary Committee that would be held twice in a year. This decision was made by the European – Union and the Greek Government participating to the meeting on March 17th, 1992. In 1993, July 30th, the response of the European Commission was positive for the Government of the Greek part. From June 24th to December 9th, 1994, on ORFU and SSEN Euro – Council Summit Cyprus was announced to be the first item for the integration process of the Euro – Council. Council of Ministers gathered on March 6th, 1995, decided to discuss the matter with the Greek Part about the question of Cyprus’ plenipotentiary membership to the European – Union. This discussion would take its place after 6 months of the Government Conference at the end of 1997. After the steps taken by the European – Union, Greek – part became more confident and tied to avoid all the forms of the cooperation and wanted to postpone the negotiation year of the announcement of the plenipotentiary membership of the Republic of Cyprus till 1998. Beside the efforts of Turkish part of Cyprus and the third side, the government of Greek part tried not only to avoid the process of negotiation, but also to reinforce its armaments. The decision of Greece to buy the advanced rocket – power system S - 300 was dangerous not only for the island, but also for the general peace and stability of the Mediterranean surroundings as well. But finally after the persistent requests of the international Commonwealth Organization Greek – Part agreed to carry on the negotiations. However, the meetings that were held in New York, Troutbeck, in July, 1997 and in Glion, Switzerland in August in 1997, between the Prime Minister Rauf Denktash and the leader of the Greek side Klerides were ineffective.

On June 17th, 1997, beside the warnings, at the end of Troutbeck negotiations the European Union issued the statement “Order of the Day - 2000”, There was indicated the fact that the European Union was going to discuss the membership problem with the Greek part beside the results of the political negotiations with its positive or negative meanings on Cyprus. These results posed an obstacle for solving the negotiations in Glion in a positive way at the beginning. The European Un-

ion was final who stroke them in 1998, March 30 to settle the problem of Cyprus, where began the official negotiations about the plenipotentiary membership of Greek part. As a response, Turkish Part ceased their two sided and multi-sided negotiations. On the customs office of Edra – Alla was established the visa regime and was announced to stop the process of the negotiations “between the parts” and to make the relationships closer between Turkey and the Turkish Part of Cyprus.

It’s obvious that the European Union ignored the rights and status of Turkish part and gave the sovereignty to the Greek part of the Government in Cyprus. After these, expecting agreements and speaking about equal rights with the Greek part would be in vain.

It was clear that until the Greek side has the de-facto government status; it is useless to carry on the negotiations with them. It’s time the international Commonwealth Countries acknowledged the existence of two parts with equal rights on Cyprus. Future negotiations will be realized inevitably according to these principles.

Turkish – Side showed its own commonwealth example to the world with the principles of equal rights. But the European – Union annulled the basic parameters of the negotiation process on the summit meeting in Luxemburg and took on negative historical responsibilities. The European – Union admitted on the summit meeting that they see the Turkish people as a minority on Cyprus. This idea is humiliating and unacceptable for the Turkish population on Cyprus.⁴⁵

3.6. European - Union Political and Economic

Approach to the Cyprus

The European Economic Community has always had a Mediterranean policy in this region. The area has very important strategic geography and through the history there are a lot of causes for instabilities and a risk of war in this part of the world. In addition to the risk of war the economic disparities between the two shores of the Mediterranean (North African and South Europe) and the conflicts themselves, have caused a lot of disputes involving Western Europe, with which the countries of the EEC have been unable to cope for both economic and political reasons.

⁴⁵ <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru121.htm>

In the early 1970s the political, economic and trade relations of the European Community and Cyprus were positive. The European Community was considering an Association Agreement with Cyprus on the trade and economic basis. The coup staged by Greek officers on 15 July 1974 led to the military intervention by Turkey, which dramatically changed the relations of that European body in respect to the island. The de facto division of the island as a result of Turkish intervention has become the major reason behind the political developments concerning the relations between the European Community and Cyprus.

After the 15 July coup, nine member countries reacted and wanted to play a mediatory role in the crisis. Their reason for adopting a common position was that they had aimed to protect the independence and territorial unity of Cyprus.

After 1974 the European Community wanted to play an advisory role in relation to the Cyprus dispute. The situation in Cyprus was analyzed by some experts of the European Political Cooperation who advised direct negotiations between the immediate parties. The European Community, therefore, apparently supported the efforts of the United Nations Secretary General.

On 3 July 1990, the administration in the southern part of the island submitted to the Council of the European Communities an application for membership of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), the European Economic Community (EEC), and the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC). The Commission in its opinion on the application announced in 1993 considered Cyprus to be eligible for membership. The Commission's opinion pointed out that there were some problems resulting from the de facto division of the island which needed to be addressed. It noted in particular that:

"The fundamental freedoms laid down by the [EEC] Treaty, and in particular freedom of movement of goods, people, services and capital, right of establishment and the universally recognized political, economic, social and cultural rights could not today be exercised over the entirety of the island's territory. These freedoms and rights would have to be guaranteed as part of a comprehensive settlement restoring constitutional arrangements covering the whole of the Republic of Cyprus."

The Commission stated that Cyprus' accession to the European Community would increase security and prosperity on the island. It would also help to bring the two communities on the island closer together.

The Council of Ministers discussed and endorsed the Commission's opinion at the meeting on 4 October 1993. In its conclusions, the Council noted as following;

"3. The Council supported the Commission approach which was to propose, without awaiting a peaceful, balanced and lasting solution to the Cyprus problem, to use all the instruments offered by the Association Agreement to help, in close cooperation with the Cypriot Government, with the economic, social and political transition of Cyprus towards integration into the European Union. To that end the Council invited the Commission to open substantive discussions forthwith with the Government of Cyprus to help it prepare for the accession negotiations to follow later on, under the best possible conditions, and to keep it regularly informed of the progress."

The substantive talks between the Commission and the "Government of Cyprus" started and continued until 1995. The substantive talks primary objective was to help the "Cypriot" authorities familiarize themselves with all the elements of the *acquis communautaire* and help "Cyprus" harmonise its legislation and policies with those of the Union.

While Cyprus' accession to the EU would bring security and prosperity to both communities on the island, it should be realized that the application of the Greek Cypriot Administration to hill membership cannot contribute to the solution of the problems between the two communities. The two communities of the island have conflicting views in relation to membership to the EU. While the Greek Cypriots see a vast political interest in joining the Union immediately. On the other hand the Greek Cypriot leadership believes that the involvement of the European Union will accelerate the solution of the Cyprus problem and the EU membership process, the Turkish Cypriots believe that the membership should come after a comprehensive settlement to the Cyprus problem (Denktas 1990:170).

The European Council appointed an EU observer to Cyprus to review its application on February 1994. The European Councils of Corfu (June 1994) and Essen (December 1994), confirmed that the next round of the Union's enlargement would involve Cyprus and Malta. On 6 March 1995, after examining the report of the European Observer for Cyprus, the Council concluded that negotiations would start on the basis of Commission proposals 6 months after the conclusion of the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference. In addition to this report, the Observer of the European Union for Cyprus put forward that United Nations initiatives should develop confidence between the parties to reach a just and viable solution. The Cyprus problem is accepted as a European problem, not just because of the Association and Customs Union Agreements, but also an ac-

count of the fact that Cyprus has been a member of the Council of Europe since 1961 (Papaneophytou 1994:88)

The need for cooperation between the two communities to achieve the integration of Cyprus with the European Community was emphasized in the 'Ghali Set of ideas. on a comprehensive framework agreement on Cyprus'.⁵ This document, unanimously concluded by the Security Council under Resolution 774/92. Structured the basis for inter-communal negotiations carried out by the [JN Secretary General during 1992. It proposed a settlement based on the Cypriot State with a single sovereignty, international personality and citizenship, with guaranteed territorial independence and integrity including two politically equal communities in a bi-zonal, bicomunal federation. The outline to the solution of the Cyprus problem as described here deserves European support to provide a suitable basis for the community's constructive engagement in the developing international efforts at finding a just and viable solution for the Cyprus problem.

Moreover the EU-Cyprus Association Council adopted on 12 June 1995 a common resolution on the establishment of structural dialogue between the ELT and "Cyprus" on certain elements of strategy to prepare it for accession (Anouil and Karides :28).

At this point, the EU confirmed "Cyprus" suitability for accession on the basis of the same criteria (Copenhagen) as the other applicant states. The Association Agreement was very important in the Cyprus economy and trade. The problem on agricultural products stemmed from the two communities' political status on the island as applying annual quotas to Cyprus on agricultural products in accordance with the Association Agreement. Since the Greek Cypriots took the advantage of being recognized as the "Government of Cyprus", they easily fill the quotas of agricultural products. However, Article 5 of the Agreement of Association focus on the prohibition of any discrimination between the products of the contracting countries. as well as, nationals or companies of the member states and Cyprus. Article 5 states that "the rules governing the trade between the contracting parties may not give any discrimination between the member states or between the nationals or companies of these states or nationals and companies of Cyprus"

Concessions given by the EEC to Cyprus on agricultural products included increase in quotas on potatoes, fresh table grapes, dried grapes, wines of fresh grapes, and applications of reference price on oranges, lemons, table grapes, unbolted wines and Cypriot liqueur wines as of 1990. Increased quotas on potatoes and reference prices on oranges and lemons were expected to provide favorable conditions for the Turkish Cypriots since these goods constituted a significant portion of their export earnings (Yesilada, Bicak 1995).

Until mid-1994 North Cyprus exports benefited from the preferential trade arrangements of the Community, based on the Article 5 of the Association Agreement. However on July 1991, the Court of Justice of the European Communities issued its ruling on a preliminary reference made by the British High Court requesting an interpretation of the relevant provisions of the EC-Cyprus Association Agreement of 1972. The Greek Cypriot exporters criticized the British authorities of accepting movement certificates from North Cyprus stamped in the name of the "Cyprus Customs Authorities" but not issued by the "legitimate authorities" of the Republic of Cyprus. They claimed that this was against the Association Agreement. They said that the goods coming from North Cyprus would not carry the certificate of the Republic of Cyprus since they are coming from an illegal entity in North Cyprus. However the question is if there is a special situation on the island the decision could be contrary to the spirit of the Agreement that avoids any discrimination between nationals of Cyprus and the Community. It is important to note that although the Court of Justice did not discuss the political situation of the island, it imposed an embargo on the export products of North Cyprus.

It is also important to note that the division of the island makes efforts practically impossible for the exporters of the northern part to obtain the necessary certificates for their products from the southern part. The European Union should find out a way to solve this problem faced by North Cyprus. Settlement of any dispute in respect of customs could be carried out efficiently between the cooperation of concerned authorities. Under these circumstances the Association Council should find an alternative solution, not to give rise to any discrimination between the nationals or the companies of Cyprus and ensure the commercial benefits to the island. If the products from the southern part benefit from the preferential arrangements but the products from the northern part do not, this would be contrary to Article 5 and it would be equivalent to the discrimination between nationals or companies of Cyprus. This meant that the citrus fruits and potatoes exported from the North Cyprus to the European Union markets could no longer take advantage from the preferential arrangements stated in the Association Agreement.

Since then, North Cyprus agricultural products are being exported to the EU as if they are being exported from Turkey. Naturally this means extra customs on those products which decreases the competitive power of those products.

Unfortunately, this situation is a clear discrimination of the Association Agreement by the EU. *According to the agreement, the EU should not discriminate any of the communities on the Island.* (Yesilada 1995)

Furthermore, on March 6 1995, the Council of Ministers have decided to enter to the Customs Union with Turkey as planned. It is crucial for Turkey to be a full member in the European Union. After five years, Turkey, if it manages its obligations committed during the customs union, will be a full member and participate into the decision—making mechanism and could defend the rights of Turkish Cypriots on the grounds of nationality. However during the five years period of the customs union. Turkey will be faced with a problem about the Cyprus issue and the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus". Turkey will have to harmonize all the amendments in the customs policies of the European Union towards the third countries. If any condition avoiding this harmonization exists, the matter will be discussed in the Association Council and the Council may give sufficient time to it for this amendment and Turkey, unconditionally, may impose the same customs tariff to a third country where member states apply,] so that Turkey could harmonize its trade policy in accordance with the community policies and sign bilateral agreements with the concerned third countries. Turkey 16 of the Customs Union Decision will have to sign a bilateral agreement with the Greek Cypriot Administration. Known as the sole government of the "Republic of Cyprus". One of the countries with which the Community has a preferential trade agreement is the Republic of Cyprus and Turkey should enter into a free trade with this part of the island within five years. In fact, Turkey does not have any trade relation with South Cyprus. However this does not mean Turkey will not sign an agreement with South Cyprus and it is a precondition for the existence of trade. Article 66 of the Customs Union Decision apparently has adverse effect on the products of North Cyprus, where this article stresses that "the legal provisions which appear in the Decision will be in conformity with the interpretations put on practices directed towards the products which enter under the customs union and with the decisions of the Court of Justice." The decisions of the ECJ are binding for the whole member states. Turkey, therefore, will have to implement the decisions taken by the Court. The Court has already prohibited the export products from the northern part of the island. Since the Community does not recognize the separate administration and only recognizes one state in Cyprus. It could only permit to the products ported from Cyprus.

"Cyprus" may take other safeguard measures after having consultation with the Association Council if only serious disturbances occurred in a sector of the economy. or serious disturbances occurred in its financial stability. However, North Cyprus has no right to ask for any safeguards in order to remedy the disturbances. There is no doubt that this has resulted from the recognition of the Greek Cypriots as the sole government of the Cyprus. While the Greek Cypriots are represented in the Association Council, where they can seek solutions to their problems, the Turkish Cypriots

are not represented in the Association Council to bring their problems to the agenda. Obviously, this is another example of the discrimination of Greek and Turkish Cypriots by the European Union.

It is worthy to note about the criteria for the smooth work of the Association Agreement. The first one is Association Council, which has the function to take decisions for the implementation of the agreement objectives. Furthermore, The Association Council makes recommendations and takes decisions. While the recommendations have no binding force over Cyprus, the decisions do.

The Association Council is composed of the members of the Council; the members of the Commission of the European communities and the members of the government of "Cyprus". The decisions are taken in the Association Council by common agreement. The President of the Council convenes the meetings once a year and prepares the agenda for the meetings of the Council in accordance with the rules of procedure of the Council. Here, the most important point is the absence of one national community. There is no representative of the Turkish Cypriots in the decision making and recommendation process of the Association Council. Therefore, any decision taken by the members of the Council of Association has no binding force over the Turkish Cypriot community because the decisions taken do not take the Turkish Cypriot community into consideration. Since 1974 only the Greek Cypriots represent Cyprus in the Association Council. However, the Republic of Cyprus was established on the principle of bi-communality and this requires both the Turkish and the Greek Cypriot representation in the Association Council. The 1974 events broke down the bi-communal representation of the Cyprus.

On 27 June 1997 the intergovernmental Conference ended. The completion of the EU, Intergovernmental Conference and the decisions taken in the Amsterdam EU summit regarding a new EU treaty opened the way for the implementation of the decisions taken regarding enlargement. On 16 July 1997, the Commission issued the Agenda 2000 report relating to the next enlargement, which confirmed that accession negotiations would begin as planned (Anouil and Karides). The Commission expressed the European Union's support to reach a solution being pursued by the UN to establish a federation. Agenda 2000 noted that the Union should play a positive role in bringing about a just and lasting settlement to Cyprus in accordance with the relevant United Nations Resolutions.: The European Union expressed that the negotiations for accession could start with Cyprus before a political settlement was reached.

Agenda 2000 emphasized that if progress towards a settlement was not reached before the negotiations were due to begin, they should be opened with the "Government: of the Republic of Cyprus", as the only authority recognized by international law.

The UN-led negotiations between the Turkish and the Greek Cypriots in Montreux in 1997 ceased because of the Turkish Cypriot opposition to the accession of Cyprus to the EU. The European Union expressed that this situation was unacceptable and the agenda for the negotiation would be put forward as agreed by the Union in March 1995. This meant that the negotiations for accession would start with the government of the "Republic of Cyprus". If a progress towards a solution of the Cyprus problem is not reached before negotiations begin. The EU promised to I facilitate the process of finding a solution by handing bi-communal projects and activities designed to inform the Turkish Cypriots of the benefits of the EU membership.

In addition, the EU stressed that the accession of Cyprus to the European Union should benefit all communities and helps to bring about civil peace and rapprochement. The accession negotiations will contribute positively to the search for a political solution with a view of creating a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation, this context; the European Council requested that the "Government of Cyprus" should include representatives of the Turkish Cypriot community in the accession negotiating delegation.

On 12 March 1998, the Greek Cypriot Administration attended the first meeting of the European Conference in London, in the name of whole Cyprus. On that occasion the President of the "Republic of Cyprus". Glafcos Clerides tabled a proposal inviting Turkish Cypriot representatives to participate in the accession negotiations. The Turkish Cypriot leadership has so far not taken up this offer. The reason of this reaction of the Turkish Cypriot leadership was that the Greek Cypriots couldn't represent the Turkish Cypriots by holding the sole representation of the Republic of Cyprus. They argue that the Turkish Cypriot side is one of the equal co-founders of the 1960 republic and that it has equal right to decide about the issues related the future of the island.

On 31 March 1998 in the negotiation meeting, the EU Presidency stressed that the accession of Cyprus should benefit all communities with the contribution to peace and reconciliation on the island.

The President of the Council of Ministers emphasized that the European Union welcomes the offer:

"Made to include Turkish Cypriot representatives in the team for negotiating the terms of Cyprus' accession to the EU. The Q European Union regrets that the Turkish Cypriot community

has so far responded negatively to this offer. It reiterates the importance that it attaches to associating the Turkish Cypriots with the accession process, in accordance with the conclusions of the Luxembourg European Council. The Presidency and the Commission will pursue the necessary contacts."

The Luxembourg European Council decided on a specific pre-accession strategy for "Cyprus". It is based on its participation in certain projects such as judicial and administrative projects in the fields of justice and home affairs and Community programs and agencies and the use of technical assistance. The European Council meeting in Luxembourg also discussed the Cyprus problem and stated its position on the issue as follows:

The accession of Cyprus should benefit all communities and help to bring about civil peace and reconciliation. The accession negotiations will contribute positively to the search for a political solution to the Cyprus problem through the talks under the aegis of the United Nations, which must continue with a view to creating a bi-communal, Bi-zonal federation in this context, the European Council requests that the willingness of the Government of Cyprus to include representatives of the Turkish Cypriot community in the accession negotiating delegation be acted upon. In order for the request to be acted upon the necessary contacts will be undertaken by the Presidency and the Commission.

The EU has always been a supporter of UN efforts and initiatives on Cyprus, addition to this, the EU emphasizes that the present status quo is unacceptable for the Community. Though, it calls for Turkey to withdraw its military power from the island. The European Union believes that Turkey can play a significant role and make difference or contribution in the search for a political settlement. In December 1996 Dublin meeting, the European Council "urged Turkey to use its influence to contribute to a solution in Cyprus in accordance with UN Security Council Resolutions."} Though, in September 1997. The European Parliament adopted a resolution on Cyprus "calling on the Union and on all member states to maintain firm pressure on Turkey to contribute positively to a just solution of the Cyprus problem and ensure that they facilitate the commencement of accession negotiations with Cyprus by the beginning of 1998.

Cyprus is a small country but the Community believes that the EU will also gain greatly from Cyprus` membership. The main benefits that may be identified at this stage appear to be the following;

- The EU borders will be expanded to the East, to a region that because of its economic resources (oil and the transport routes for Middle East and Central Asian oil) is of crucial importance to the interests of the EU member states.
- The EU will be able to improve the security of the region, and thereby improve the security of Europe.
- The existing function of Cyprus as a business centre for the Middle East, North Africa and Eastern Europe could be greatly developed for the benefit of European firms.
- Cyprus could be exploited as a communication point for Europe in the region.
- EU firms would have improved access to the Cyprus market, which due to the high level of development is larger than that of countries with a much greater population, but also through Cyprus's access to Middle East and East European markets.
- The highly developed and professional service sectors of Cyprus. Including professional services, could be used to reduce the costs of operation of EU firms operating in the regions with which Cyprus has economic relations.

Cyprus could become a bridge between Europe and the Middle East, which would provide connections and services for commerce, transport and service industries. These are precisely the areas where Cyprus already has a strong presence and a comparative advantage.

So in the end, it can be summarized as the EU started its formal and economic relations with Cyprus by the 1972 Association Agreement. Although the Article 5 of the Association Agreement says that the EU will not discriminate any one of the communities on the island, in practice this has not evolved in that way. Since 1994, the EU is not accepting talks from North Cyprus because they are not originating from South Cyprus. Stating accession negotiations with South Cyprus without any Turkish Cypriot member, is another example of discrimination. These actions of the EU are quite affected by the heavy lobbying of Greece. Greece became a member of the EU in 1981 and since then the decisions related with Cyprus are all taken in favor of Greek Cypriots' administration although this is against the promises and signature of the union.

Originally the Cyprus crisis became a matter of argument among the member states. Their individual national interests clashed with the common interest of the Community. Later on, the member states were able to coordinate their position and took some common political action. The initiatives taken by Britain as a guarantor power between July 15 and August 15 1974 facilitated a rallying of the member states. Within these developments, some countries promoted their national policies instead of common policies. According to the British view, the 1960 Guarantee Treaty

gives it a legal but not an obligatory position to intervene in Cyprus.' During the 1974 crisis, Britain's main aim was to maintain and secure its sovereign bases for its strategic and regional interests where, the Greek coup and Turkish intervention did not threaten its bases' status. In addition to this, Britain holds its intervention at minimum level without taking any advanced support from the United States.

The European Union and its member states call upon the parties to increase their efforts and willingness to achieve a comprehensive settlement in accordance with the UN resolutions, 1977-79 High Level Agreements based on the concept of a bi-communal and bi-zonal federation. But in practice, its decision to start accession negotiations with Greek Cypriot Administration in the name of whole Cyprus, have I affected the efforts of UN in a very negative way as it is expressed by the General Secretary of the United Nations.⁴⁶

3.7. Relations between Turkey and Cyprus

A partnership state between Turkish and Greek Cypriots was set up in 1960 according to agreements signed by the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot leaders and the Turkish, Greek and British governments. However, in 1963, only three years later, the Turkish Cypriots were ousted by force from all organs of the new Republic by the Greek Cypriots, in contravention of the founding agreements and the constitution. The claim put forth thereafter by Greek Cypriots to represent the "Republic of Cyprus" has been illegal, and has not been recognized by Turkey. The 1974 attempt by Greece to overrun Turkish Cypriots and to annex the island was resisted by Turkey in accordance with the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee. Consequently, Turkish Cypriots set up their own Republic, while continuing the search for reconciliation. The decision of the EU to start negotiations with the Greek Cypriot Administration for the accession of "Cyprus", without the consent of Turkish Cypriots, and in disregard of the negotiations under the auspices of the United Nation's Secretary General further complicated the situation. This has rendered the settlement process more difficult.

⁴⁶ Ebru Kaptan SERTOGLU, Cyprus and European Union relations, international Relations Hacettepe University, September 2000, p. 39-52

Turkey wants a freely negotiated, mutually acceptable, comprehensive and viable settlement in Cyprus. Cyprus is the home of two nations and there exist two states in the Island. Turkey supports the efforts carried out under the good offices mission of the United Nations Secretary-General towards finding a just and viable settlement to the Cyprus issue. As a sign of this, President Denktaş made a peace call to the Greek Cypriot side and proposed the establishment of a “confederation” in Cyprus on August 31, 1998. Foreseeing a confederated structure composed of two peoples and of two states of the island supported by symmetrical agreements with the two respective motherlands and guarantor states, this proposal would provide for the security of both sides and safeguard their identity and well being. However, this call did not receive a positive response. Moreover, President Denktaş, displaying once again his willingness for a settlement and his conciliatory attitude, invited Greek Cypriot leader Clerides to face-to-face talks in the Island in November 2001. In the direct talks between the two parties, which have been in progress since January 2002, six rounds have been completed. In this context, President Denktaş has put forward Turkish Cypriot Party’s comprehensive proposals for a settlement on 29 April 2002, and updated these proposals in a letter to the UN Secretary General on 11 September 2002.

The Turkish side attaches great importance to the settlement of the Cyprus issue and has the necessary political will to this end. However, as long as the Greek Cypriot side claims to be the sole and legitimate government of Cyprus and expects joining the EU without the solution of the problem being a pre-condition, it will be difficult to achieve a mutually acceptable settlement. Furthermore, the embargoes imposed on the Turkish Cypriots constitute another negative factor that damages the relationship between the two parties in Cyprus.

Regarding the accession of the so-called “Republic of Cyprus” to the EU, Turkey and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) never accepted the decision taken at the EU summit in Luxembourg in December 1997 to start accession negotiations with the Greek Cypriot Administration. Through separate press statements, Turkey and TRNC declared that the Greek Cypriot side had no authority to negotiate on behalf of the whole Island and that the EU decision was in contravention of the relevant provisions of the 1959-1960 Treaties on Cyprus, and thus, constituted a violation of international law. The said Treaties prohibit Cyprus from joining any international organization of which both Turkey and Greece are not members. Turkey is currently not a member of the

EU. Therefore, the accession of the Greek Cypriot side to the EU as the result of its unilateral application will not only be against international law but will also deepen the division on the Island.⁴⁷

3.7.1. The Position of the Turkish Part in Cyprus

After the discussion of the facts mentioned beforehand there must be chosen the right political position according to the 4 main circumstances:

- 1) Following the objective reasons to fix the law facts it's important to formulate the questions and responses in this way;
 - a- Does the Government of Greek – part take the interests of Turkish people living on Cyprus into its consideration which was determined by 1960 year agreement? The response is “no” of course.
 - b- Is the government of Greek – part able to unite with the European – Union, without the agreement of Turkish – part who is not the member of this Union?
- 2) The membership of the Greek – part to the European – Union with the name of “Cyprus” is a political aim that will abolish the achieved agreements and negotiations carried on so far, and will restore the circumstance existing till the year of 1974.
- 3) With its strategic view, Cyprus, joining to the European – Union without Turkey means realizing the idea of “Enosis” secretly. The South part of Turkey will be besieged by the government of Greece and will lock all the ways to the open seas.
- 4) There are serious doubts about Economy. The European – Union, the International Finance Organizations and other developed countries gave a 1.5 billion dollar help to the Greek – part of Cyprus for the benefit of their economy.

Following the ideas mentioned beforehand we can make a conclusion:

- 1) The Greek part is not allowed to unite to the Union without solving the problem of Cyprus and inquiring the status of the Turkish population on island.
- 2) After settling the problems of Cyprus, the negotiations with the European-Union must be carried on again. Taking into consideration the equality of rights and according to the agreements of Turkish and Greek parts, 5 years later, an agreement must be done with the participation of Turkey about the plenipotentiary membership to the European Union.

⁴⁷ <http://www.byegm.gov.tr>

3) If these demands are not taken into consideration, there must be taken political, military and economical steps to activate the agreement made in 1994, 29th August, the agreement made between Denktash and Demirel in 1993, December 28th, in 1997, January 20th the Declaration and the decision of Parliament made in the same year on January 21st, also the Declarations made between the dates 1997, 4-20th July to 6th August and 1998, April 23rd. Equal to this, Turkey and the North part of the Republic of Turkey must be integrated in the same form like the Greek part and the European Union. The process of ceasing all kind of negotiations must be fulfilled until the satisfaction is achieved for the demands of Turkish part about the two factual governments existing on Cyprus.

3.7.2. Turkish Politics about Cyprus

Turkey has been sending millions of dollars to Cyprus and extending its budget to about 350 millions in favor of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. South Cyprus is going to be the first country to make net payments into the budget of EU. This procedure would clearly be characterized as loss of money. According to calculations made by Turkish Research Center, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus will receive 240 million euro from regional and social foundations of EU budget. This is equal to 1050 euro per Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus resident, and will certainly decrease burden carried by Ankara.⁴⁸

3.7.3. The Factual Independence of the Republic of Turkey on Cyprus.

England and Greece signed the agreement for the Greek part's integration with the European – Union. After integrating with these two guarantor governments, there will not be any neces-

⁴⁸ Prof. Dr. Faruk Şen, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, s. 50

sity for Turkey to care for the entirety of Cyprus. The Republic of Turkey of the Northern Cyprus is becoming an independent government factually. After enquiring the exact reason of the problem, conflict is believed to be solved. But nowadays as the problem is difficult to be solved, it is supposed to be caused by the mistakes of Turkey, Greece, England, the United Nations and the European – Union’s. The actions done by England and Greece must be specially mentioned. Since 1974 they have been trying to avoid the question of Cyprus “diplomatically”, so what does it mean? Has everything finished for the benefit of Turkey for the Republic of Turkey on the Northern Cyprus? The essence of all these is the following; the South Cyprus (the Greek part) signed the agreement for the integration with the European – Union, but there is an unsettled question that must be solved by the initiative of the General Secretary of the United Nations. Each factor of the Annan Plan must be discussed and then the agreement has to be signed on. According to this plan, the European – Union will make a decision within a different format and Turkey will be integrated to this union. There is a procedure for achieving an optimal result, but it must be indicated that the membership of the Greek – Part with the European – Union will not change the essence of the question. There is another question whether the Greek part will be given the relief after uniting with the European – Union. Of course, they will. The plan of Annan is no more important for the Greek part that was highly claimed by Rauf Denktaş to be realized, as they were not the plenipotentiary members of the European – Union. According to this, the question of Cyprus will not be settled. As the Greek part supposes “Turkey and Cyprian Turks so eager for integrating with the European – Union, they will agree to accept not only the Annan plan, but our claims also, if they continue living under the economical blockade. The viewpoint is depended on the efforts that have been done by Turkey and Cyprian Turks for integrating with the European - Union, because of what, they are ready to go on the compromises. If this supposition is right, it means that Turkey is in front of a more difficult task than it has had in earlier periods.

The supposition here was that Turkey and Cypriot Turks passionately desired to integrate with the European – Union and that’s why they were ready to compensate. There was another hypothesis about not realizing the Annan Packet before Turkey’s plenipotentiary membership with the European - Union.

Though this version does not fit to the interests of the Greek part, the argument is based on the fact that they are not informed about the possibility of Turkey’s integration with the European – Union. Having the guarantee of the membership with this union is also impossible. So we cannot postpone the question of Cyprus that is based on the Annan Plan till Turkey’s plenipotentiary

membership with the European – Union. It means that the settlement has to be made within the borders of the Annan Packet, and integrate the Greek part and the Northern Cyprus together with the European – Union.

It's all right, but what happens if Turkey does not become the member of the European – Union? Or if they say the following words to Turkey: “Thanks for settling the question of Cyprus, but unfortunately there was a high percentage of the member of resistant who were against your membership with this union. Acting by this way, you will make Turks appear in front of the problems, but you will not be able to integrate with the European – Union, too. There are two dangerous circumstances for Turkey: The first one is losing the perspective of uniting with the European – Union. The second one is the agreement about losing the territories of the Turkish Republic on the Northern Cyprus. Why the European – Union's trying to accept the region with so many unsettled problem is not comprehensible. But obviously, the European – Union seems to play two games by using the Greek part properly for its own benefit. I want to underline the circumstances of this game, because in spite of all the things, the European – Union accepted the Greek part to become a plenipotentiary member of the union without setting the question. The essence of the question lies under different circumstances but not in the VETO Rights of Greece against the integration. Greece made important operations about the Cyprus problem between the years 1986 – 87 within the borders of the European – Union. We were unable to impede these efforts, because Greece was the member of the European – Union, but we were not. The European – Union could only cause the problems to them, but our efforts had no results. In 1993, the European – Union agreed to 1990 year's statement made by the Greek part for their plenipotentiary membership with the European – Union. With this action they opened the way to the Greek part to realize the claims they had.

Beside the fact that the European – Union is acting according to the norms of the international law, it had an influence over ignoring the agreement of 1959 -60 and accepting “the Republic of Cyprus” as the member of this union. It was the break of the law norms, but we should not think them so, if we consider them as the formal law norms. By using the military forces, Greeks have abolished constitutional systems in 1963 that was ruled by both parties. 1964, the decision that is consisted of 186 pages was made by the Security Council of the United Nations. According to it, the South Cyprus is being mentioned as the island of Cyprus. After making this decision, the International Commonwealth Countries recognize Cyprus as the south Cyprus. Since 1984 until now, Turkey has been unable to change these circumstances. The reason of accepting the decision of 186 pages was the violating military facts that began in 1963 and were seriously grown during 1964.

We had to stop the violation by using our own forces, but the Turkish part was unable to do it in this period or they had to use the Peace Corps for this process. The decision of 186 pages was created to send the Peace Corps to Cyprus. This was the reason of using the term “The Republic of Cyprus” towards the Greek part by the Turkish side.

According to this fact the European – Union made a decision for satisfying the Greek – Part’s claim about their member – ship with this union. The International Law says: for the existence of the government the following factors are necessary to exist to secure the territorial entirety, beside the fact that the Commonwealth Countries do not recognize the North part of Cyprus as a government, though it is any way, because of its existing borders, flag and authority of ruling the government. Due to the Turkish military forces on Cyprus, the independence of the Republic of Turkey is no more in the danger. Let’s recall the East Germany where were so many Soviet soldiers, but it was an independent government within the borders of General Secretary of the United Nations. The independence of the government is not restricted by the existence of the foreign military forces inside the country.

3.7.4. The Military Factor of Turkey over Cyprus

The location of the Turkish Military Forces on the island represents a base for peace in the region. The Ambassador of Germany to the Republic of Turkey on Cyprus Rudolf Mauser marks on the peaceful process carried on Cyprus though, the Greek parliament seems to be mainly consisting of the former terrorists who have hostile attitudes towards Turkey. Now there is a question that how do you expect the problem to be solved in a positive way if there are such people in the Greek part with this kind of conceptions? They do not aim to settle the question peacefully, but they try to cause difficulties for the peaceful process. This is the idea of an Ambassador from one of the advanced governments expressed after his long time observations. The results of the referendum held on the island shows the objectivity of this idea. In my opinion, it’s high time for the Greek – part to ignore this kind of inappropriate actions. They wish Turkey could make a compromise and establish the peace under the press of United Nation as a result.

The peace that was established with the intervention of Turkish Military Force is fairly known by everybody. Their existence is a guarantee for the peace and stability of the island. This

idea is well known for politicians and for the press, too. To establish the peace and stability, it is necessary to give the parties equal rights on the island. The Europeans' opinion about this fact is the following: why don't they try to settle this conflict without causing any difficulties there as we managed to overcome this kind of a problem according to the agreement in Maastricht? Such conflict cannot be solved with the pressure of the United Nations over the parties. It can only be solved with their own free – wills and agreements.

The plenipotentiary member – ship of the South Cyprus with the European – Union, or its member – ship with the Customs Union, is against the Lozan and Zurich Laws, according to the German Ambassador Mauser. The economy of the Northern Cyprus has a big damage that has already caused hard conditions there. When asked to raise the question that how sounded the idea of uniting the Turkish part with the European – Union, his respond was obvious. Europeans will not let the Northern Cyprus to integrate with the Customs Union since it is a pleasure to keep 60 thousand people who are in bad conditions, waiting. They do not want to be exposed to the exposition of Cyprian Greeks. They managed to launder a big amount of money. Beside these, they try to integrate the South Cyprus with the Europe and ignore Cyprian Turks and even Turkey and make them to be out of the process.

CHAPTER - IV

THE WAYS OF SOLUTION APPLIED UP TILL NOW

4.1. What is Effective and Actual Guarantor

As it is known, Turkey, England and Greece took their responsibility for maintaining the independency of the newborn Republic of Cyprus, by keeping its territorial entirety and security system of the Government with the agreement signed in 1960 Zurich and London.

According to this agreement Turkey, Greece and England were given a right to use their forces in case the independency of their territorial entirety were in danger.⁴⁹

4.2. The Definition of the “Cyprus Plan”

- 1) The structure of the Cyprus Constitution is going based on the principles of the welfare between Greek and Turkish parts.
- 2) With the partner – ship and agreement of both of the parts, there is going to be established a common security on Cyprus.

⁴⁹ <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru150.htm>

3) According to the demands of article 5, that's been about the close relationship between the administrative units, the principle of the welfare is considered to be realized between the two societies.

4) The central authority is going to be based on the principles of the Presidential Board.

5) There is a possibility of ruling the Greek and Turkish parts by administrative municipal settlements. Generally, villages and the municipal units are included in the business of the social ruling.

The representatives who were elected from the Turkish and the Greek sides would be given the right of the legislation. They would unite their business with "The House of the Representatives"

After looking through the achieved results of the 3 responsible sides and Geneva – agreement, there seemed some circumstances of welfare for the benefit of Turkey. To redistribute the forces equally, there was a necessity for an administrative system on Cyprus. In fact, it meant "The authority of Cyprus does not exist." The World's Commonwealth Countries ignored the agreement that's been achieved so far, it was a pity that they considered the Greek – part as unique, "Official Authority" on Cyprus. This was a main reason of unsettling the question of Cyprus.⁵⁰

4.3. Achenson Plan

In February 1990, the disregard of the equality of rights of Turkish people by Vasilious with his denial of their self-determination and prevention to recognize Cyprian Turks as an original and a different nation, blocked the process of settling a question.

The project, that was offered by the General Security in 1990, March 5th, considered both sides as equal in their rights. This was discussed and accepted by the Security Council, in addition to a new decision, taken on March 12th, in 1990.

The decision, taken by the United Nations (N 649), underlined the factual existence of both sides and the equality of their rights⁵¹

⁵⁰ <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru150.htm>

⁵¹ <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru150.htm>

4.4. Cuellar's Report

In 1990, July 12th, the General Security Cuellar presented a report to the Security Council of United Nations, underlining a principle of the Equality of rights of both sides.

The question is discussed in a following way:

“Cyprus is presented as an environment for the existence of Turkish and Greek sides. The relationship between these sides is not the relation between the majority and minority, but the relationship of two equal sides in the Government of Cyprus. The arrangement process of this question has to base on the principles of the equality of rights.

Cuellar also underlined the circumstance of the existence of the two equal sides on Cyprus, whose political equality and sovereignty are to function officially by the two sides of this Government.

The reports made by Cuellar beforehand, caused displeasure in the Greek part. They were explained as “a notification of Turkish people's advantage”⁵²

4.5. The Map and the Plan of Butros GALI

The Prime – Minister of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus Rauf Denktash sent an official message to the United Nations Secretary-General Butros Gali that was presented in the following way:

Dear General Secretary!

Thanks for the letter sent on December 17th, 1993. After the elections that were held in the Turkish Republic on December 12th, the government and authority have begun their functioning. With the agreement of parliament and the authority I was allowed to participate to the process of the negotiations that were expected to go on between the sides. I agreed with this decision and I

⁵² <http://www.brt.gov.nc.tr/haberler/haber/sagmenu/belgeler/bm649.htm>

would like to show my proud feelings evoked by that occasion. Under the light of this fact because of slowing the temp of the negotiations, I would like to express my grateful feelings towards you.⁵³

Prime – Minister Rauf Denktash

4.6. The Federal System Offered by Turkey

After the second peaceful operation, to prevent a military escalation, Turkey offered the Greek side to settle the question according to the system of Canton, but the offer was declined by the Greek side. The plan was formulated in the following way:

- 1) The Republic of Cyprus will be an independent government (with the existence of two sides), depending on the principles of welfare for both sides.
- 2) The Republic will consist of six Turkish and two Greek federative units.
- 3) The control over these zones will be done by the special groups.⁵⁴

4.7. Efforts Done for Settling the Question of Cyprus

The first article of this agreement considers the following: The sides have to collaborate with each other, for their common security. In case of arising problems in the security sphere, they deal with their problems together.

According to the second article, the prevention of the military violence must be done by using the combined forces.

Article 3: The aim of the coalition is, to establish a military coalition on Cyprus, with the participation of the three parts in it. This military coalition will be consisted by 950 Greeks and 650 Turks. At the same time the Government of Cyprus is given a right to claim for the reduction or the

⁵³ <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kkctc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru150.htm>

⁵⁴ <http://www.brt.gov.nc.tr/haberler/haber/sagmenu/belgeler/tckanton.htm>

increase of the number of military servants from Turkish and Greek sides. Greek and Turkish parts provide the training of Cyprus military forces. Ruling of the coalitional military forces is managed by the Greek Turkish and Cyprian Generals who have been chose for one year, by the Governments of Greece, Turkey and Cyprus. There will be established a committee for the highest coalition with the help of Cyprian, Turkish and Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs. Its function will be discussing the questions offered from the authority of different parts.⁵⁵

4.8. Annan Plan for Cyprus

The Annan Plan was the proposal of the United Nations to settle the Cyprus dispute of the divided island's nations of Cyprus as the United Cyprus Republic. It was named after United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan, who largely devised the proposal together with Didier Pfirter.

Proposal



Proposed flag of the United Cyprus Republic

The 5th revision of the Annan Plan proposed the creation of the United Cyprus Republic, covering the island of Cyprus in its entirety (except for the British Sovereign Base Areas). This new country was to be a loose confederation of two component states – the Greek Cypriot State and the Turkish Cypriot State – joined together by a minimal federal government apparatus.

This federal level, loosely based on the Swiss confederate model, would have incorporated the following elements:

⁵⁵ <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru40.htm>

A collective Presidential Council, made up of six voting members, allocated according to population (per present levels, four Greek Cypriots and two Turkish Cypriots), and selected and voted in by parliament. An additional three non-voting members would be assigned 2:1.

A President and Vice President, chosen by the Presidential Council from among its members, one from each community, to alternate in their functions every 20 months during the council's five-year term of office.

A bicameral legislature:

A Senate (upper house), with 48 members, divided 24:24 between the two communities.

A Chamber of Deputies (lower house) with 48 members, divided in proportion to the two communities' populations (with no fewer than 12 for the smaller community).

A Supreme Court composed of equal numbers of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot judges, plus three foreign judges; to be appointed by the Presidential Council.

The plan included a federal constitution, constitutions for each constituent state, a string of constitutional and federal laws, and a proposal for a United Cyprus Republic flag and national anthem. It also provided for a Reconciliation Commission to bring the two communities closer together and resolve outstanding disputes from the past.

It would also have established a limited right to return between the territories of the two communities, and it would have allowed both Greece and Turkey to maintain a permanent military presence on the island, albeit with large, phased reductions in troop numbers.⁵⁶

4.8.1. The Referendum in Cyprus, 2004

The two major communities of the de facto divided island's nations of Cyprus held a referendum on settling the Cyprus dispute on 24th April 2004. The people of Cyprus were asked to choose a ratifying or rejecting vote for the 5th revision of the United Nations' proposal known as the Annan Plan.

⁵⁶ <http://www.unficy.org/media/Other%20official%20documents/annanplan.pdf>

The Annan Plan's Referendum Results

Voting sectors	Yes	No	Turnout
Turkish Cypriot Community	64.90%	35.09%	87%
Greek Cypriot Community	24.17%	75.83%	88%

The participation in the referendum of post-1974 Northern Cyprus settlers from mainland Turkey was disputed by many Greek Cypriots, but this was not deemed a matter of relevance to the referendum.

Since the Cypriot Greek Community did not approve the plan and implementation of the plan was depend on its approval by both communities, the Annan Plan became null and void. The European Union states: "In light of Protocol 10 of the Accession Treaty, 2003, Cyprus entered the EU as a whole, whereas the acquits are suspended in the northern part of the island ("areas not under effective control of the government of the Republic of Cyprus"). This means inter alia that these areas are outside the customs and fiscal territory of the EU. The suspension has territorial effect, but does not concern the personal rights of Turkish Cypriots as EU citizens, as they are considered as citizens of the Member State Republic of Cyprus"

Had the plan been ratified by both sides, Cyprus would have entered the EU as the United Cyprus Republic.

Reasons for 'Yes' and 'No' vote



Divided Cyprus

The main reason for the 75 percent "no" vote among Greek Cypriots in the referendum was the general perception that the Annan Plan was unbalanced and excessively pro-Turkish, and that it would not safeguard Greek Cypriot rights in the north.

Political leaders of both controlled areas of the Republic of Cyprus and Greece also influenced the Greek Cypriot vote strongly for the opposing of the plan. Tassos Papadopoulos, the President of the Republic of Cyprus, made an emotional speech against the plan broadcast live on television. Two days before the referendums, Cyprus' biggest party, AKEL, decided to reject the Annan Plan because of its perceived bias. Greek Prime Minister Kostas Karamanlis decided to maintain a "neutral" position over the plan, but the Greek opposition by the leader George Papandreou (of the PASOK party) urged Cypriots to vote in favor of the plan, because the plan had been promoted by his political party while it was still on power and Mr. Papandreou himself was the Foreign Minister of Greece during the last PASOK term. Mr. Papandreou even stated that the plan was laid out during his term and that both parts were ready for "a final common agreement" before his party lost the elections. Mr. Papandreou's involvement in conceiving and negotiating crucial points of the plan has been a source of controversy in Greece, at least during the referendum days.

Many Greek Cypriots opposed to the plan since it meant endorsing a confederate state with a weak central government and considerable local autonomy, rather than the pre-1974 *status quo ante* of Greek Cypriot majority rule over a minority Turkish population. It would also have left Greeks dispossessed of their homes in 1974 without any financial compensation or the return of their property. The plan would have cemented the division of Cyprus into two political entities and safeguarded the presence of settlers from mainland Turkey, both of which were felt to be illegitimate and unfair outcomes. Any solution other than a return to the *status quo ante* was deemed unacceptable by many Greek Cypriots, and opinion polls conducted over the entire period of the negotiations from start to finish had always shown around 80% opposition to the proposals.

There were reservations over the fate of property or humanitarian disputes, which could no longer be brought to an International Court according to the plan, but would have to be settled by a third party set by the warring forces. An embargo on weapon imports to the Greek Cypriot side, until the Turkish Cypriot side would be able to fully support itself. That also caused reservations among Greek Cypriots partially, because it did not apply to the Turkish forces.

On the Turkish Cypriot side, the plan was felt to be excessively pro-Greek, but most Turkish Cypriots were willing to accept it as a means of ending their prolonged international isolation and exclusion from the wider European economy. It was opposed by their leader, the Turkish Cy-

priot President Rauf Denktash' actively avocations for a "No" vote. However, his Prime Minister Mehmet Ali Talat favored the plan's acceptance; likewise the Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan supported it, too. Turkey saw the resolution of the Cyprus issue as being an essential first step to eventuate Turkish membership of the EU as well as a way of defusing tensions with Greece.

The Grey Wolves (a Turkish right-wing nationalist group belonging to the MHP nationalist party) actively advocated a "no" vote. There were some limited riots caused by the Grey Wolves party activists against pro-ratification supporters during the pre-vote period. At least 50 such activists arrived in Northern Cyprus during the pre-voting period. However, the referendum itself passed off peacefully and was supposed to be free and fair.

Both sides also had reservations over the fate of property or humanitarian disputes, which could no longer be brought before an International Court according to the plan, but would have to be settled in Cyprus, in front of a specially appointed non-EU court, including UN, UK and USA representatives.

Although the plan was declared on 1st April 2004, it continued to be modified until only 24 hours before the referendum, enabling opponents to argue that people were being asked to vote on something they had not even seen and whose consequences could not be fully analyzed.⁵⁷

The Republic of Turkey on the Northern Cyprus accepted the United Nations' plan and displayed its own attitude about setting the question in a peaceful way towards the whole world. Their action was disliked by those forces, which are against the integration of Turkey with the European – Union. Destructive forces tried to use the factor of terror that would impede to establish stability on the island. The group of terrorists so called PKK tried to tense the situation there, because of this, Cyprus was begun to send the commando. This group was helped by some of the influential forces whose aim was the total migration of the Turkish population. PKK's (KONGRA – GEL) propose was to liquidate Turkish Military Servants, mostly colonels and Majors, so as to send their back – sights. Terrorists did their intensive ideological works and made their aggressive acts to the Kurdish population of Cyprus. The terrorist organization that moves from Turkey to the Northern Cyprus was helped by the Greek Military Forces. This collaboration was a version of the European – terror. Although the European government criticized the terror at first, they supported to use the

⁵⁷ <http://www.unficy.org/media/Other%20official%20documents/annanplan.pdf>

methods of terror itself, by causing the disappointment of Turkey. So, they should not forget one thing; terror does not have a nationality, a religion and a language. Those forces, who are struggling with Turkey today, will struggle with the people who finance and help them in the future.

4.8.2. Greeks Say “No“

Why were Greeks against the plan on the Referendum besides its positive attitude towards them? The population was forced by the Greek part's authority to negate the Annan Plan, for the regulations of the conflict. In order to settle the question in a constructive way. Turkish people chased and adopted the plan unanimously, while the advantageous Greek part that are the member of the European – Union, did not use it properly. Their aim was not settling the question completely, but gaining more profit in the process of the negotiations. Besides, their interests that were considered as possible, they ignored the offered plan.

Let's discuss the shares they had portioned out, according to this plan.

Generally, the plan can be presented to the sides at the referendum with the following definition: by the year 2011, the quantity of the Greek and the Turkish military servants, will have been reduced till 6 thousand on island, and by the year 2018 this number will have been reduced till 3 thousand. After that, the quantity of the Turkish military servants will be 650, the Greek – part's will be 950 and in the following years the demilitarization control on the military forces will be done every three years though, it used to be held every 5 years, before. 36 per cent of the territories, which are under the control of the Turkish part, would be reduced to 29 per – cent. Giuzeliurt and other territories would be handed to the Turkish side. Besides, the territories, belonging to Turks, would be a consecutive settlement for the Greek population, though there are some obstacles is setting Greeks to the North direction. The number of Greeks, returning to the Northern part had should not been more than 18 per cent of the Turkish population for the next 19 years. These kinds of restrictions will be annulled, later on. During this period, they will be abolished earlier than Turkey integrates with the European – Union.

Only Greeks from Sipah, Dick Karpar, Yeni Erengois and Adachag will be returned to their homes without any impediments. The lands, which are expected to be handed to the Greek – part, will be divided and handed in 6 stage processes, in about 24 months period.

There are some limits considering the purchasing on immovable property, for not breaking the number of the senators (24 representatives from each side) in the senate. Their selection is not depending on their citizenship, but it depends on their ethnicity. For electing the representatives of parliaments and Euro – Parliament, the federal groups are going to the Government of Turkey and the Republic of Turkey on the Northern Cyprus who have always agreed and will agree in the future to settle a question peacefully. Their position is confirmed with many occasions. After the Turkish armed forces were settled, there have not been any bloody events on the island. Turkish military servants stopped the massacre on Cyprus.

The question must finally be solved. But the interests of both parties have to be taken into consideration. First and for most, neither of the parties will be given any privileges under the Equality of Rights in this federative republic, in case the republic is established on Cyprus.

Turkey must maintain the status of the guaranteed government; therefore, if the question of redistributing the territories arises, for the benefit of Turkey, they must be redistributed, so as to develop the economy of the country that is mainly based on Tourism and Agriculture. That's why the part of GIRNE and the Airport of ERCAN are given the great impotencies, economically, as well as with the security intention. There must be taken special attitude towards the question of Cyprus, for instance Marash is an insignificant part of Cyprus. It is expected to hold the election on July 13th. The federal authority will be completed by 3 Turkish and 3 Greek Minister. There will be sent 4- Greek and 2- Turkish parliamentarians. The Presidential Board will be completed by 6- Greek and 3-Turkish representatives. The president and the Prime – Minister will be appointed for 10 months period. At the beginning they will be changed correspondingly, according to the parties. In the next period, a Greek representative will be appointed as a chairman in 40 months - period and Turkish - part representative for 20 months period. There is a necessity of one Turkish representative to have a minimum right to take decision there; that's why neither of the parties is given any priorities.

After the year 1974, 45 thousand inhabitants who were settled on Cyprus, were given the rights to stay on the island. After making the agreement, the number of the Turks who are going to be exiled on Cyprus must not be more than 5 per cent of the Turkish part. These are the main claims of the plan. The decision must be taken by the Cyprus native population. Let's see what their position will be.

The main reason of not settling the question of Cyprus is not a benevolent and a constructive attitude of the West towards this problem. It is expected to leave this territory, Marash. It's not

a big part of Cyprus, but it has had 40 thousand sectors considering the Tourism. This number is more than the total number of the sectors of the whole Turkey.

The number of percents of the territories to be dropped is not important, but what important is the meaning of the territories.

The irrelevant attitudes of the European – Union are grooving day by day. All the members of the European – Union, except Greece who announced that the integration to the European – Union without setting the question of Cyprus was impossible and only the Greek part should not become the member of this Union. Some of the members of the government think Greece to cause a lot of problems towards the union. For what is this actual problem necessary to add to other problems? Once again, the European – Union confirmed its dual practice attitude towards Turkey by accepting the Greek part to their own Union. This position is not appropriate to the norms of 21th century International Law. Turkey is considered to be aggressive towards Cyprus. The Turkish military servants must leave the island without forgetting one thing: We act according to the security agreement and use the rights of this agreement, by using their forces. The system of the constitution was abolished by the Greeks. England and Greece did not agree on collaboration with Turkey after Turkey's application to them to stop the aggression. According to this, Turkey used the right of Intervention. This is a reality about the question of Cyprus.⁵⁸

4.8.3. Greek Refusal

Greeks refused to accept the United Nations' plan. The Referendum that held on April 24th, played a main role in formulating the future of the island. With the refusal of Greeks and with the agreement of Cyprus, the way of taking free steps for the Turkish Republic was opened. The plan No: 5 of Kofi Annan was profitable for the Republic of Turkey on the Northern Cyprus, and for Turkey itself, because according to this plan the number of Turkish representations would be grown in the senate and would be equalized to the number of the Greek representatives, who are consisted of 24 Senators there. The main point of the Annan plan is the two governments to be equal in their rights, by making their Common Federation. They would use their rights without any

⁵⁸ <http://www.trncinfo.com/TANITMADAIRESI/2002/TURKCE/TARIH/tarih.htm#Annan%20Planı>

restrictions except those rights they would hand voluntarily within the federal systems created by them. These were the whole complexity of the rights that were firm by the Annan Plan. But Greek part's denial of this plan dragged the basement out, and made the uprightness of the plan obvious in practice. This plan could not be called as defective or un-valuable for setting the question of Cyprus. There is only one inevitable alternative for the establishment of the government with equal rights within the bounds of federation, the formulation of the constitution. Obviously, there are two governments existed on the island in fact. Because of their past conflicts, the factor of confidence was reduced among them. If you do not manage to restore the faith between these two people, and give them a guarantee of living in peace, you will not manage to cease the conflict even by making an ideal constitution and an agreement there.

We saw well enough the displeasure of the Greek part about the agreement in New – York meeting. The Turkish part began to attack for the first time.

Greeks had had some advantages until that marked period. Turks used to leave the table at every negotiation without any pleasure, but Greeks did not feel the necessity to express their protest there. These traditions were broken after presenting the plan of Annan. At the process of the negotiations the Greek part seemed to be surprised and confused for the first time. They did not want to soothe the conflict of Cyprus, where membership with the European – Union helps them to act according to their wishes. During the renewal period of the negotiations their passion was presented by their reflection of being the only factual government on the island. They also stated that the North part of Cyprus was conquered by Turks. Their part was not able to make a control over the Northern Cyprus, but they were ready to change the present constitution of the Republic of Cyprus. They would support the rights of all Turks as they were minority. According to the majority of the Greek – Part the last word belongs to them. Their aim had been clearly seen after Turks began to protect their own possessions. The Greeks did not like that offered plan, which considered the equality of rights and considered the freedom of both parties. This idea was not accepted by the Greeks, but the results of the referendum brought a great success to the Turkish part. According to this fact, Turkey fulfilled the duties it was obliged to do. Following to this, the republic of the Northern Cyprus maintains the embargo status. Correspondingly, they were forced to recognize the Northern Cyprus. The Republic of Northern Cyprus made a new format of the relationships with the European – Union. As a response of this the European – Union will accept the North part of Cyprus as an individual government in the Union. After this plan, the negotiations would be held by the representatives from Turkey and Greece from the governments with equal rights. In case the

European – Union does not give a chance to Turkey, the results will be desperately bad for the Union. There are 16 billion Muslims living in Europe nowadays. According to Iraq, American policy there is a great displeasure for Muslims towards the West Civilization. If the European – Union does not let Turkey to integrate with the Union through, this tense period and possibility of the War between the civilizations, there will be confirmed the act of terrorism caused by the enemies of the West Civilizations. The denial of the European – Union of Turkey's integration with its Union will grow the hostilities of Muslims towards Europe. In spite of realizing every demands of the European – Union, Turkey is still ignored from it. The Europe who used to declare its own resistance towards a foreign religion and a civilization carries on a different policy itself. All their decisions which ignore Turkey confirm the idea about the West Civilization of Europe, which Union is “the Union of the Christianity.” This factor actualizes the thesis of “the attack of the civilizations” that is a great shame of the Westerns' intellectual and educated people in the 21st century.

4.9. Greeks Think to Settle the Question in Cyprus Like That

The Claims of the Greek – part can generally be formatted so:

1. Turkey refuses to wear the status of the guarantor or will restrict its own rights that are connected to the situation. It will not be given the right of the unilateral military intervention and will withdraw the forces from the island. The decisions about the military intervention will be made by the security council of United Nation, NATO and the European – Union.
2. There will not be existed the right of equality in the policy, as the majority and the minority are impossible to use their rights equally there. 18 % of the population will not be equal to 82 %.
3. Turkey will agree that they have the status of minority.
4. The island will be totally left by the Turkish military forces.
5. The Republic of the Northern Cyprus will be divided into parties.
6. There will not be formatted the federal system of the two governments with equal rights.
7. Since the Turks do not present themselves as a different nation they will not be given the right of self determination or the right of the isolation,

8. Greeks will be appointed to the positions of the President, the Prime – Minister, and to every other important position, while Turks will be appointed as their assistance there.
9. The regions (but not the governments) will not be given the right to carry on the economical and political relation – ships with the third government independently.
10. Turks will not have any priorities in their regions.
11. All the Greek refugees will be returned to their own dwelling.
12. There will not be existed a border between the two regions.
13. Greeks will be given the right of inhabiting to the Northern part, with their own property and with the right of the free movement there.
14. All the Turkish citizens who settled on Cyprus will be sent back.
15. It will be thought as a step for accepting the process of “ Enosis”
16. Cyprus will become the member of the European – Union but Turks have to be integrated with “Cyprus” according to the example of Germany.⁵⁹

Iakovs – the Patriarch of American Orthodox Church stated the following about the mentioned strategy at the meeting with the Greek officials in 1991.

“The question is expected to be solved according to our historical wishes and expectations. This will be considered as a condition of MODUS VIVENDI”.

MODUS VIVENDI comes from the Latin terminology and means “A meditorial step”, in other words, the Greek patriarch confessed about their plan, that was nothing more, but the part of “Enosis” that is a basement of the Greek chauvinism.

4.10. Turkey Supports This Kind of Settlement for Cyprus

1. For the welfare of its own inhabitants, Turkey must keep the status of the guarantor and the right of the unilateral military intervention. The military forces of Turkey must remain on the north part of the island.
2. The main request is acquiring the equal political rights. Turkish inhabitants ought to use all the rights as the Greek part do.

⁵⁹ <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru148.htm>

3. Turkish people are not the minority of the island. They will not agree to have the status of minority beside the advantages of the majority. There must be recognized. The principle of the Turkish people's hegemony with the independence of the Republic of Turkey on the Northern Cyprus.
4. Turkish military forces will leave the island according to the contract statements. There will be left only the required number of the military forces for securing the Turkish inhabitants.
5. The Republic of Turkey of the Northern Cyprus will not be divided into parties, but it will become the member of the federal government maintaining the equality of rights.
6. The people of both parties have to establish two governments with equal rights. To integrate with the existing de-facto government is impossible. This government must be separated.
7. The new government ought to be named as "The Union of Greek and Turkish Republics", There must be underlined the existence of the two governments with equal rights.
8. As an individual nation Turks have the right of self-determination. This right is obviously formulated at the same time with the right of the isolation within the borders of the agreement.
9. The President, the chairman of the parliament, the minister of the foreign affairs and other candidates from both parties must be successively appointed to their positions. The rights and the obligations must be shared equally in all the sections of the government.
10. The unions of the federation must have the ability of making the economical and political relationships with the third governments.
11. In order to control the free transportation and the restoring of the gained property, there must be established a kind of monetary.
12. Turkish people ought to use their total rights in their own government.
13. All the Greek refugees are impossible to be returned. It can only be if the borders are redistributed. There must be considered the items of Dantash – Makarios Agreement about the question of the security and the property taken at the process of the redistribution, in the year 1977. Turkish people must not be forced to migrate again for the fourth time.
14. The question of the Land must be solved according to the existing situation. The principle of the compensation must also be realized.
15. The federal parts will use their rights without any restrictions, except the common rights that will be transferred in the hands of the central authority. The decisions must be taken according to the common agreement at the council of Ministers. Polling system should function at the parliament as well.

16. The territory that will remain within the borders of the Turkish part has to be useful for the development of the economy, and proper for the security purpose.
17. There must not be allowed the violated migration of the Turkish people and inhabiting the Greek population on these territories.
18. The Republic of Turkey of the Northern Cyprus makes the decision itself for the status of its own citizens. The migration of these citizens from the Northern Cyprus is impossible.
19. The agreements must be formed according to the referendum, with the agreement of both parties.
20. By using the name of “Cyprus”, Cyprian Greeks will not become the members of the European – Union totally. Their plenipotentiary membership will be possible only after making an agreement with the Turkish part.
21. Turkish part is highly necessary to be involved and invited as a factual government in the negotiations held for its plenipotentiary membership with the union.
22. If the claims are not accepted, CHKTR will continue functioning with the same status it’s got until now.⁶⁰

4.11. The Last Way of Solution Proposed by United Nations (Annan Plan for Cyprus)

The Annan Plan was the proposal of the United Nations to settle the Cyprus dispute of the divided island’s nations of Cyprus as the United Cyprus Republic. It was named after United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan, who largely devised the proposal together with Didier Pfirter.

The 5th revision of the Annan Plan proposed the creation of the United Cyprus Republic, covering the island of Cyprus in its entirety (except for the British Sovereign Base Areas). This new country was to be a loose confederation of two component states – the Greek Cypriot State and the Turkish Cypriot State – joined together by a minimal federal government apparatus.

⁶⁰ <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru147.htm>

This federal level, loosely based on the Swiss confederate model, would have incorporated the following elements:

A collective Presidential Council, made up of six voting members, allocated according to population (per present levels, four Greek Cypriots and two Turkish Cypriots), and selected and voted in by parliament. An additional three non-voting members would be assigned 2:1.

A President and Vice President, chosen by the Presidential Council from among its members, one from each community, to alternate in their functions every 20 months during the council's five-year term of office.

A bicameral legislature:

A Senate (upper house), with 48 members, divided 24:24 between the two communities.

A Chamber of Deputies (lower house) with 48 members, divided in proportion to the two communities' populations (with no fewer than 12 for the smaller community).

A Supreme Court composed of equal numbers of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot judges, plus three foreign judges; to be appointed by the Presidential Council.

The plan included a federal constitution, constitutions for each constituent state, a string of constitutional and federal laws, and a proposal for a United Cyprus Republic flag and national anthem. It also provided for a Reconciliation Commission to bring the two communities closer together and resolve outstanding disputes from the past.

It would also have established a limited right to return between the territories of the two communities, and it would have allowed both Greece and Turkey to maintain a permanent military presence on the island, albeit with large, phased reductions in troop numbers.⁶¹

⁶¹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Annan_Plan

CHAPTER - V

THE SOURCE OF PERMANENT SOLUTION IN CYPRUS IS EDUCATION

5.1. The Only Solution for Cyprus Problem is Education

I assert that the only way to get out of the problem is education, because of the fact that the solutions that have been developed were in vain. Some agreed, others were against, this happened to every project. Even so called “Annan” plan, which was supposed to be the most successful decision to the problem did not bring any positive solution. While Turkish side felt quite positive about the plan, Cyprus Greeks were against it. Seems as if no other plan is left, and both parties still bear a hope for the last plan Of Anan. I believe that my plan, even though being a long term project, I go to bring both conflicting sides to the end of the problem. The building bricks of this project are young generation and teachers, ready to sacrifice a lot for the idea. Solution is to build schools where respect to universal laws would be thought to young people. These schools should be able to criticize any that is under discussion and open new horizons in science. And the only institution that can accomplish this task is school.

5.2. What Kind of Education Should Be

5.2.1. Today's World and Science

Science has made such a major improvement within last quarter of century that all the discoveries made since the start of human being existence can be taken as a tiny particle. Still would be wrong to assert that we have reached the ultimate point. It hard to think of the pas without science, as well as it is impossible to think of the future without mentioning science in it. In the final end it is all about science. There is n future without science. Speculating about science it would be rather impolite not to mention those who make the science and deliver it to humanity- teachers. Science should be delivered to people just because people have full rights for it, but not out the fact that those to whom is delivered share the same ideology as the one who teaches, this would be considered as the attempt to frame the freedom of individual.

Science is to something that should be sold or bought, one should not be allowed to get profit out of it, otherwise it have no right to be called science. To be exact , profit should gained by the whole humanity, heather than a certain group f people, only in that case knowledge can be called science, One could not be able to deliver ay goodness to humanity, thinking of profit while teaching. It is impossible to think of science, collective mind and innovations in a place where everyone is forced to think in a single way. In order to save our young generation we are to educate them using all influence tools like family, mass media, and educational institutions. The problem is that since quite long it has been left on its own. Only b by the help o education one can learn how to respect universal values, respect ones moral values, and learn what love is. It is important that those who give education would be able to sacrifice their “today” for everybody “tomorrow” making no plan for the future is suicide.

There always exists action-reaction correlation. Bearing this fact in mind we can imagine type of next generation that is going to be brought up out of education given today. That is why it is of major importance to make a plan and do all preparations related to it. Universe always undergoes some changes throughout its life. Human being can not be left out changes as well. Since every-

thing is changing, developing in universe, we, people, have to pace the old as well. Actually, without having an understanding of what “changes” means, it is impossible to find out the reason of “existence”, Child from its cradle should be thought his or her traditional together with universal values, the intensity of education should be increased throughout lifetime. The most important task is not to give education but to be able to apply the knowledge we get into life. It is also important to educate all social groups, starting from early ages and ending with old people, in order not to end up with confrontations in ideals and principles.

Technology we have developed till this time is rather dangerous as well as useful. Last two centuries have been the most crowded in terms of historical and social events. It is rather important to use science and technology we developed in sake of humanity. It should not get in to evil hands.

Science and technology is in hands of human beings, and here is no real reason to be afraid of it danger does not come from science it comes from those who use it. Even planned actions can end up with disaster. One should be looking for ways to make use of science and technology for sake of humanity. It is not technology but user whom we should be afraid of. Einstein could understand it only after Hiroshima and Nagasaki have been bombed that his discovery turned out to be in evil hands, and begged pardon from his Japanese colleague.

But the bitterest observation made is that not only those who were in charge of thousands of deaths begged pardon, some were even proud of their deed. Reason for this is that people have no ideals; they follow their own egoistic individualistic “instincts”. People would become successful in their life; if they live their life’s sticking to humanistic philosophy and principles. That is where teachers come to play. If young generations are left on their own without education, which includes moral education as well, it will lead to self destruction. The only way out of this dead end is bringing up generation according to moral humanistic values. It is not about being not educated, being not able to read, write or have knowledge in science; it is about being dogmatic, being closed to other ways of thinking. Dogmatism of present is much more dangerous than dogmatism of the past. They can read and write, but they are slaves of their own EGO. Because of our own EGO we cannot solve humanity problems make our life’s happier. CEHALET is hard to describe, it is a tendency of developing science, technology and degrading cultural state of population at the same time. If there was shown respect to universal values together with developing trend of science there would be much more understanding between folks, nations.

There is major task coming up in this context for teachers. Since solution lies in education teachers play a huge role in the plan. If they succeed with this task, those conflicting people will become more just friends.

5.2.2. Educative Role of Teachers in Education

If we want to solve all human problems, we have to strengthen our education. That means we have to pay great attention to the main actor in this piece-teacher. School- can be considered as a laboratory where solution is being sought, lectures are the pills, and the teacher is the master who can explain and answer to question like what how and why.

Teacher should be able to show the true way in this life to his young fellows. He should always be on alarm and be ready to fulfill his task. Students will bear those ideas they absorbed from they let or in their hearts throughout their life. One has to use those things her she has learned in order to shape life, otherwise surrounding conditions will shape it. The greatest master that does not give up with giving lessons is life itself. But those who cannot learn from lessons given by life need some interpretations. In this context we can consider teachers as an interpretation. Good lesson is lesson hat is learned by the help of teacher, at school. It is important to know what and when to educate. It is impossible to call someone who teaches hate as a teacher.

Teacher is someone who gives direction to life. He has much more influence on a child than even parents. He plays the role of both parents. Teacher should not feel sorry for the lectures given, get into politics. His heart and should make up a union and teach his students principles of universal unity.

Most important aspect is to know what how, why to teach. There is no need to educate people if are going to become enemies in the end. Political and social preferences of nations nowadays are in a direct relation with education people get. Teacher has to prepare students for the future. Every family wants its child to get the best education and find a better place in this world, but this is not the main aim. The main task is to bring a child that would respect for universal moral values; this can be done only by the help of virtuous teachers. The happiest thing is when minds of young people would be filled up with scientific knowledge, and their hearts with respect to universal principles. These young people will not be scared by any difficulties.

One cannot ignore the fact that we live in rather difficult period of time. Young people feel themselves rather depressed under the pressure of materialistic world with its materialistic principles of living life. It is hard to find “true” way out those problems. The main reason is lack of helping hand. Young people were wrongly directed by TV, radio, newspapers. So the mistake that has been made is that there was no support, or there was something that seemed as a helping hand that was actually reached to grab something from them in return. What should be at this point is to fill the missing gap. There is a huge need for those who would undertake the job. Starting point should be family. Family and teachers should do this hand in hand together.

Education is the power that will keep people on their feet. Education that has been given till this time has teacher to see someone who does not share the same opinion as an outsider, stranger.

Generations that have not been educated according to universal principles will never be able to bring my goodness to their generation. Someone who knows and sticks to universal principles in his or her life will not only contribute to his or her national wellbeing but to those who behold other nationality as well. It is better to have a good enemy rather than a bad friend. It is easy to find examples for it. Fatih Sultan Mehmet, who was the initiator of a new era, has succeeded just thanks to education he has taken from his teacher Aksemseddin. He was not representing physical power, but universal values he gained due to education. This kind of behavior can only be expected from someone who has been taught universal values. It is hard to understand the controversy, and answer the question why is it that there was such a humanist behavior at those times, while having such non-understanding now. The explanation lies in the fact at that time people were “real teachers” rather than some teaching staff that we have today. The relation between today’s teacher and a student just like the relation takes place between the one who owns a house and the one who rents it. Nowadays teachers are far from helping people, they need it themselves.

So something must be done in order to stop this tendency. All ideas should be open for discussion, no discrimination should be made. And I believe that this is possible only with the help of teachers, whose minds are full of knowledge and whose hearts are full of love. This should be accomplished in a global scale, in order to give a chance for a terror. If we do not start to act now as the time goes by all universal, moral, humanistic values will be lost. Young generation will have to suffer a lot. I am really concerned about the future. Young people just have to get rid of materialistic principles.

But those people who would undertake his task should be strong in heart and in mind. This should be generation of truth, representatives of truth. This generation by the help of love in their

hearts and knowledge in their brains should turn this world in to paradise. Probably what I have written here sounds as utopia, but there is no other way. I got this idea out of my life and professional experience. Reforms I have described will prove themselves with time. In order to wake up a nation, create a world without any problems, have a friendship between different nations, and solve problems that have taken place between nations there is a need for teachers and generations that have been brought up by the help of these teachers. I think that it is a long term solution called reforms in education that has to be undertaken. The most important point is not to create the system but keeps it functioning. In order to keep it functioning generations have to trust and respect each other.

Observation

As known, we cannot reckon without a solution waiting problem in the island. Depending on my 13-year-experience in abroad, I defense the idea that this solution is going to be education. This opinion which I presented as a solution is not a dream work, but the reality itself. It is a common conviction that people approach friendly to the things they know well and antagonistically to unknown facts.

Concluding from my 13 years experience in Georgia and 1 year experience in USA, I state that it can become a solution for the countries where two or more different nationalities live together. And I believe that this will be the functioning solution.

A case study I want to tell here depending on my 8-year-experience is based on 13 years I passed in Georgia immediately after graduation, verbally working as a teacher and a principle in schools. I still work as board member at a university. At a school I worked in previously were students from different nationalities; Georgian, Russian, Armenian, Azerbaijan, Turkish, Greece, Israel, Latvian students were having lessons in the same class. At the beginning they all felt stranger to each other, but as they got used to each other, they became friends. We made a competition among the student of the school, which was related to the poems and songs about the wonderful earth. I witnessed to a friendly rivalry among these students sharing the same stage at that fairly held international competition. Nobody was upset about losing, and those who won did not feel too proud since they were not just classmates, but brothers. There were happy for those who won, and upset for those who lost at the same time. They could not be rivals anyway since they study as if

they were hands or other pair organs of the same body. On the strength of this experience, I can say that education can become a good solution to the problem in such a multinational environment. And the same solution type should be applied in Cyprus as well-it is an education reform. It is not the United Nations that should bring the solution, but the island itself. Even though this type of solution seems to be long term solution, I think that it is going to work, the method of this solution is education, and the tool is a teacher.

Suggestions

My final advice is that the educational institution in the communities with two or more nations should be revised. The generations brought up this way, by learning the language of each others will have a mutual understanding of the each which will bring love preceding and they can overcome all the problems. Even the attempt of opening schools using English as the language of instruction reciprocally can be an alternative. In these schools, while the technical lessons are taught in English, the humanitarian subjects can be given in their native languages. This type of education should be till children reach the age of going to universities that they want. If universities would run the same way, people would not come out of there as enemies but as friends. Among these teenagers some business partnership will be accomplished. This kind of relationship can even go further than some business relation and will not bring else than peace and tolerance.

Conclusion

Since the second half of the 20th century, European countries have been using their efforts for solidarity. The main reason of founding this union is to prevent the battles between Europeans, for they had struggles among each other until the beginning of the 20th century. Though the thought of union - ship which bore in their minds seems as a solution, this consideration was not helpful for assembling the European Union as a whole. When we look over the origin of the EU objectively, it is barely seen that the EU is a union whose roots neither based on Christianity, nor leaned on brotherhood as some people claim, but a union whose members have fear for each other and want to remove this fear with union - ship. In addition to that, it is not possible to assert the contrary, be-

cause the wars happened between the European countries in 19th century verifies this reality. Even though they are a union, it is striking that they behave individually, when they have self-interests. In fact, they are different from each other in many aspects when we consider them in their own identity. Their real common points are the values such as democracy, human rights, state of law and free marketing economy, rather than religion.

The sudden collapse of the USSR and Yugoslavia, who were regarded as undestroyable, brought me the idea that Europe, which has been established on the base of fear and self-interest will not be sturdy and durable. When it is observed, the existence of serious ethnic problems and border complications will be seen as well. I believe that on the way of development, a formation full of problems is under risk, whether they are strong enough. The EU, which can't reflect the strong mood of a union, couldn't apply the Schengen Agreement to England and convince them to use the common currency "Euro" like other members. Moreover, England, who has always been against the idea of being one state, caused the union to bring the "Ala Carte" method into force, which means that the members are free whether to participate or not any occasions they want. Despite these, the EU maintains the idea that they are unrivalled, and this must be the reason that many new countries endeavor to be the members of the union day by day and in the first quarter of the 21st century the number of members will have reached to 30. On the way to Europe, the addition of Switzerland and Georgia with Turkey for membership seems definite. I suppose that countries like Russia and Belarus, who would like to rely on a trustworthy support against the economy of China, will integrate with the union.

Although Turkey considers itself as a part of Europe, it is a reality that they accept Turkey as European in the frame of their needs. Because while they say "yes" to the union of Turkey for some organizations, such as European Council, OECD and NATO, they say "No" to the integration process with the EU by using double standard. That's why Turkey has had a relation between the years 1959-2007 for 48 years, which is still in the waiting room. The EU constantly lays some norms and criteria in front of Turkey. It is wrong to say that Turkey represents the EU standards; yet, in December of 2006 when the member countries thoroughly looked over, the opinions of Europeans about Turkey came into daylight, which showed that why they kept Turkey wanting.

Despite their opinions, they decided to give Turkey a date for negotiation, because the AK government in the parliament which came to power in 2002 in Turkey, depending on its own majority, accepted a big amount of Copenhagen Criteria as a law in the assembly. This unexpected attempt surprised the Europe. Therefore, though a difficult and troublesome opposition, the negotia-

tions were decided to start on 3rd October 2005.

As it is known, Cyprus problem takes the lead among international problems with its insoluble position. The primary reason for this is the geo-politic and geo-strategic importance of Cyprus. Day by day, the essence of the problem of Cyprus is being noticed. When Cyprus is examined, what takes attention is the indefinite beginning date of the problem, which for one side started in 1963, while for the other after 1974. However, the real matter is not when it started, but why or how it occurred and the unsettled process of it.

If we look through Cyprus deeply, we will observe that though the basic differences depending on language, religion and culture, islanders of both sides desire peace on the island. But because of the attitude of some outer powers and politicians, the problem came to an insoluble stage currently. Islanders were never so close to each other, until the referendum process. In spite of the fact that the Greek side uttered “No” in the referendum, before this process, both nations wanted to integrate with the EU as one government accepting to be together. Nevertheless, with the effect of unknown reasons, it was provided the Greeks to vote for “No”.

Depending on this development, I affirm that even though the Mediterranean Sea rises and leaves Cyprus under water, the problem there will not be settled with the known resolutions but with a radical reform in education. This is because that nowadays, Cyprus is not only important for its geo-politic and geo-strategic position but also for economic reasons. According to a recent research, they stroke petrol reserves valued as \$400 billion in Cyprus.⁶²

European Union, without controlling Cyprus, in other words the Mediterranean Sea, cannot be a dominant super power in the world. Besides being a super power, there is another important thing to do which is to act according to the undertaken role and I believe this can only be possible by domination in Cyprus. The Annan Plan, voted in April of 2004 was a part of this, to help Cyprus to be a united island to the EU which was tried to be obtained by international pressure of the West applied on Turkey.

According to me, they should not rule out the fact that Washington, which invests the projects of the century in Turkish and Georgian Eurasia region, will not feel at ease in these territory without Turkey and Georgia.

Nevertheless, USA, from the aspect of Turkey, wishes to benefit from the “Great Project of the Middle East”; and that’s why that the Cyprus Island comprises an utmost importance from the

⁶² http://www.dispolitikforumu.org/index2.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=144&Itemid=6

geo-politic and geo-strategic point of view. USA, once more realized the fact that Cyprus is actually a desired place in the East Mediterranean for the American military base at the time of the Iraq War. It is known that petrol is the most essential thing for all the countries in the world to survive. And the most reliable transfer of it from the Middle East and Eurasia to USA and the EU is via Ceyhan Petrol Station located in Turkey. Cyprus, which is only 65 km away from Ceyhan, arouses the interest of not only Washington-Brussels-Ankara triangle, but also Damascus, Kahire, Bagdad and Tehran together with Moscow.

Let's dream for a Cyprus without the obstacle of Turkey for just a second; it is really so precious for the EU and the USA, since they will reach the possibility of controlling the Middle East via Cyprus without Turkey. Thus, both USA and the EU should consider the presence of Turkey once more. I believe that the presence of an unsteady Turkey will cause to alter the whole plan and the projects of Washington-Brussels Line.

Turkey with its new formation process, which started in 1991, gained more geo-political and geo-strategic importance. Because the vital blood vessels of the countries, who want to be the global, super power, pass through Turkey. It is an obligation for USA who plans to settle on Eurasia for a long time, to find a faithful ally companions to cooperation. The continuity of the good relations with Turkey and Georgia is going to guide USA as an important road map for its stabilization in the region.

Like every nation and country, who becomes member of any union with an intended purpose, Turkey has got some purposes, too. According to the statement of Ali Bulac, these purposes are:

Turkey was ignored from this union and in 1960s still made a statement for uniting to it. Since that time the process of joining to this union has had several changes. According to the convention of Helsinki in 1999 December 10th and Niche 2000 December 7th meeting, there were some changes for those social classes who did not accept the idea to unite European Union. There were two important factors in this situation; the first one is Europe rejected Turkey to join to this union. But finally, for the benefit of Turkey the half of the member countries from this union has changed their opinion and the arguments, and objective reasons of the antagonist countries have been changed too. The second is the changes of the same kind that took place in Turkey, especially through the Islamic part of the population, who supported the ideology of the left – hand party at the first time and the changes caused by 1997 February 28th processes influenced them to be against joining the European Union. There was a question about the factor of Islamic religion. According to

the idea of some of the inside circles the question of the religious factor would be settled in case uniting process with the European – Union was solved. What the European – Society asks was the following question: how would the government, whose official religion was Islam, managed to integrate with the European Institutions.

According to the convention of 237th article of Rome, none of the governments bordering to Europe has rights to determine their membership clearly and not to be ignored. It would disregard those people who took part for the establishment of the European – Union. Europe looks suspicious at Muslim Turkey. But out of 376 Million population of Europe, 14 million is Muslim, with whom they live. If we look through the differentiation of the population according to their religion, there are 5 million Muslim populations in France, 3.5 million in Germany, 2 million in England; others live in Spain, Holland, Austria and so on...

To my opinion the European – Union must solve these problems and react adequately. There must not be allowed those conditions and circumstance that will evoke an attack between the civilizations, it will not be good for anybody.

Turkey lives in the new World already. The geopolitical surroundings of Turkey had the important changes in Northern and Western Parts of the World the new geopolitical system was created.

In the Balkans, countries belonging to Yugoslavia, achieved their independence with the price of their own blood. Turkey has the strongest government in the 21st century; it's been extended from Adriatic to the Government of China. But the important question is how the policy officers see and value their county themselves. With the separation of the USSR, the power of Turkey did not reduce, but increased greatly after 1990s. The Europeans for their first time belt themselves to be out of danger and began to revalue relation they had with their strategic partners in the Cold – War period. Germany managed to avoid the process of decentralization in the World War II and united. The European Governments began revaluing relations they had with USA and Turkey, as there was no more danger of the Cold War. Besides, one of the main factors Europe faces is energetic crisis. Europeans, who gained the control over Arabic oil in 1920s, gave it to Americans; there was another trail for controlling over the Caucasus, Middle East and Middle Asia's energetic resources again.

Nowadays, Turkey has got the greatest resources of its young, dynamic 70 million populations. The important factor for the European Union is the energy and water resources that are more important in the country than the oil resources in the Middle East. Turkey is the strategic partner for

the Middle East as for the Europe also. In case Turkey unites to the European Union it will grow up politically and economically. If the GAP project is put into practice, the greatest economical and political potential will be created in the Middle East. Beside many political difficulties, this project is considered to be the most important by the European Companies.

Cyprus is extremely important for powers, which try to reach global dominance. That is why USA wants to own Cyprus. By owning Cyprus, USA will get control over sea energy transportation line extending from Persian Gulf to Cebelik as well as Baku-Tiflis-Ceyhan petrol line and Middle East oil in general. Second important issue is to be able to protect Israel. Presence of NATO troops on the island could be of great advantage for Israel.

As I mentioned above, one of the most important matters in Cyprus is the weakness in education. Both public on the island, who was not educated sufficiently, despite sometimes living in the same village, stayed in different districts and even in these small regions, formed everything on their own separately. When we observe this configuration, we see the Turkish are more temperate than the Greeks, because the Turkish people try to work cooperatively with the Greeks and learn their language, while we cannot encounter such examples from the Greeks. And also the Turkish side, with a majority of 64,90% 'Yes' answer counter to 35,09%, accepted the Annan Plan with the carried out referendum, and despite all these negative situation on Cyprus, they wanted to share the island without any problem and to solve the question. Nevertheless, The Greeks' result was 75,83% 'No' answer counter to 24.17% 'Yes'. In other words, in compare to Turkish side's 87% 'Yes' vote, the Greeks said 'No' with 88% vote; thus, it is unraveled who is on the side of peace and settling the problem and who is not.

When we look through the reasons of the insolubility of the question in Cyprus for years, we again come across with the EU. If you ask why, I can explain that since the EU has always been on the side of Greece against Turkey, the Greeks, with the relief of the power behind them, not only ignore the problem on Cyprus, but also find new ones, and see themselves as the only supreme ruler on the island. In that manner, they applied to the EU alone without recognizing the Turks. If they had had good intensions and wanted any solution, they would have applied together with the Turks, and also if the EU had wanted the same, they would not accept this singular application of the Greek side. Their attitude, which shows that they have mutual agreement, puts the Cyprus in an indelible position.

Greece, who is benefitting from the power that comes from the EU, has always displayed this potential and after its membership, they have not refrained from using their veto rights for the membership of Turkey. They have even offered the idea that if they warrant the Cyprus' integration, only on that condition they can accept the union-ship of Turkey. Besides, they showed themselves as the only ruler on Cyprus, and by this way, they applied for the union-ship. At the beginning the EU stated that they would accept them after settling the problems on Cy-

prus, yet they admitted the Greek side as a member in 2006. From now on, I do not think that the Greeks will seek for a solution on the island, after supplying their own security and economic comfort. Greece and the Greek part of Cyprus look as if they have reached the purpose they wanted. It is obvious now that Greece does not need to have any anxiety on the side of security on Cyprus, while Turkey should carry this fear due to its geo-politic position and with the security reason. Because the island is like a city of Turkey which brings responsibilities for it while it does not have the same meaning for Greece. The only fear of security for Greece is Turkey. I believe that if Turkey and Greece sort their security problem out, their expense on defense will be lessened, and they will reach their economic and social goals easily. Today, it is a pity for the world countries to allocate more than one trillion of their budgets for the security purpose, while some humankind cannot find any money to meet their primary needs.

According to me, Cyprus problem does not occur as a problem that can be solved by neither the USA nor the EU. In fact, it should be settled only under the roof the UN, who has not got any tendency with the political relations. Even again the Annan Plan should be a faithful base, and we should seek for a solution from the UN.

The solution on Cyprus should be multi-directional that is, the freedom of owning real estate, freedom on travelling and settling between two sides. One of the main problems on Cyprus is the land; the Turkish side has got 36 % of the portion, but they want this number to reduce to 29% or 28%, besides it is important from which region the land will be chosen. They should both share the sovereignty equally and use their legislative and executive authority for their vital interests when it is necessary to block the decisions related about foreign policy, approaches of EU Council and voting results. The real problem will appear on this topic, unless both sides have the equal right of veto. It is also necessary to have common authority on economy, but it does not seem as a problem for an EU member-to-be Cyprus Government, since the policy of money will wholly be united with the European Central Bank.

It will not be easy to find a solution for Cyprus considering the parameters above. After all, if there is a solution on Cyprus, there will be differences in the policy of Turkey. If Turkey integrates with the EU, perhaps the problem can settle by itself. From now on, the solution is a subject based on the manners of the Greeks. Turkey displayed its attitude in the referendum and supported this process consistently. Turkey does not want the existence of Cyprus problem anymore. Because the delayed solution of the problem causes Turkey to lose blood and the Turkish people on the island have social and economical difficulties day by day. The delay is now completely due to the manner of the EU. Though Turkey showed with the referendum that they are on the side of solution, they back up the Greeks and give them social and economical help which let them feel relieved. That's why the Greek side is not affected from insolubility, but besides they use this against the Turkish part. The isolation applied to the Turkish people causes them to have economic problems. Although they try to close this economic gap with the help of Turkey, that is sometimes not enough for them, too and

they become a burden on Turkey's budget. This is a matter that can be solved with the removal of the embargo over the Turkish part on the island.

If it is aimed to have peace on the island, it can be supplied at first by the change of the standpoint of the two governors on the island more than the public itself, and the governors should forward their public to know the other side better and again they should constitute the friendly environment and encourage the people of both sides. These two sides, who will continue their lives as the residents of the island should give a reliable secular education to their youth which is rich in universal values.

Scanning Literacy

After I scanned at the literacy of the thesis, I reached the abstracts of these high license studies that are mentioned below.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research is to examine the deficiencies in economic policies and political strategies that were and are still being applied by the governments of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) and by Turkey, during the foundation process of TRNC's economic infrastructure.

It can be seen that between the years 1960 - 1974, the Greek Cypriots dominated on the island in sense of economy, while the Turkish Cypriots were left out of this economic system. After the peace operation of 1974, the Turkish Cypriots, who settled on the northern side of the island, began the efforts to construct their economic structure with the help of Turkey. However, they failed in doing this. Among the reasons of this failure, one cannot undervalue the two aspects of Cyprus question that are non-recognition and embargoes. It was estimated that the financial aids from Turkey would help the economy of TRNC to be put on a sound footing. Yet, today, TRNC's economy is having a hard time both because its sources are not used continuously and because of the political and economic mistakes. For these reasons, this thesis is prepared to study the Cyprus question and the economical infra-structure of TRNC.⁶³

⁶³ Remziye SEFIK, The Economic structure of Turkis republic of Northern Cyprus and Turkeyes policies, *International Economical Relation*, Thesis Number: 132846, Hacettepe University, February 2003

ABSTRACT

The relations between Greece and Turkey entered into a new phase with Greece's acceptance to the European Union (EU) as a full member in 1981. Since that time, Turkey's relations with the EU have been greatly affected by Greece. Greece as a full member has used each and every mechanism in EU to apply pressure on Turkey concerning bilateral problems such as Cyprus issue. On the other hand, Greece's efforts caused a pro-Greek bias in EU's attitude towards Turkey. In addition, there is a possibility that even the disputes like Cyprus and Aegean between Greece and Turkey have been solved; EU might still be unable to accept Turkey as full member as a result of unfavorable Commission report.

Therefore, this thesis aims to analyze the effects of Turkish-Greek rivalry on Turkey's membership process to EU. The main causes of dispute between Turkey and Greece that are considered as obstacles to Turkey's membership are dealt with in detail. Throughout the study the main theme is the presentation of the interwoven relations among the triangle; namely Turkey, Greece and EU. Besides the evaluation of the international conjuncture, the influence of internal and external developments on the arguments and policies of both countries are also taken into account.⁶⁴

ABSTRACT

The Ottoman Empire, defeated in the First World War, had been disintegrated and had lost most of its territory. Turks living outside the Anatolian territory were frightened, concerned and indecisive. Moreover, as the Ottomans had fought in the opposite front, Britain, by a Royal Council's order in the early stages of the War, on 5 November 1917, officially declared the annexation of Cyprus. A few Turkish Cypriots still living there were alarmed about the future. Some of the Turkish Cypriots left the island. However most of them chose to stay in their homeland.

From the time when Cyprus was left for England by Lozan Treaty till 1947s, Cyprus was not a problem concerning Turkish-Greek relations. But after 1950s, this subject has been a very core issue of Turkish foreign policy. The basic reason behind this problem was the dream of Greeks for building Big Greek which was named as Megali-idea. Through this image Greeks has decided to union the island with Cyprus Greeks.

⁶⁴ Arzu Benu EKEN, The Turkish-Greek dispute and Turkey's relations with the European Union, *International Relation*, Thesis Number: 132813, Hacettepe University, June 2003

The Turkish Cypriots which experienced English colony administration and Turkish-Greek oppression has struggled for their own existence and their own security. In this study, the value was given to important events took place in Cyprus during the struggle years with the contribution of Turkish society leader, Rauf Denktash. In this perspective, the reality of Cyprus has come forward in relation with past and present.⁶⁵

ABSTRACT

As is evident with the headline the research subject of the thesis is related to the political relations between Northern Cyprus and the future of such relations. The Cyprus conflict which is identified as one of the longest pending conflicts in the world, has lasted so many times but no agreement has been achieved so far.

Cyprus has exclusive characteristics of its own. Cyprus has remained under the rule of foreign forces continuously. The Republic of Cyprus that was proclaimed in 1960 could have only survived for three years. And always bore the form of a state, which required the patronage of guarantors with the intervention right of such guarantors compared to the other independent countries.

Another motive, which lays in the insolubility of the Cyprus conflict, is the existence of numerous bodies who are the parties to the conflict. The conflict has become further complex with the European Union becoming party to the conflict.

Contrary to what is already assumed, many efforts have been forwarded to the settlement of Cyprus Conflict. The difficulty with the conflict itself constitutes the main reason why it was not solved appropriately so far. The 1960 treaty was appropriated because it was an imposed treaty and this it did not last long. Even though the international community supporting collective living of two communities together in the island, the two communities have not appeared to be desirous to do so, as a matter of fact they did not need to do so either.

There are conditions precedents of the Turkish Party in the settlement of the Cyprus Conflict. For the purpose of any prospective settlement, The Greek Cypriot party must observe and assume such conditions with understanding. Because, the Turks who are in minority census must not face the pains they practiced in the past anymore.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ Aydın Zeki TUĞ, The All aspect of Cyprus affair and Denktash, *Türk İnkılap Tarihi Uluslararası İlişkiler*, Thesis Number: 132800, Hacettepe University, June 2003

⁶⁶ Fatih GULER, The Political relations between Northern Cyprus and the Greek Cypriot, and the future of such relations, *International Relation*, Thesis Number: 135200, Istanbul University, 2002

SUMMARY

Turkish society has been living in Cyprus since Ottoman Empire has conquered Cyprus in 1571. Because of Ottoman Empire's tolerant administration system Greek Cypriots also lived in peace during the times in the island of Cyprus. The independent trend around the world and in Greece during 1821 has affected the island in great extent with independence movements and ideology of "Enosis"; uniting Cyprus to Greece and during those times, the ideology of Enosis was seeded on the island. In the year of 1878 the Ottomans lost power in international platform and in fear of losing the Marmara Sea to Russia, they rented the island to British Government in return for military support. This was the start of a strong colonist administration system on the Island. With the Lausanne treaty the Island of Cyprus was legally surrendered by Britain.

After the Second World War there was a great pressure on both societies in the Island. Greek Cypriots started their illegal actions against the British colonial administration because their demand for enosis was not being accepted by the British government. The underground organizations got strong in this period. The underground organization EOKA started getting support from the Greek Cypriot society and it spread ideology of enosis in a more effective way with the help of the Orthodox Church.

During 60's when Britain decided to leave the island, Greek Government and Greek Cypriots claimed the island should be given to Greece. Turkish Government did not stand silent to this argument and claimed that the island should be given to Turkey. The three (Turkey, Greece) governments which had claims on the island set for long agreements and signed for new Cyprus Republic where both societies had equal rights.

During those years the British government has applied for membership to EEC (European

Economic Community). Because Cyprus's economy was very dependent on Britain, in the fear of losing British market Cyprus government has also applied for the EC community. This application was done in the year of 1962 with the approval of both societies in the government of Republic of Cyprus. In December 1963, the Cyprus government was purified by illegal force from Turkish representatives. After that period so-called "Cyprus Government" had continued its relations with EEC. However during those relations, the Turkish Cypriots were not represented.

The years 1963-74 were the exile years for Turkish Cypriots. The ideology of enosis got stronger and with the Greek military coup during the time and their support in the island for enosis, EOKA got all the control of the government in the Island. This strong cruelty was done by Greek Cypriots to Turkish Cypriots could not be condoned. So Turkish government intervened the island and the freedom of Turkish Cypriots was given. The island was divided into two parts. Turkish side (Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus) was not given the legitimacy, Greek side (South Cyprus) got all the rights of Cyprus and continued the relations with European Union (EU) and all the other international institutions.

In 1990'5 the EU became strong political and economical organization worldwide. Greek Cypriots administration applied for full membership to the EU in the name of whole Cyprus. The union had accepted this application and the accession negotiations had started. However, Turkish Cypriots had reached very strongly against this application. They claimed that the application would not be binding for Northern Cyprus since the Greek Cypriot Administration does not represent the whole island. All the financial and political support gin by the international organization was only given to this so-called Cyprus Republic, which does not represent Turkish side. In this study; the reasons for GCA application for full membership to the EU is being analyzed. Also the possible scenarios that are likely to take place in the future are evaluated and important implications are being made membership for Turkish Cypriots even after a solution would be very risky for them since the membership could take place after a solution to the Cyprus problem but before Turkey's full membership to EU.⁶⁷

⁶⁷ Ebru Kaptan SERTOGLU, Cyprus and European Union relations, *International Relation*, Thesis Number: 98527, Hacettepe University, September 2000

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Arı Tayyar uluslararası ilişkiler teorileri İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti. Yayınları, 2002, s.452
 2. Arı Tayyar, Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri, İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti. Yayınları, 2002, s.452
 3. Bulaç Ali, Avrupa Birliği, Feza gazetecilik A.Ş Yayınları, 2001, s.7-8
 4. Çakmak Haydar, Avrupa Birliği Türkiye İlişkileri: Ankara: Barış Kitap Basım ve Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti. Yayınları, 2005, s.76
 5. Çakmak Haydar, Avrupa Birliği Türkiye İlişkileri: Ankara: Barış Kitap Basım ve Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti. Yayınları, 2005, s.78
 6. Çakmak Haydar, Avrupa Birliği Türkiye İlişkileri: Ankara: Barış Kitap Basım ve Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti. Yayınları, 2005, ss.79-80
 7. Eken Arzu Benu, The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey’s Relations with the European Union:Ankara, June 2003, ss.7-10
 8. Eken Arzu Benu, The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey’s Relations with the European Union:Ankara, June 2003, ss. 10-14
 9. Eken Arzu Benu, The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey’s Relations with the European Union: Ankara, June 2003, p. 14-17
-

10. Eken Arzu Bensu, The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey’s Relations with the European Union:Ankara, June 2003, ss. 20-22
11. Eken Arzu Bensu, The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey’s Relations with the European Union:Ankara, June 2003, ss.18-20.
12. Eken Arzu Bensu, The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey’s Relations with the European Union:Ankara, June 2003, ss. 78-82
13. Eken Arzu Bensu, The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey’s Relations with the European Union:Ankara, June 2003, ss. 82-86
14. Eken Arzu Bensu, The Turkish – Greek Dispute and Turkey’s Relations with the European Union:Ankara, June 2003, ss. 86-92
15. *EKEN Arzu Bensu, The Turkish-Greek dispute and Turkey's relations with the European Union, International Relation, Thesis Number: 132813, Hacettepe University, June 2003*
16. GULER Fatih, The Political relations between Northern Cyprus and the Greek Cypriot, and the future of such relations, *International Relation, Thesis Number: 135200, Istanbul University, 2002*
17. <http://instituteus.com/news/turkish/index.php?p=19>
18. <http://www.brt.gov.nc.tr/haberler/haber/sagmenu/belgeler/bm649.htm>
19. <http://www.brt.gov.nc.tr/haberler/haber/sagmenu/belgeler/tckanton.htm>
20. <http://www.byegm.gov.tr>
21. <http://www.deltur.cec.eu.int/default.asp?lang=0&pId=3&fId=10&prnId=1&hnd=0&ord=0&docId=311&fop=1>

22. http://www.dispolitikaforumu.org/index2.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=144&Itemid=6
23. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru37.htm>
24. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru37.htm>
25. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru85.htm>
26. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru122.htm>
27. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru122.htm>
28. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru122.htm>
29. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru122.htm>
30. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru122.htm>
31. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru122.htm>
32. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru121.htm>
33. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru150.htm>
34. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru150.htm>
35. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru150.htm>
36. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru150.htm>
37. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru40.htm>
38. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru148.htm>
39. <http://www.emu.edu.tr/turkce/genel/kktc/kitaplar/sabahattinismail150soru/cevaplar/Soru147.htm>
40. http://www.odevarsivi.com/dosya.asp?islem=gor&dosya_no=101521

41. <http://www.trncinfo.com/TANITMADAIRESI/2002/TURKCE/TARİH/tarih.htm#Kıbrıs%20Türk%20Federe%20Devleti>
42. <http://www.trncinfo.com/TANITMADAIRESI/2002/TURKCE/TARİH/tarih.htm#Annan%20Planı>
43. <http://www.unficyp.org/media/Other%20official%20documents/annanplan.pdf>
44. <http://www.unficyp.org/media/Other%20official%20documents/annanplan.pdf>
45. Kalaycı İrfan, Kıbrıs ve Geleceği: Ekonomik Politik Bir Tartışma, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2004, İstanbul: Atlas Yayın Dağıtım, 2004, ss. 91-95.
46. Kalaycı İrfan, Kıbrıs ve Geleceği: Ekonomik Politik Bir Tartışma, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2004, İstanbul: Atlas Yayın Dağıtım, 2004, s.332
47. Kantarcı Şenol, Kıbrıs Laboratuvarı: İstanbul: Aktüel, Alfa Akademi Basım Yayım Dağıtım Ltd. Şti, 2005, ss. 71 - 76.
48. Kantarcı Şenol, Kıbrıs Laboratuvarı: İstanbul: Aktüel, Alfa Akademi Basım Yayım Dağıtım Ltd. Şti, 2005, s. 34.
49. Ramazan Kılıç, Türkiye-AB İlişkileri ve Gümrük Birliği: Ekonomik Entegrasyon Teorisi – Gümrük Birliği Teorisi, Ankara, Siyasal Kitabevi, 2002, s. 111.
50. SEFIK Remziye, The Economic structure of Turkis republic of Northern Cyprus and Turkeys policies, **International Economical Relation**, Thesis Number: 132846, Hacettepe University, February 2003
51. Şen Faruk, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, s. 74

52. Şen Faruk, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, s. 73
53. Şen Faruk, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, s. 73
54. Şen Faruk, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, ss. 2000 – 2001.
55. Şen Faruk, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, s. 195
56. Şen Faruk, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, ss. 197-198
57. Şen Faruk, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, s. 199

58. Şen Faruk, Türkiye AB İlişkilerinde Dış Etkenler: Kopenhag Zirvesinden Bugüne Irak Savaşı – Türkiye – AB, AB Ülkelerindeki Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü, İslam ve Göç, Kıbrıs Dosyası, ilerleme Raporunun Değerlendirilmesi, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık, 2005, s. 50
59. SERTOGLU Ebru Kaptan, Cyprus and European Union relations, international Relations Hacettepe University, September 2000, p. 34
60. SERTOGLU Ebru Kaptan, Cyprus and European Union relations, international Relations Hacettepe University, September 2000, p. 34-36
61. SERTOGLU Ebru Kaptan, Cyprus and European Union relations, international Relations Hacettepe University, September 2000, p. 36-37
62. SERTOGLU Ebru Kaptan, Cyprus and European Union relations, international Relations Hacettepe University, September 2000, p. 37-39
63. SERTOGLU Ebru Kaptan, Cyprus and European Union relations, international Relations Hacettepe University, September 2000, p. 39-52
64. SERTOGLU Ebru Kaptan, Cyprus and European Union relations, International Relation, Thesis Number: 98527, Hacettepe University, September 2000
65. http://www.dispolitikaforumu.org/index2.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=144&Itemid=6
66. TUĞ Aydın Zeki, The All aspect of Cyprus affair and Denктаş, Türk İnkılap Tarihi Uluslararası İlişkiler, Thesis Number: 132800, Hacettepe University, June 2003