

**PERCEPTIONS**  
**JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

**September - November 1999**

**Volume IV - Number 3**

**THE CRUX OF THE CYPRUS PROBLEM**

RAUF R. DENKTAŞ

His Excellency Rauf R. Denktaş is President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

Anthony Nutting, who was the British Minister of State at the Foreign Office during the period 1954-56, wrote in his book *I Saw for Myself* his impression following talks with the leaders of Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots:

“There is nothing Cypriot about Cyprus except its name. In this beautiful beleaguered island you are either a Greek or a Turk. From the leaders of the two communities downwards the chasm of suspicion and hatred which separates them is frighteningly wide.”<sup>1</sup>

EOKA terrorism, which aimed to unite the island with Greece (enosis), was at its height and the Turkish Cypriots, who looked upon enosis as changing colonial masters for the worst, resisted it with every means at their disposal. Hence, the message passed on to all young Greek Cypriots was, “the struggle against the real enemy of our nation and religion, the remnants of the occupying power in Cyprus, will commence as soon as the fight for enosis comes to a successful conclusion”! Any Greek Cypriot who saw the futility and the danger of the drive for enosis, and thus supported independence as a more suitable solution, was regarded as a traitor to the national cause and murdered by EOKA (the Greek Cypriot terrorist organisation). In fact, everyone who opposed enosis was declared an enemy and lived under a constant threat. All Turkish Cypriots were against enosis!

By 1957, inter-communal clashes assumed the character of a civil war. The suspicion and mistrust between the two communities now was fed with inter-communal blood. The British government had relinquished its policy of never abandoning Cyprus and instead began to entertain the idea of British sovereign bases in an independent island supported by Turkey and Greece as a means for Western defence. The union of the island with Greece (after being granted independence and after having exercised its right of self-determination) was to be left to a future date. In the meantime, Turkey was somehow expected to be satisfied with retaining a base in a ‘Greek Cyprus’ near her coast! The Turkish Cypriot community, who opposed enosis and therefore Greek Cypriot domination, had to be dealt with as well. In the beginning, although Britain thought that Turkey had put the Turkish Cypriots up to resist enosis (and from 1955 to the end of 1957 British Colonial administration made good use of this Turkish Cypriot anti-enosis feeling in the context of its policy of divide and rule), she later on discovered that this was not the case. What is known as the January 1958 events made Britain realise that the Turkish Cypriots were determined to resist enosis at all costs.

On 26 and 27 January 1958, the Turkish Cypriots staged a peaceful demonstration against enosis and in favour of partition. The British responded to it by doing what they had not done to the Greek Cypriot anti-British demonstrators for three years (from 1955 to 1957): they shot dead seven Turkish Cypriots who were doing nothing unlawful. The next day, thousands of Turkish Cypriots attended a mass burial in defiance of the Colonial Government’s attempt to prevent the ceremony. The British Colonial Governor, Sir Hugh Foot, was

off the island at the time. His deputy, George Sinclair, commented:

“It is sad to say this but I believe my Government in London has just realised how serious the Turkish Cypriot community is in its opposition to enosis. A new page has been turned in our thinking!”

By the end of 1958, Makarios and Greece realised that the Turkish Cypriot reaction to enosis, and the consequent inter-communal bloodshed (about 100 people on each side had been killed by June 1958 and Turkish Cypriots had been evacuated from about 33 mixed villages to safe areas), would bring Turkey onto the island, and partition (double self-determination) would become a reality. However, when Greece failed to get a resolution from the United Nations in favour of self-determination in December 1958, Turkey and Greece, put their heads together and worked for a solution based on bi-communal partnership! Britain agreed to endorse any agreement between the two mother countries provided her security requirement—sovereign bases on the island—was met!

The Turkish and Greek governments worked out a paper that came to be known as the Zurich Agreement, and this was later endorsed by the leaders of the two communities at the London Conference in February 1959 and named the Zurich and London Agreements. These were to become, after 18 months of serious work in different committees in which both communities participated fully on the basis of equality, the Cyprus Agreements of 1960.

The wisdom of these agreements lay in the fact that they outlawed the cardinal causes of the conflict (the Greek Cypriot demand for enosis and the counter Turkish Cypriot demand for partition) and overcame the source of Turkish Cypriot fears, being dominated by a Greek Cypriot majority. Power sharing in the joint government was arranged in such a way that the effective equal participation of both the Turkish Cypriot and the Greek Cypriot communities was assured. Furthermore, through a system of tripartite guarantees incorporated into these Agreements, Turkey, Greece and Britain were given the right to intervene together or alone in order to protect or reinstate the state of affairs in case it was threatened or disturbed.

Executive power was assumed by the President who was elected by Greek Cypriots and the Vice-president (who had identical powers) elected by Turkish Cypriots. Each community had its own elected government (Communal Chamber) to deal with its own communal matters. The system was in fact, as experts referred to it, a functional federation and not a unitary state. Geographical separation (which the bloody years of 1955-58 had made a necessity) was thus avoided through this guaranteed system of bi-communal partnership.

#### WHY DID IT FAIL?

By December 1963, the miracle of Zurich and London Agreements crumbled into a bloody mess on the Greek Cypriot pretext that the Constitution had proved to be unworkable! Claiming to act upon this belief, Archbishop Makarios proposed to amend 13 points of the Constitution that in his view were the sources of this unworkability. Nevertheless, he knew that the Turkish Cypriot side would not agree to his proposals because the amendments would nullify the status of the Turkish Cypriots as a co-founder partner of a partnership Republic and would reduce them into the status of a minority in a Greek Cyprus!

There was no problem with the Constitution as the Greek Cypriots alleged. Makarios's aim was to convert the partnership Republic into a Greek Cypriot republic and the decision to destroy the Republic was in fact made the moment Makarios signed the Zurich and London Agreements in 1959.

The following is what the neutral President of the Supreme Constitutional Court, Prof. Forstoff of Heidelberg University, said on the workability of the Constitution:

“From the moment I commenced my duties I noticed that there were allegations to the effect that the Constitution was not capable of being implemented; that revision was necessary and the like. I faced these

allegations with the following thought. Every constitution can have its peculiar problems. There is no constitution in the world which has not got its particular difficulties and problems. This is primarily a question of goodwill. If there is goodwill a constitution can be implemented and this Constitution is capable of being implemented.”<sup>2</sup>

When Forstoff made this factual statement, he did not know what we since then came to know, namely that the alleged unworkability of the Constitution was in fact a part of Makarios’s plan, devised as early as August 1960, seeking to destroy the Republic. Here is what Lieutenant-General Karayiannis of Greece, who was brought to Cyprus in order to convert his gunmen into a Greek Cypriot army in contravention of the 1960 Treaties, disclosed to an Athenian paper:

“In the August of 1960, his patience having been exhausted by the negative stance of the Turkish Cypriots in the Cyprus Parliament and their menacing offensive for partitioning the island by surprise, President Makarios decided to proceed with the following:

- a) to organise the Greek Cypriots for battle and arm them,
- b) to proceed with the revision of the Constitution, so that, with the cancellation of the Vice-President's veto, it would become possible to put the state into proper working order.

First of all he put into operation a specially prepared scheme for organising the Greek Cypriots for battle. When progress with this organisation reached such a point that the opposition of the Turkish Cypriots would be deemed manageable, he would proceed next to the revision of the Constitution.

The organisation of the Greek Cypriots for battle which was thus created and which initially bore the title ‘the organisation’, finally took the name the National Guard of Cyprus. The Minister of Interior, Polycarpos Yeorkadjis, was appointed its commander, and the President of the Parliament, Glafcos Clerides, and the Minister of Labour, Tasos Papadopoulos, as its sub-commanders ...”<sup>3</sup>

Then came to light the notorious Akritas Plan in the Greek Cypriot daily *Patris* of 21 April 1966, which accused Makarios of stopping short of declaring enosis when Turkish Cypriot resistance had spread all over the island as envisaged by this plan of genocide!

Mr Glafcos Clerides, who was one of the architects of and active participants in this plan, as stated by General Karayiannis in the above-quoted statement, confessed in his memoirs, *Cyprus: My Deposition* (Vol. II), that there never was an intention of cherishing a partnership state. He used the following words:

“Turkish Cypriots made so many concessions in 1971 that they made possible the settlement of the Cyprus question. The fact that it was Makarios himself who caused us to miss this great opportunity we had gained in 1972 is proved by the documents exchanged between the Governments of Cyprus and Greece at the time. I admit that I made a mistake by keeping silent at that time. When one writes history he has to refer to the past mistakes. Thus, for this reason, I am in a position to state that it was Makarios who was responsible for the loss of this opportunity and it was he who made this mistake. Our rejection of even a certain autonomy to be given to the Turkish Cypriots and our ignorance of the recommendations of the Greek Government to the effect that we recognise it and our stating that we accepted it as a form of a veiled federation can be understood in the documents exchanged between the Governments of Cyprus and Greece ...”<sup>4</sup>

And on his activities as an enosis adherent and active EOKA fighter he says:

“I struggled for enosis and if you wish to know it, my code name within EOKA was Hiperides. I do not deny that I am an enosisist and that I fought for enosis.” (From a press conference broadcast on Greek Cypriot RIK

TV on 26 November 1987.)

“I want you to know that, at this juncture, consultations are underway at the UN headquarters regarding the resolution to be adopted by the Security Council on the Cyprus issue. But in Cyprus there is already the decision taken by a President named Glafcos Clerides. A Clerides who had been given the codename Hiperides by General Grivas. Henceforth, the future course of the Cyprus issue will be decided here in Cyprus. We will not bow to pressures from the Americans and the British. We will continue our struggle, in trenches and our head-up, until the final victory of Cyprus Hellenism.”<sup>5</sup>

If we glance at the Akritas Plan we see clearly that the Republic of 1960 had no chance of survival. Although the Turkish Cypriot side has circulated this plan to the Security Council (30 May 1978, UN Documents A/33/115; S/12722) no one seems to have been impressed by it. The plan outlines the political and military preparations and the way by which the world would be hoodwinked into believing that the attempt to amend the Constitution was an act of necessity made in goodwill.

The aim was to get rid of the Treaty of Guarantee. Once this was achieved, the road to self-determination would have been unblocked. If the Turkish Cypriots had resisted the attempt to change the Constitution, they would have been given a sharp blow and the world would then have been told that this is an internal matter of Cyprus and that no one should interfere! The struggle was for enosis but the Greek Cypriots would not have revealed this until the time came. If, however, the conflict had spread, then enosis would have been declared immediately.

#### 1963 ONSLAUGHT AND WHAT WENT WRONG THEREAFTER

A cease-fire became possible when Turkish jets flew over Nicosia on Christmas Day 1963 and when the Turkish contingent (650 men and officers from Turkey who had arrived in Cyprus on the 16 of May 1960 in compliance with the 1960 Agreements) went out of its camp, which was on the Greek Cypriot side, and proceeded to a location near the Turkish part of Nicosia. The Treaty of Guarantee was obviously very much alive and active.

Talks between the two sides at the British High Commission under the auspices of the British Minister of the Commonwealth, Mr Duncan Sandys, came to naught and it was agreed that the two communities should attend the London Conference.

At the London Conference, the Turkish Cypriot side received the first shock from the British. Before the Conference, Duncan Sandys had given the Turkish Cypriot leadership a signed undertaking that the representatives of both sides were to be invited to London on the basis of equality as two leaders because the Turkish Cypriot side claimed that the bi-communal government of Cyprus had collapsed and that there was no single legal representative of that government any longer. On the other hand, the British had assured Makarios that the ‘government of Cyprus’ would also be invited, and naturally, a Greek Cypriot would be its representative. At the Conference when this biased approach was discovered, the Turkish Cypriot side refused to enter the conference room until the ‘government of Cyprus’ label was removed from the text. The Greek Cypriot side continued to argue that the Constitution was no longer valid and they offered minority rights to the Turkish Cypriots. The Turkish Cypriot side accused the Greek Cypriot side of deliberately destroying the constitutional order in order to proceed to enosis and wanted a federal settlement. After six weeks of wrangling, the Conference ended with no result. The British Guarantor, instead of standing by what she had agreed to guarantee under the 1960 Agreements, advised the Turkish Cypriot representative to accede to the Greek Cypriot proposals. In this connection, Duncan Sandys in reference to Turkey stated, “it [Turkey] will never come and you will have to leave Cyprus only with your shirts on”.

The matter was now in the hands of the Security Council which passed its 4 March 1964 Resolution (186), in which references to the ‘government of Cyprus’ were to give Makarios every chance to claim this title for the

Greek Cypriot side alone. The cat was made responsible for the safety of the pigeons. Through Resolution 186, the Security Council was asking the now defunct 'government of Cyprus', made up solely of Greek Cypriots, to keep law and order and UNFICYP was being sent to Cyprus to help it do so! From then onwards, the Cyprus problem was solved in the eyes of the Greek Cypriot side. They believed they had achieved their national objective of converting a guaranteed partnership republic into a Greek Cypriot republic although the Turkish Cypriots never bowed to this illegality. Having been ousted from the government, the Turkish Cypriots were squeezed into enclaves (three per cent of the area of Cyprus from over 32 per cent). The Greek Cypriots declared the Constitution "dead and buried" and told the Turkish Cypriots (deprived from all sources of income, subjected to daily harassment and persecution) that they could only return to government if they accepted minority rights, which naturally the Turkish Cypriots refused.

The efforts of the Security Council, under the Good Offices Mission of the Secretary General, to settle the Cyprus problem as if it were a problem between the two communities under the roof of a legitimate government, proved futile. The inter-communal talks formula helped the Greek Cypriots to strengthen their own image as the 'government of Cyprus' and thus to isolate the Turkish Cypriots under illegal embargoes, portraying them to the world as a minority that demanded excessive rights from their legitimate government. No one bothered to grant that what the Turkish Cypriots were defending were their vested rights in a destroyed partnership and as one of the partners ousted from it by force of arms. They had all the right to challenge the Greek Cypriot claim to be the government of Cyprus. Indeed, what they rightfully asked for was their own share in the territory of the defunct republic (confiscated by Greek Cypriots) and their just share in its independence and in its sovereignty, all of which the Greek Cypriots claimed solely for themselves.

Today, we are told that the Cyprus issue has to be settled; that it has lasted for too long; that the status quo is unacceptable; that the difference between the parties can be bridged and the island be reunited; and that, after the collapse of the Berlin Wall, it is very sad to see Nicosia divided; etc. No one realises that the 'wall' in Cyprus prevents the Greek Cypriots from forcing their political will on the Turkish Cypriots and that the Turkish Cypriots began to live in peace and enjoy human dignity only after the Turkish intervention of 1974—an intervention which took place in compliance with Turkey's rights as one of the Guarantor Powers. Turkey put an end to the invasion of the island of Cyprus by Greece and saved the Turkish Cypriots from total annihilation as was originally planned.

In 1992, we have this most indicative quotation from Mr Clerides, as published in *Fileleftheros*, a Greek Cypriot daily, on 20 September 1992:

"The best solution for us is no solution. Next year we shall be where we were the last year, and the next, where we were the year before. We, the Greek Cypriots, today have the government completely under our control. We do not have the Vice-president with his veto or the three Turkish ministers in it. All the ministers are Greeks. Our government is the only one internationally recognised. Why should we bring back the Turks? The Turks today control only three per cent of the land; the area comprising their enclaves. They haven't got rich resources and are having difficult times because of economic atrophy. Finally they will have to accept our decisions—or go."

Has anything changed now to make the Greek Cypriot side more amenable to a fair settlement that safeguards the political equality and sovereignty of the Turkish Cypriots? The world still recognises as the sole legitimate government of Cyprus an administration composed 100 per cent of Greek Cypriot people, while the authenticity of the 1960 Republic of Cyprus lay in power sharing between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities on an absolutely equal basis.

Under the false pretence of being the 'government of Cyprus' the Greek Cypriot side is enjoying for and on behalf of Cyprus all the benefits of sovereignty and recognition. Since 1963, the date when the Turkish Cypriot community was removed from the budget of the 'Republic of Cyprus', all the aid sent for Cyprus to the government of Cyprus has been used for the benefit of the Greek Cypriot side. Under this false title, the Greek

Cypriots are giving military bases to Greece, purchasing sophisticated armaments, continuing to impose embargoes on the Turkish Cypriot people and thus to punish them for not accepting the minority rights they so generously offered in the 1960s. Hand in hand with 'Mother Ellas' they place obstacles to Turkey's every move in the international arena for Turkey's 'sin' of saving the Turkish Cypriots from utter annihilation and for preventing enosis, which was almost achieved.

Makarios declared that, "by presenting to the world the Greek Cypriot administration as the 'government of Cyprus', he had brought Cyprus to the nearest point to enosis (and that there was) no going back from this point except for enosis". This aim of enosis is the reason why the Greek Cypriot side has resisted every proposed settlement that underlined the guarantee system and hence blocked the road to enosis. Therefore, a new agreement with the Greek Cypriots is not possible without outlawing enosis once again and emphasising the guarantee system of 1960. Makarios's 'will and testament' to his successors is that they should never sign a new agreement which incorporates these two elements. That is why Mr Clerides is repeating Makarios's declared policy that he will hand over Cyprus to the next generation intact, as he received it from his predecessor. That is why, under the title of the 'government of Cyprus', the onslaught against Turkish Cypriots continues and military preparations are not reversed!

The Greek Cypriots elected Mr Clerides the 'President of Cyprus' in 1993 on a ticket that rejected the UN Secretary General's ongoing attempt to help the parties settle the Cyprus problem on the basis of a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation. Ever since, he has stood firm on this line of policy and refused to have face to face meetings with me, giving the excuse that there is no common ground between us. I pointed out to him that the Set of Ideas, which had been on the table since 1992 and on which much work had been done, formed a sufficient common ground. But he did not move from his policy of giving priority to the European Union (EU) membership, knowing that this was an impediment to any settlement. In the meantime, the EU accepted the Greek Cypriot's unilateral and illegal application as valid for and on behalf of Cyprus in complete disregard of Turkish Cypriot objections based on legal, political and moral grounds. That the two parties had agreed to pursue EU membership after an overall settlement and subject to the approval of the two peoples through separate referendums was also ignored. All of these points were ignored by the EU, which was confronted by the blackmailing policy of Greece, which insisted that if the 'government of Cyprus' was not accepted as a candidate, then Greece would veto the candidacy of all the other applicants!

The purpose of this unilateral and illegal application was made clear by the Greek Cypriot leadership as the following excerpts show:

"If the Greek Cypriots enter the EU, this would give the Greek Cypriots major cards to play on many constitutional issues put forward at present by the Turkish Cypriots ..."<sup>6</sup>

"The accession of Cyprus into the EU will inevitably have an impact on the 1960 Treaties of Guarantee and of Alliance and will abolish the unilateral right of Turkey to intervene in Cyprus."<sup>7</sup>

"Ghali's Set of Ideas can not be put into effect. We do not accept any diversion from the principles of the EU. We do not accept a federal system that does not recognise the freedom of movement, settlement and the right to property."<sup>8</sup>

Indeed, the priority for the Greek Cypriot leadership was and still is the membership of the EU. In their view, what guns and embargoes have not achieved, EU membership would achieve for them! The Greek Cypriot side's sole intention is to retain the title of the 'government of Cyprus' and, as long as they are allowed to continue with it, they shall not be motivated for a mutually acceptable solution. Furthermore, they are determined to go to any length to hold on to their unjustly acquired status.

The treatment of the Greek Cypriot aggressor as the 'government of Cyprus' for so many years has eliminated any motivation on the part of the Greek Cypriot side to seek a new compromise based on equality and

realism—power sharing on the basis of two existing states. His Excellency Kofi Annan, the Secretary General of the UN, brought Mr Clerides and myself together at Troutbeck, New York, and in Glion, Switzerland, in July and August 1997. There I underlined the Turkish Cypriot position vis-à-vis the EU's unacceptable interference in the inter-communal talks. Mr Clerides, now confident that the dice had been cast in his favour and that no one could prevent the process of EU membership, was bold enough to tell his own press that he attended the inter-communal talks for tactical reasons and that no one should be worried that he would be making unnecessary concessions to the Turkish Cypriot side. "I attend these talks", he said, "for tactical reasons. Our tactic is to say 'yes' to whatever the other side says 'no' in order to project the other side as intransigent. The tactic has been very successful so far, so we shall continue with it".

At the talks, I asked him how he reconciled what he was doing in Cyprus with the efforts we were making at the inter-communal talks in order to settle the problem. I underlined the importation of Russian missiles, the giving of military bases to Greece, the importation of heavy and sophisticated arms, and the unilateral application for EU membership. In this connection, I pointed out to Mr Clerides that the Greek Cypriot application for EU membership not only contravened the 1960 Agreements but was also contrary to what was envisaged by the UN Secretary General in his Set of Ideas: namely, that a joint application for EU membership would be made after a settlement and after discussions and agreement by both sides. Furthermore, each side would submit such an agreement for democratic approval in separate referenda. Mr Vasiliou and I had, at the time, accepted the course suggested by the UN Secretary General. How could he reconcile the fact that they were now attempting to undo the most cardinal part of a future settlement (which, again, both sides had discussed and accepted in principle), namely that of the global exchange of property between the two sides, by promising the Greek Cypriot refugees that they would all go back to their properties, knowing well that half of the Turkish Cypriot population (refugees from the South), would never go back to their properties in view of what had been done to them until the arrival of Turkey in 1974.

Mr Clerides was to the point in his answer to me:

"All these matters you have raised are governmental acts. Governmental acts do not stop just because inter-communal talks are on. These activities shall continue."

When I asked him whether he meant that he was the 'President of the Turkish Cypriot Administration' also and, hence, that I had no right to raise these issues at the talks, he made the following statement in the presence of Mr Diego Cordovez, the UN Secretary General's Special Representative:

"I know I am not the President of the Turkish Cypriot Administration and that I do not represent them. But the whole world treats me as such; do you expect me to say that I am not?"

Clerides had thus hit the nail right on the head. As long as he was treated as the 'President of the whole of Cyprus', he would continue to hide behind this false title and try to achieve what they had failed to achieve through violence and oppression.

I replied: "I don't expect you, Mr Clerides, to tell the world that you know you are not the 'President of the whole of Cyprus', but I expect Mr Cordovez to tell the world and through him the Security Council members and the EU members that you know you are not the 'President of the whole of Cyprus' and, therefore, you should not be treated as such!"

Mr Cordovez and the UN Secretary General who appointed him were of course prevented by their mandate from saying so. The 4 March 1964 resolution was their excuse for saying that their mandate is to facilitate talks between the two communities subject to the existence of a legitimate government of Cyprus. Fiction rather than reality is the basis of their mandate and it appears that the Security Council cannot be told by the Secretary General what the facts in Cyprus are! Thus, the aggressor in Cyprus is encouraged in its policy of doing everything possible to usurp the rights, liberties and the equal political status of the Turkish Cypriots.

Aggression against Cyprus and the attempt to convert it into a totally Greek Cypriot republic, are thus being facilitated by the refusal of the international family of nations to diagnose the Cyprus issue correctly before presenting remedies for its resolution. The Greek Cypriot side does not want an agreement that would satisfy the Turkish Cypriot side as a sovereign equal in all respects. But this is what Turkish Cypriots are! What Greek Cypriot leaders want is to retain the title of the 'government of Cyprus' at all costs and thus eventually have Cyprus for themselves in complete disregard of what President Clinton stated: "Cyprus has two owners, Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots." This brutal illegal attempt, now in its thirty-sixth year, to rob Turkish Cypriots of all their rights and status is the cause of the Cyprus issue. Unless this is tackled with courage, the Greek Cypriot side will naturally try to get away with usurping the whole of Cyprus.

Insisting on having the right to extend their authority over the North is tantamount to claiming territory without having the proper legitimate title to it and is an indication of the continuation of the Greek Cypriot policy of colonising the Turkish Cypriot people. All these attempts and overtly criminal acts, persisting since 1963, have not improved the "frighteningly wide chasm of suspicion and hatred" that Mr Anthony Nutting found to exist between the two communities back in 1956. Now, the dangers of future conflict are greater than ever because the Greek Cypriot youth is not told what their elders did to the Turkish Cypriots during the 1963-1974 period; the Greek Cypriot youth does not know that today's seeds of complete separation were sown by their leaders back in 1963 when they tried to take over Cyprus by force of arms. The Greek Cypriot youth, believing that Cyprus was a prosperous and peaceful island until 1974, when Turkey came and pushed them out of their homes, naturally is not prone to a fair settlement. Had they been told the truth, the Greek Cypriot youth would soon see that their leaders made the division and that the Turkish Cypriots are fully justified in being reluctant to establish a paper partnership anew when it can be declared unworkable at the will of the Greek Cypriots. They would then be able to understand why the Turkish Cypriots insist on a formula based on the existence of two states.

Destined to share a common land with the Greek Cypriot people, after 36 years of separation, the Turkish Cypriot people still cherish the idea of a state to state partnership.

These are the realities of Cyprus. I would not have gone into the past had the Greek Cypriot side not based its case on the events of 1974 and accused Turkey of invading their land. Turkey saved the Turkish Cypriot people together with the Turkish Cypriots' land and share in the independence and sovereignty of Cyprus. Greek Cypriots succeeded in destroying the 1960 partnership, but they failed to destroy the Turkish Cypriot partner who safeguarded its rights and status at great loss of life and property. That is why at Glion, when Mr Clerides, having declared the demise of the inter-communal talks in which he claimed he had never put his trust. I could do nothing better than thank him for his out-spokenness and tell him that from now on I would talk with him on the basis of real equality from state to state. That is how my confederation proposal of 31 August 1998\* came to the fore. This is a realistic partnership proposal which would enable both sides to co-operate in peace and harmony and also by addressing the legitimate interests of all sides for longer term stability. It is also consistent with the efforts of the UN to reach a mutually acceptable settlement. The beginnings of federations have usually been confederal agreements between two equals. The Cyprus issue can not be settled by disregarding the events of 1963-1974; this is a time for a proper diagnosis of the problem. The old formula of inter-communal talks has only helped the Greek Cypriot side to bolster its image as the 'government of Cyprus' thus leaving no motivation for a new power sharing between two sovereign equals. But that is what the Cyprus issue is about.

- 1 London, Hollis and Cater, 1958.
- 2 Speaking to a UPI correspondent in Heidelberg University, Germany, 30 December 1963.
- 3 As published in the Athenian paper Ethnikos Kiryx, 13 June 1965.
- 4 Glafcos Clerides, Cyprus: My Deposition, Vol. II, Alithia Publishing 1990.
- 5 As published in the Greek Cypriot daily Simerini, 20 June 1994.
- 6 See Glafcos Clerides' statement to the Greek Cypriot daily newspaper, Agon, 23 July 1994.
- 7 See Glafcos Clerides' statement to the Greek Cypriot daily newspaper, Agon, 18 July 1995.
- 8 See the Greek Cypriot daily newspaper, Simerini, 9 June 1996.

\* The text of the proposal is as follows:

“As a final effort to achieve a mutually acceptable lasting solution in Cyprus, I propose the establishment of the Cyprus Confederation based on the following arrangements:

1. A special relationship between Turkey and TRNC on the basis of agreements to be concluded.
2. A similar special relationship, between Greece and the Greek Cypriot Administration on the basis of symmetrical agreements to be concluded.
3. Establishment of a Cyprus confederation between TRNC and GCA.
4. The 1960 Guarantee System shall continue.
5. The Cyprus Confederation may, if parties jointly agree, pursue a policy of accession to the EU. Until Turkey's full membership to the EU, a special arrangement will provide Turkey with the full rights and obligations of an EU member with regard to the Cyprus Confederation.

The ultimate aim of the negotiations will thus be a partnership settlement which will be 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. All rights and powers which are not referred to the confederal entity will reside with the two confederated states. Any agreement to be reached as a result of the negotiations will be submitted for approval in separate referenda.

By participating in these negotiations the parties will acknowledge that the Greek and Turkish Cypriot sides are two sovereign and equal states, each with its own functioning democratic institutions and jurisdiction, reflecting the political equality and will of their respective peoples. They will also acknowledge that the authorities of one party do not represent the other.

We believe that only this structure,

- a) will provide for the security of both sides,
- b) will safeguard their identity and well being.

If the Greek Cypriots agree to this final basis, we are ready to begin negotiations to establish the

Cyprus Confederation.”