

ETHNIC NATIONALISM AND CONSOCIATIONAL DEMOCRACY IN CYPRUS*Pinar Erkem¹**ABSTRACT**

The 1960 Cyprus Republic, which had a bi-communal power-sharing system, could not have lasted for long and it turned from consociational democracy to majoritarian in 1963 after ethnic conflict. Attempts to find a solution to Cyprus problem still focus on ethnic power-sharing but the conditions and bi-communal relations prior to 1960 system, which are conducive to its failure, are not adequately consumed. The paper argues that, the reasons for the prolonged conflict derive from ethnic rivalry and lack of an overarching loyalty. Modernization, kin-state relations and colonial policies are the contributing factors. This paper aims to contribute to future institutional designs for not only Cyprus but for all divided societies.

Keywords: Cyprus; ethnic conflict; ethnic nationalism; consociational democracy; power-sharing; colonial policies

KIBRIS'TA ETNİK MİLLİYETÇİLİK VE ORTAKLIKÇI DEMOKRASİ**ÖZ**

İki topluluğun varlığını tanıyan ortaklıkçı demokrasiye dayalı 1960 Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti etnik çatışmalar sonrası 1963 yılında son bularak çoğunlukçu demokrasi uygulamaya konuldu fakat Kıbrıs sorununa çözüm çabaları halen ortaklıkçı demokrasi üzerinde durmaktadır. 1960 sisteminin çökmesine yol açan topluluklar-arası sorunlar henüz tam olarak ortadan kaldırılamamıştır. Bu çalışmayla, Kıbrıs'ta güç paylaşımı sisteminin çökmesinin arkasındaki milliyetçiliğe dayalı nedenler incelenecektir. Bu çalışmanın iddiası, uzun süren Kıbrıs çatışmasının nedeninin etnik rekabetin varlığı ve ortak bağlayıcı bir değerin yokluğudur.

Anahtar sözcükler: Kıbrıs; etnik çatışma; etnik milliyetçilik; ortaklıkçı demokrasi; güç paylaşımı

Cyprus has been under influence and administration of different civilizations throughout its history, centuries long Byzantium and Ottoman rules and 82 years of British colonial rule, until its independence in 1960. Since the Ottoman era, considerable Turkish population has been living in the island, together with the Greek Cypriot inhabitants. However, during the colonial era, with the influences of nationalism and colonial policies, inter-communal tensions aroused. From then on, Cyprus is accepted as a deeply divided society and the prolonged conflict could yet not be resolved.

This paper argues that, the reason for the prolonged conflict derives from ethnic rivalry and lack of overarching loyalty and it will focus on the development of ethnic identities in Cyprus. These have their roots in the pre-independence period, in which Cyprus was under British colonial rule.

Therefore, the roots of the argument will be tracked in the colonial period, particularly in the development of nationalism in both communities. It will be argued that modernization, kin-state relations and colonial policies have impacts on the creation of ethnic rivalry, which in turn caused inter-communal conflict. As a result, an overall comprehension of the conflict and the nature of nationalisms of both communities will contribute in the understanding of the fall of 1960 republic, the only power-sharing period in Cyprus history.

1960 Republic and Consociational Democracy

Even though various dates are given for the dawn of the inter-communal conflict, the fall of the 1960 republic in 1963 after inter-communal violence, constitutes a corner stone in the relations. In 1960, a bi-communal state in which Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities shared power was established with the support and involvement of Britain, Greece and Turkey. The independent republic was based on the recognition of the two communities and protection of their distinct identities through consociational democracy. As put forward by Lijphart (1977), consociational democracy is a model to provide stability and peace in deeply divided societies and rests on four main principles, which are sharing power in a grand coalition, segmental autonomy, minority veto and proportionality for different communities in representation and public opportunities like funds or recruitment. All of these principles were established by 1960 Constitution in Cyprus. Sharing power of communal elites took place in the executive through a Greek Cypriot President and a Turkish Cypriot Vice President, whose powers were almost similar unlike presidential systems. Additionally, a very strong Council of Ministers functioned as a power-sharing body, with seven Greek Cypriot and three Turkish Cypriot ministers. As there weren't any territorial separation, autonomy principle was implemented culturally; two Communal Chambers had extensive powers regarding the communal matters.² The minority veto was implemented both in the House of Representatives, regarding taxation, municipal and electoral laws, and in Presidency, particularly on foreign affairs, defense and security issues.³ Proportionality in communal representation was following a ratio of 70:30 in favor of Greek Cypriots in legislature, judiciary, security services (except for the army where the proportion was 60:40) and was supposedly implemented in the public service.⁴

However, the independence did not bring peace and stability, instead, the conflict escalated and turned into acts of violence in 1963, bringing an end to the recently established bi-communal state. Besides discontent of the public due to failing to realize enosis (uniting with Greece), the main controversies that doomed the republic were based on the power-sharing arrangements. The main subjects of disagreement were the organization of the army, proportional public recruitment, tax law and separate municipalities. The question of how the army would be organized, either integrated or as ethnically separated units, could not be decided upon among communal elites, showing the lack of an accommodation culture (Kyriakides 1968, 92-94).

² 1960 Constitution, Part V, Articles 89-90-104-105.

³ 1960 Constitution, Articles 50-78.

⁴ 1960 Constitution, Articles 46-62-129-130-178.

Proportionality in civil services recruitment was another disagreement subject. Its implication was postponed as it would have resulted in loss of jobs for Greek Cypriots, was against meritocracy and with an excuse of inexistence of enough qualified candidates among Turkish Cypriots to fill in the positions (Kyriakides 1968, 78-81). Essentially, the problem was the over-representation of Turkish Cypriot community with regards to their actual population ratio of 18, 4% (Stavriniades 1976, 45). Not only recruitment but also representation of Turkish Cypriots in state institutions with 30% was perceived too much and unjust by Greek Cypriots (Kyriakides 1968, 76). In addition to this, minority veto of Vice-President, and generally veto rights in executive and legislature, were confronted by Greek Cypriots for harming the functioning of the state and giving the Turkish Cypriot community excessive power (Yakinthou 2009, 66). Turkish Cypriot elites, on the other hand, used veto power against the extension of colonial tax law, in order to make Greek Cypriot elite to deal on other issues like municipalities or civil services. This was interpreted as an abuse of veto power by Greek Cypriots. The last issue concerned the legislation for existence of separate municipalities of Turkish Cypriots in the biggest five towns, which was in practice since 1958 (Bose 2007, 70). Even though segmental autonomy principle favors this, fear of separation prevented the President to accept the legislation (Clerides 1989, 122; Stephens 1966, 164-176). Eventually, power-sharing system was regarded by the Greek Cypriots as unjust, dysfunctional and favoring Turkish Cypriots, while Turkish Cypriots were defending their strict implementation as a protection against a domination of the Greek Cypriot majority (Kyriakides 1968, 83). In accordance with Horowitz's (2014, 8) claim, majorities and minorities have "asymmetric preferences" and the majorities accept the consociational regime when they are weak but overthrow it when they regain strength, as happened in Cyprus. Thus, with the discrepancy of perceptions and lack of mutual trust, cooperation could not be established. In 1963, the thirteen amendments to the Constitution changed consociational democracy into a majoritarian system, literally bringing an end to the bi-communal republic.

The inter-communal relations have deteriorated steadily from that point on, resulting in isolation of the two communities from each other since 1974. The intercommunal talks with the aim of bringing peace to Cyprus are still going on under the auspices of the UN, within a bi-communal and bi-zonal federation framework; in other words, a consociational federation. Therefore, examining the nature of nationalisms in Cyprus and their impact on the failure of 1960 bi-communal republic will contribute to a future institutional design for a solution in Cyprus.

Two ethnic nations, in search of their own self-determinations

Prior to further analyzing the rival ethnic nationalisms in Cyprus, first a definitive clarification and diagnosis of the problem should be made. There are two separate ethnic groups and two separate ethnic

nationalisms in Cyprus. According to Connor's (1994, 4) definition of "nation", nationalism is a subjective and emotional concept, in which a group identifies itself with a larger group, with its past, present, future and destiny. The two communities in Cyprus should be defined as nations due to their identifications with their kin-states. The Greek and Turkish Cypriots are not just religious, linguistic and cultural groups, but are ethnic nations (Watts 2007, 227). As one of the conditions of being an ethnic nation, both groups have historically been living on the territory. Despite of the claims that the Turkish Cypriots had settled in Cyprus with the Ottoman conquest, the fact that they have been living in the island for centuries necessitates the acceptance of their inhabitation as natives. Consequently, accepting both communities as ethnic nations is crucial, as Azar (1986, 28-30) puts forth, lack of recognition of identities and un-representation in the administration according to these recognized identities are among the causes conflicts.

Ethnic nationalism was so strong that independence under the Cyprus Republic could only be the second best solution for both communities (Bahcheli and Noel 2013; 3). It even prevented the anti-colonial struggle to unite all the peoples of Cyprus, but instead it was for enosis and taksim, rather than sole independence (Lijphart 1977, 161). As a response to Greek Cypriot nationalism that was seeking for unification with Greece, Turkish Cypriot community developed their counter nationalism in the same line. As a result, the counter-nationalisms of the ethnic communities were far from the prospect of a common identity, directed only to their kin-states.

As ethnic nations, both communities believe that they have common ancestry or kinship with their kin-states, are a big family, and have the nationalism bond that will make them to respond, even with violence, to any threats that will be directed to this family. Territory, sovereignty and national pride are important values for these kinds of groups and to have sovereignty and power over their territories and be recognized as nations are of great consequence (McGarry and O'Leary 1995, 355). In parallel with this assumption, in Cyprus, Greek Cypriots thought they have the right of sovereignty as they are the majority group. They demanded a majoritarian state in compliance of their majority status and a state that will be in accordance with their definitions, which can be evaluated as self-determination to build a nation-state. Therefore they proclaimed the demands of Turkish Cypriots as incompatible with their own view and the 1960 system as an arrangement that "denied the Hellenic character" of the island (Bose 2007, 62). From the perspective of the Greek Cypriots, they were the "Cypriots" whereas the Turkish Cypriots were "the Turkish", just an "insignificant minority" (Borowiec 2000, 49; Kizilyürek 2002, 103). Thus, the two groups were not in equal status from this perspective. The existing economic imbalance at the expense of the Turkish Cypriots further deteriorated the situation (Lijphart 1977, 161; Kizilyürek 2001, 62-69). According

to the majoritarian view of Greek Cypriots, accepting the Turkish Cypriots as a separate community was a mistake; they were only a minority and the right to rule belonged to the majority (DGCP 1965, 34). That approach was in line with the general acceptance of nation-state system, in which the majority groups represent the “nation” in a “nation-state” (Connor 1994, 40-41). However, it is conflict stimulating, particularly for the states which contain multiple communities or nations.

On the other hand, Turkish Cypriots thought that the sovereignty right should be shared with them and they should be recognized as the equal constituents, as they are a nation living in the same territory with Greek Cypriots. Turkish Cypriot community demanded to be recognized as one of the founders of the state and to have equal status and power in the state apparatus. These contradictory perspectives and demands were perceived as conflict stimulating factors by the two communities. Even though this is not the only explanation for the conflict, in order to understand the nature of the conflict it is necessary to see that the two groups are ethnic nations and their demands are shaped according to this fact. As the perceptions of two groups contradict, they comprehend each other’s claims as a threat over their own, which creates an insecure environment for both.

In order to demonstrate the potency of ethnic identity, desire of union with kin-state and majoritarian perspective of Greek Cypriot community, the announcement made by the enosis movement following the Independence Day ceremonies of Greece in April the 28th 1895 is a significant example:

As the Hellenic people of Limassol district, in line with the rest of the Hellenic people of the island, who constitute the majority of the all community, today we seriously demand the realization of our endeavor, which we always desired, currently desire and will desire in the future, as the one and only solution, to unite with Hellas, with whom we belong to with ethnic and blood ties, with minimum delay (Hill 1952, 500).
(Italics belong to author)

Although the discourse used in this announcement is a product of nationalist language, it is significant in demonstrating the reasons behind the failure of 1960 bi-communal system and then shifting to majoritarian system, and also in understanding the approach in the negotiations. As Horowitz (2014, 17) argues, majorities are inclined towards majority rule with minority rights. The assumption of the right of majorities to rule has been evident in Greek Cypriot community from the time of this announcement to the failure of 1960 Republic.

As a consequence of the ethnic nationalisms that were influenced from the reciprocal negative perceptions of the communities, the 1960 Cyprus Republic did not satisfy the desires of neither group, which were both pursuing unification with kin-states. As a result, it was hard for the new system that was

dependent on cooperation of the communities, to function efficiently in an environment of mutual distrust and different perceptions. Thus, as Kizilyürek (2002, 27) mentions, this “state without citizens” was in the end owned by the majority population as their nation-state.

As in many deeply divided societies, existence of reinforcing cleavages in Cyprus further complicates the conflict and makes it harder to be regulated (Sisk 1996, x; Lijphart 1977, 81). Religion, language and ethnicity differences reinforce each other. Loizos (1988, 641-646) asserts that religion has an impact on the identities in Cyprus, but it remains secondary compared to ethnicity. In Cyprus the main conflict issue is not religious difference and religion is not influential beyond the operationalization of its symbolism as being a part of the culture. It is influential in sanctification of values and goals to turn them into unquestionable phenomenon in order to remain them out of the political scene. Additionally it has impacts on the unwillingness of the people and leaders in the regulation of the conflict through accommodation. Role of the church in the Greek Cypriot community, adopting a discourse for the sanctification of enosis, accepting a religious leader (head of the church) as the community leader and president of the state, can be seen as examples of this effect. However, these impacts play a secondary role in the conflict, which is most of all derived from ethnic nationalisms.

Ethnic nationalism in Cyprus

Nationalism is claimed to be the reason of failure for developing a common identity and the beginning of inter-communal conflict in Cyprus. Lijphart (1977, 161) mentions that it was “the divergent nationalisms” which divided Cyprus. Stavrinides (1976, 43) supports this and adds that as long as the nationalist leaders support these rival nationalisms, there will not be a common identity. During 19th and beginning of 20th centuries, when nationalism was rising, Cyprus was under colonial rule. Colonial administration did not have any agenda to support the emergence of a common identity or an overarching loyalty (Bahcheli and Noel 2013, 15). On the contrary, as it will be discussed in the following part of the article, the colonial administration did not hesitate using the ethnic groups against each other for the sake of its policies. In turn, with the addition of other factors like influence of kin-states, modernization or education, the age of nationalism had an effect of strengthening ethnic nationalisms in Cyprus.

The communities perceived each other as obstacles and threats against the realization of their nationalist aspirations. In a booklet named Dictionary of Greek Cypriot Politics (1965, 34), Turkish Cypriot was defined as “born enemies of Hellenism, to be wiped off the surface of Cyprus, if enosis is to be achieved” and “who oppose enosis and refuse to accept Archbishop Makarios’ offer to become Greek Cypriots; wrongly treated as a separate community for four centuries”. This perception of seeing one another as

obstacles and threats against realization of self-existence and goals complicated any chance of building a common future and a common identity. Despite of living together for centuries, not having close contact between the communities catalyzed the “Othering” of each other, which was later stimulated further by the nationalists, as they required an “Other” to build their antagonism against (Volkan 2008, 83; Bryant 2004, 66; Bahcheli and Noel 2013, 15). Moreover, the relations of their kin-states have also affected the communities. As ethnic nations, Greek and Turkish Cypriots share sentimental bonds, to be part of the same family, with their kin-states. Therefore, the tension between Greece and Turkey, as both have gained their independence through wars against each other, affected Greek and Turkish Cypriot perceptions against each other as well (Bahcheli 1990, 20-25; Anastasiou 2008, 27).

One of the factors for the emergence of mutual distrust and hatred, thus causing conflict, is the different time frames of development of nationalism and modernization in two communities. The Ottoman millet system has compartmentalized the society according to religion. This has begun to change in Cyprus with transformation of the Orthodox into Hellene in 1821. The nationalist re-organization of the society was completed in 1923 with transformation of the Muslim into Turk. These dates can be seen as the cornerstones for the development of nationalism and thus as the beginning of conflict.

For the emergence of Greek Cypriot nationalism there are different views, however the general acceptance is that the independence of Greece in 1821 was influential in the awareness of ethnic consciousness. It stimulated the possibility and need of living as a separate nation (Ehrlich 1974, 9; Dodd 1999, 1-3). Bryant (2004, 97-100) puts forth the date as 1900 and the following decade, as that was the first time in using an ethnic discourse with “Othering” of the Turkish to unite Greek Cypriots, which was used by the Kition bishop during his campaign to be elected as archbishop. The beginning of enosis policy is also vague; the dates vary from 1830 to 1930 (Ehrlich 1974, 9; Trimikliniotis and Bozkurt 2012, 53). It can be argued that independence of Greece and acceptance of expansionist Greek foreign policy of Megali Idea in 1844, which aimed to cover all Orthodox-Hellene territories under Greece, affected the development of nationalism among Greek Cypriot community (Kizilyürek 2002, 49-59). The rise of ethnic nationalism was evident especially during 1897 Greek-Ottoman war, when more than six thousand Greek Cypriots volunteered in Greek army for the “national cause” (Bahcheli 1990, 24; Kyriakides 1968, 11).

The aim of enosis or uniting with Greece should not only be seen as a political project. It is an element of ethnic identity, expression of the belief that Greek Cypriots have the same identity with their “kin” in Greece. Besides having common language, religion, culture, social and economic life, with having the same history education for long years, Greek Cypriots share belonging to Hellenic culture (Stavriniades 1999,

63-64; Hill 1952, 488-489).

The beginning of nationalist movements in Cyprus from the second half of 19th century evolved in line with advancement of education and literature as Anderson (1995, 83-98) suggests as influential factors in development of nationalism. Particularly through the teachers coming from Greece to Cyprus, from 1860's on, education system, especially language and history education became tools to inflict nationalism to younger generations. Increasing literacy and advancement of press as results of modernization helped development and expansion of Greek nationalism (Kitromilides 1990, 7-8; Bryant 2004, 49). Ethnic nationalism and consciousness in the Greek Cypriot community grew during the 19th century. The policies of British colonial administration had also impacts on development of nationalism, together with modernism (Michael 2011, 7-8; Bahcheli and Noel 2013, 14). Therefore it can be said that modernization, education and colonial policies had impact on the rise of nationalism in Greek Cypriot society.

Turkish Cypriot nationalism can be perceived as a defensive counter-nationalism that was influenced from weak modernization, defensive as a response to enosis demand, and leaning towards kin-state nationalism (Kızılyürek 2002, 18-27). Emergence of Turkish Cypriot nationalism has a parallel course to development of Turkish nationalist movement during the last decades of Ottoman rule and establishment of the Republic in Turkey (Sönmezoğlu 1991, 8). It flourished almost a century after Greek Cypriot nationalism, as a counter-nationalist movement (Kızılyürek 2002, 26). Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot nationalisms had developed in different settings and time frames, which impacted their characteristics. During 1930s, nationalist sentiments among Turkish Cypriot community increased, attracting the attention of the colonial administration as well (Gazioğlu 1996, 231-251; Kızılyürek 2002, 218-219). Similar to development of Greek Cypriot nationalism, education played an important role in the development of Turkish Cypriot nationalism. New history books brought with the aim of developing Turkish nationalism and reforms in Turkey were closely followed (Salih 1968, 41). This was a period in which Turkish Cypriots redefined their identity (Bryant 2004, 177).

Nevzat and Hatay (2009, 918-921) claims that the process of transforming from a Muslim community to a Turkish community has started during 1920s but the colonial administration insisted to regard them as religious community, especially during mid-1930s. That was recalled as a period in which the Turkish Cypriots were obliged to call their identity as "Islam" and the "Turkish high school" was renamed as "Islam high school" despite of the objections from Turkish Cypriots (Denктаş 1997, 14-15). This insistence of colonial administration was based on the realization of evolving ethnic nationalisms and attempting to substitute ethnic nationalism with religion.

Different modernization pace has imbalanced the relations between communities in political, cultural and economic terms and thus affecting the intercommunal relations permanently. For instance, literacy ratios or numbers of press release were considerably different for two communities: the first book published in Cyprus was History of Cyprus from Kyprianos in 1788, while the first Turkish book was dated 1892 (Kizilyürek 2011, 37; Bryant 2004, 47-48; Kitromilides 1990, 7-8). The social changes that occur as an outcome of modernization can cause a community to feel disadvantaged in social mobility and result in conflicts (Weiner 1970, 205). Therefore, it can be argued that different pace of modernization in the two communities have contributed to the conditions of conflict, which is in parallel to the assertion of Nordlinger (1972, 112-116), that increasing insecurity, anxiety and fear that arouse from modernization can increase intercommunal conflict and violence. Consequently, century long difference between the developments of nationalisms in two communities, coupled with different pace in modernization, has affected their nationalisms in an asymmetrical way.

Development of ethnic rivalry

In analyzing the development of ethnic rivalry, some key events like 1931 revolt has considerable importance, as it has influenced the rise of Turkish Cypriot nationalism as a counter-movement to Greek Cypriot nationalism and the following militarization of communities, which resulted in the inter-communal violence. Moreover, modernization and ethnic geography have roles in separate nationalisms in Cyprus.

The increasing control of colonial administration over education policies during 1920s provoked reactions from the Greek Cypriots. Denial of Greek Cypriot demand for more autonomy, decreasing support for enosis from the colonial administration, and economic problems triggered by a new taxation proposal from the administration, initiated the start of the 1931 revolt (Kyriakides 1968, 24; Heacock 2011, 33). The taxation proposal was voted down in the council by the decisive vote of a Turkish representative, however, the following revolt and plans for independence did not involve any proposals regarding Turkish Cypriots, rather they were written with references to religion and enosis (Heacock 2011, 32-34). Even though this revolt against the colonial administration could present an opportunity for the two communities to stand together, the ongoing enosis aim prevented the Turkish Cypriots to support the movement (Nevzat 2011, 101).

As a result of the exclusivist orientation of the enosis movement against Turkish Cypriots, nationalist tendencies in Turkish Cypriot community strengthened (Yakinthou 2009, 37-39; Kizilyürek 2002, 26-27). 1931 revolt and the following years became a determinative period for Turkish Cypriots to realize enosis as a threat to their existence (Dodd 1999, 5). As a result of this consciousness, in post-1931 period, Turkish

community began to establish its communal organizations (Alasya 1988, 146). Another motive of these communal establishments was the hope of self-determination, as the president of the USA Franklin Roosevelt and the Prime Minister of Great Britain Winston Churchill signed the Atlantic Charter in 1941, which foresaw the right of self-determination (Gazioğlu 1996, 335-357). In such an expectation, in 1943 Turkish Minority Agency of Cyprus (KATAK) was established (Gazioğlu 1996, 335-357; Egemen 2006, 124-130). The development of ethnic nationalisms toward different self-determination plans was becoming evident in both communities.

Another reason for separate communal establishments was the difficulty of staying in bi-communal organizations due to the increasing ethnic nationalisms. Institutions like workers or farmers associations or unions were getting ethnically divided as a result of nationalism (Gazioğlu 1996, 336-347)⁵. The separation of the common grounds in which the peoples of two communities can interact, resulted in the diminishing chances for the development of overarching loyalties, which in turn caused deepening of divisions. As Eckstein (1966, 34) puts forward, when the political and ascriptive differences coincide and this difference is reflected in political parties, media, interest groups, schools and voluntary organizations, than that society is a deeply divided one. In a society with less contact among communities, “Othering” and discrimination can be more frequent and that will increase the divisions, which will prepare the grounds for a future conflict. From the events beginning from 1930s, it can be concluded that Cyprus was turning into a deeply divided community.

The ethnic nationalisms in both communities came to another level with the establishment of guerilla organizations in both communities, EOKA and Volkan (later TMT) (Xydis 1973, 35; Stavrinides 1976, 31; Tocci and Kovziridze 2004, 66; Alasya 1988, 175; Denktash 1988, 23; Druşotis 2006, 28-29)⁶. Even though these organizations struggled for their nationalistic goals rather than aspiring to eliminate the other community, in order to create unity in their communities, they did not refrain from suppressing the criticals in their own communities. For example TMT was described as “an anti-communist, anti-Hellene and having a genealogist understanding of Turkishness” and illustrative to this description, one of its activities was forcing abolishment of the Communist Party, firing its branches, threatening its members to resign and executing the members who refuse it (Kizilyürek 2002, 244; Salih 1968, 62-63). The situation was the same in both communities. During the EOKA campaign, more Greek Cypriots were executed than Turkish Cypriots or British officials (Mayes 1981, 61). Therefore, the activities of these guerilla organizations were not only to protect their communities but also to eradicate anyone who could harm or they thought could harm, their nationalist aspirations such as the moderates, people who support reconciliation, or the

⁵ For example, in Cyprus Farmers Union congress of 1943, Turkish Cypriots claim to hang Turkish flag aside of the flag of Greece was rejected and enosis demand took place in the activity report despite of the objections from Turkish Cypriot members.

⁶ Ethniki Organosis Kyprion Agoniston (EOKA) was established in 1953 and began its anti-colonial struggle in 1955. Volkan was established in 1956 and was replaced by Türk Mukavemet Teşkilatı (TMT) in 1958. Both organizations had support from their kin-states.

communists (Yakinthou 2009, 47; Coughlan 2000, 222; Alasya 1988, 175; Druşotis 2006, 31-34).

Eventually, the guerilla organizations further deteriorated the inter-communal relations, increasing the tensions and hostility particularly through “provocative leaflets” according to archive reports (CIA 1957).⁷

As a result of the insecurity, mutual distrust and suppression of the moderates and leftists, radical nationalism strengthened in both communities. The increasing tensions and nationalism in both communities created a mutual distrust atmosphere that harmed the intercommunal relations.

Besides ethnic nationalisms, weak inter-communal trust deriving from ethnic geography is influential in Cyprus (Brown 1997, 5). As McGarry and O’Leary (1995, 361) assert, when kin-states are in a geographically close location, communities and majority-minority relations are more prone to be influenced from them and they can have impact on the conflict. The locations of the kin-states in a geographic proximity both consolidate ethnic nationalisms in communities and their threat perception, which in turn negatively affect the inter-communal relations. For communities, the greatest external threat comes from the other community’s kin-state. And as Stavenhagen (1996, 184-185) claims, security is a need for the communities; when they feel under threat, conflicts are more probable. Likewise, Rubenstein (1999, 194) takes attention to the external parties as potential actors to prevent a peaceful solution. Besides that, having kin-states in close locations, particularly Turkey’s close location creates a double minority situation for the communities in Cyprus. While the Turkish Cypriots have minority psychology within Cyprus, the Greek Cypriots have a minority psychology in the region, with a big and populated Turkey as the closest neighbor to the island (MRG 1976, 20). This situation has become another reason for the mutual distrust. Consequently, kin-state relations had an impact of increasing the polarization and antagonism between the communities (Bahcheli and Noel 2013, 17).

As ethnic nationalisms have developed in a rival nature, with the contribution from support of kin-states and mutual distrust created particularly by underground organizations and enosis movement, a common identity could not have evolved. The anti-colonial movement, which could be a ground for cooperation, was utilized for strengthening enosis movement that created insecurity for Turkish Cypriot community. Therefore, it can be evaluated as a loss for the chances of creation of a common loyalty to independence in 1960.

Conclusion

As the conflict in Cyprus is yet not successfully resolved and the plans to manage the conflict still target maintaining a power-sharing arrangement to enable two communities to live together, it is important to understand the roots of the conflict. The rival ethnic nationalisms of two communities could not be

accommodated in 1960 consociational republic. Understanding the development of ethnic nationalisms is significant for the design of future solutions. This paper argues that, it was colonial policies, modernization and kin-state relations that had most serious impacts on the emergence of ethnic rivalry, which could have helped the functioning of power-sharing system in 1960.

There are two ethnic nations in Cyprus with counter nationalisms and different goals; both desired to unite with their kin-state or both seek for separate self-determinations. These nationalisms have developed in different time periods and circumstances. This article argues that particularly modernization, kin-states and colonial policies had affected emergence of the ethnic nationalisms and the conflict. Modernization has influenced two communities in different time frames. As a consequence, Turkish Cypriot community felt disadvantaged in social mobility and this caused insecurity in inter-communal relations, which contributed in the evolution of defensive counter-nationalism. Existence of kin-states in geographically close locations and their interference in the development of ethnic nationalisms through education and supporting guerilla organizations had impacts on the development of ethnic nationalisms and also antagonistic evolution of intercommunal relations.

With strong and separatist ethnic nationalisms, 1960 bi-communal republic could not succeed and turned into a majoritarian state, with a prolonged ethnic conflict that is still to be resolved. In order to establish a working bi-communal solution in Cyprus, historical events illustrate that the importance of overarching loyalty and tradition of accommodation among the elites might be more significant than consociational theory have suggested. For the success of future solution plans for Cyprus, it might be fruitful for the policymakers to work on development of more extensive co-operation among the communities and of an overarching loyalty like Cyprus-ness, but acceptance of the existence of two ethnic nations on Cyprus, is a key matter to any institutional structure.

Bibliography

Alasya, H.Fikret (1988), *Tarihte Kıbrıs [Cyprus Through History]* Ankara, Kıbrıs Türk Kültür Derneği Genel Merkezi.

An, Ahmet, (1997), *Dinsel Topluluktan Ulusal Topluluğa Geçiş Süreci ve Kıbrıs Türk Liderliğinin Oluşması (1900-1942) [Transformation from a Religious Community to a National Community and Evolution of Turkish Cypriot Leadership (1900-1942)]*. Nicosia: Galeri Kültür Yayınları.

Anastasiou, Harry, (2008), *The Broken Olive Branch, Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict, and the Quest for Peace in Cyprus, The Impasse of Ethnonationalism*, New York, Syracuse University Press, (kindle version).

Anderson, Benedict, (1995), *Hayali Cemaatler [Imagined Communities]*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Azar, Edward E., (1986), "Protracted International Conflicts: Ten Propositions", in: *International Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, Edward Azar, John Burton (Eds), Sussex, Wheatsheaf Books, pp.28-39.

Bahcheli, Tozun and Sid Noel, (2013), "Ties that no longer bind: Greece, Turkey, and the Fading Allure of Ethnic Kinship in Cyprus", *Divided Nations and European Integration*, Tristan Mabry, John McGarry, Margaret Moore, Brendan O'Leary (Eds.), University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bahcheli, Tozun, (1990), *Greek-Turkish Relations Since 1955*. USA: Westview.

Borowiec, Andrew, (2000), *Cyprus: A Troubled Island*. Westport-Connecticut-London: Praeger.

Bose, Sumantra, (2007), *Contested Lands, Israel-Palestine, Kashmir, Bosnia, Cyprus and Sri Lanka*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Brown, Michael E., (1997), "The Causes of Internal Conflict", in: *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict*, Michael E. Brown, Owen R. Cote Jr., Sean M. Lynn-Jones, Steven Miller (eds), London, The MIT Press, pp.3-25.

Bryant, Rebecca, (2004), *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*, London, I.B.Tauris and Co.

CIA, (1957), Office of Current Intelligence, Washington, "Current Intelligence Bulletin", Document No.28, 24 November 1957, Copy No.138.

Clerides, Glafkos, (1989), *Cyprus: My Deposition, Volume 1*, Nicosia, Alithia Publishing.

Connor, Walker, (1994), *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding*, Princeton New Jersey, Princeton University Press.

Coughlan, Reed, (2000), "Cyprus: From Corporate Autonomy to the Search for Territorial Federalism", in: *Autonomy and Ethnicity, Negotiating Competing Claims in Multi-ethnic States*, Yash Ghai (ed), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp.219-241.

- Denktash, R.R., (1988), *The Cyprus Triangle*, New York, The Office of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.
- Denktaş, Rauf R., (1997), *Koloni İdaresinde Kıbrıs Türkleri*, [Turkish Cypriots under Colonial Administration] İstanbul, Akdeniz Haber Ajansı Yayınları.
- DGCP (Dictionary of Greek Cypriot Politics), (1960), Kıbrıs [Cyprus].
- Dodd, Clement H., (1999), “A Historical Overview”, in: *Cyprus: The Need for New Perspectives*, Clement H. Dodd (ed.), England, The Eothen Press, pp.1-15.
- Eckstein, Harry, (1966), *Division and Cohesion in Democracy: A Study of Norway*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Egemen, Salih, (2006), *Kıbrıslı Türkler Arasında Siyasal Liderlik*, [Political Leadership Among Turkish Cypriots] Lefkoşe, Ateş Matbaacılık.
- Ehrlich, Thomas, (1974), *Cyprus 1958-1967, International Crises and the Role of Law*, Great Britain, Oxford University Press.
- Erim, Nihat, (1975), *Bildiğim ve Gördüğüm Ölçüler İçinde Kıbrıs*, [Cyprus As I Know and Witnessed] Ankara, Ajans-Türk Matbaacılık Sanayii.
- Gazioğlu, Ahmet C., (1996), *Enosis Çemberinde Türkler, İngiliz Yönetiminde Kıbrıs II, (1878-1952)* [Turkish In The Enosis Chamber: Cyprus under British Rule II (1878-1952)] İstanbul: Kıbrıs Araştırma ve Yayın Merkezi.
- Guelke, Adrian, (2012), *Politics in Deeply Divided Societies*. UK: Polity Press.
- Heacock, Roger, (Fall 2011), “The Framing of Empire: Cyprus and Cypriots through British Eyes, 1878-1960”, *The Cyprus Review*, Vol.23, No.2, pp.21-37.
- Hill, Sir George, (1952), *A History of Cyprus, Volume IV*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Horowitz, Donald, (April 2014), “Ethnic Power Sharing: Three Big Problems”, *Journal of Democracy*, Vol.25, Nr.2, pp.5-20.
- Ker-Lindsay, James, (2011), *The Cyprus Problem, What everyone needs to know*, Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press.
- Kızılyürek, Niyazi, (2001), *Kıbrıs Sorununda İç ve Dış Etkenler*, [Domestic and Foreign Factors in Cyprus Problem] İkinci Basım, Lefkoşa, Işık Kitabevi.
- Kızılyürek, Niyazi, (2002), *Milliyetçilik Kısılcında Kıbrıs*, [Cyprus Constricted Under Nationalism] İstanbul, İletişim.
- Kızılyürek, Niyazi, (2009), “Federalizm ve Kıbrıs'ta Federal Devlet” [Federalism and Federal State in Cyprus], p.61, in: *Kıbrıs'ta Federalizm: Öznesini Arayan Siyaset*, [Federalism in Cyprus: Policy Looking for a Subject] Niyazi Kızılyürek, Tufan Erhürman, Lefkoşa, Işık Kitabevi, pp.8-99.

Denktash, R.R., (1988), *The Cyprus Triangle*, New York, The Office of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

Denktaş, Rauf R., (1997), *Koloni İdaresinde Kıbrıs Türkleri*, [Turkish Cypriots under Colonial Administration] İstanbul, Akdeniz Haber Ajansı Yayınları.

DGCP (Dictionary of Greek Cypriot Politics), (1960), Kıbrıs [Cyprus].

Dodd, Clement H., (1999), "A Historical Overview", in: *Cyprus: The Need for New Perspectives*, Clement H. Dodd (ed.), England, The Eothen Press, pp.1-15.

Eckstein, Harry, (1966), *Division and Cohesion in Democracy: A Study of Norway*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Egemen, Salih, (2006), *Kıbrıslı Türkler Arasında Siyasal Liderlik*, [Political Leadership Among Turkish Cypriots] Lefkoşe, Ateş Matbaacılık.

Ehrlich, Thomas, (1974), *Cyprus 1958-1967, International Crises and the Role of Law*, Great Britain, Oxford University Press.

Erim, Nihat, (1975), *Bildiğim ve Gördüğüm Ölçüler İçinde Kıbrıs*, [Cyprus As I Know and Witnessed] Ankara, Ajans-Türk Matbaacılık Sanayii.

Gazioğlu, Ahmet C., (1996), *Enosis Çemberinde Türkler, İngiliz Yönetiminde Kıbrıs II, (1878-1952)* [Turkish In The Enosis Chamber: Cyprus under British Rule II (1878-1952)] İstanbul: Kıbrıs Araştırma ve Yayın Merkezi.

Guelke, Adrian, (2012), *Politics in Deeply Divided Societies*. UK: Polity Press.

Heacock, Roger, (Fall 2011), "The Framing of Empire: Cyprus and Cypriots through British Eyes, 1878-1960", *The Cyprus Review*, Vol.23, No.2, pp.21-37.

Hill, Sir George, (1952), *A History of Cyprus, Volume IV*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Horowitz, Donald, (April 2014), "Ethnic Power Sharing: Three Big Problems", *Journal of Democracy*, Vol.25, Nr.2, pp.5-20.

Ker-Lindsay, James, (2011), *The Cyprus Problem, What everyone needs to know*, Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press.

Kızılyürek, Niyazi, (2001), *Kıbrıs Sorununda İç ve Dış Etkenler*, [Domestic and Foreign Factors in Cyprus Problem] İkinci Basım, Lefkoşa, Işık Kitabevi.

Kızılyürek, Niyazi, (2002), *Milliyetçilik Kısılcında Kıbrıs*, [Cyprus Constricted Under Nationalism] İstanbul, İletişim.

Kızılyürek, Niyazi, (2009), "Federalizm ve Kıbrıs'ta Federal Devlet" [Federalism and Federal State in Cyprus], p.61, in: *Kıbrıs'ta Federalizm: Öznesini Arayan Siyaset*, [Federalism in Cyprus: Policy Looking for a Subject] Niyazi Kızılyürek, Tufan Erhürman, Lefkoşa, Işık Kitabevi, pp.8-99.

Kızılyürek, Niyazi, (2011), Paşalar ve Papazlar: Kıbrıs'ta Hegemonya, [Pashas and Priests: Hegemony in Cyprus] İkinci Basım, İstanbul, Khora-Kalkedon.

Kitromilides, Paschalis M., (Jan.1990), "Greek Irredentism in Asia Minor and Cyprus", Middle Eastern Studies, Vol.26, No.1, pp.3-17.

Kyriakides, Stanley, (1968), Cyprus: Constitutionalism and Crisis Government, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lijphart, Arend, (1977), Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Loizos, Peter, (December 1988), "Intercommunal Killing in Cyprus", Man, New Series, Volume 23, Issue 4, pp.639-653.

Druşotis, Makarios, (2006), Kıbrıs, 1970-1974, EOKA B, Yunan Darbesi ve Türk İstilasası [Cyprus 1970-1974: EOKA-B, Greek Coup and Turkish Invasion] Lefkoşa, Galeri Kültür Yayınları.

Mayes, Stanley, (1981), Makarios, A Biography, London, Macmillan.

McGarry, John, Brendan O'Leary, (1995), Explaining Northern Ireland, Oxford, Blackwell.

Melakopides, Costas, (1996), Peace in Cyprus: Time for a Comprehensive Initiative, Kingston, Queen's University.

Michael, Michalis Stavrou, (2011), Resolving the Cyprus Conflict: Negotating History, New York, Palgrave MacMillan.

MRG (Minority Rights Group), (1976), Cyprus, Report No.30, London, Minority Rights Group.

National Archives at College Park, MD, (20 February 1960), RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, NND 989591, Lot no.66D277, Entry 5257, Box no.1, Incoming Telegram, Document No.362, Nicosia to Secretary of State.

National Archives at College Park, MD, (2 April 1960), RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, NND 989591, Lot no.66D277, Entry 5257, Box no.1, Incoming Telegram, Document No.416, Nicosia to Secretary of State.

Nevzat, Altay, Mete Hatay, (2009), "Politics, Society and the Decline of Islam in Cyprus: From the Ottoman Era to the Twenty-First Century", Middle Eastern Studies, Vol.45, No.6, pp.911-933.

Nevzat, Altay, (Fall 2011), "Ronald Storrs and Mısırlı zade Necati: The Governor's Encounter with the 'Thirteenth Greek'", The Cyprus Review, Vol.23, No.2, pp.77-107.

Nordlinger, Eric A., (1972), Conflict Regulation in Divided Societies, USA, Harvard University.

Özgür, Özdemir A., (2000), *Hayatımda Kıbrıs, Bir Kıbrıslı Türk Diplomatın Tanıklığı*, [Cyprus in My Life: A Turkish Cypriot Diplomat's Testimony] Lefkoşa, Galeri Kültür Yayınları.

Rubenstein, Richard E., (1999), "Conflict Resolution and the Structural Sources of Conflict", in: *Conflict Resolution: Dynamics, Process and Structure*, Ho-won Jeong (ed.), USA, Ashgate, pp.173-196.

Salih, Halil İbrahim, (1968), *Cyprus: An Analysis of Cypriot Political Discord*, New York, Theo Gaus' Sons.

Sisk, Timothy D., (1996), *Power Sharing and International Mediation in Ethnic Conflicts*, Washington DC, United States Institute of Peace.

Sönmezoğlu, Faruk, (1991), *Tarafların Tutum ve Tezleri Açısından Kıbrıs Sorunu*, [Cyprus Problem in terms of the Attitudes and Thesis of the Parties]. İstanbul:İÜ Basımevi.

Stavenhagen, Rodolfo, (1996), *Ethnic Conflicts and the Nation-State*, London and New York, MacMillan-St. Martin's Press.

Stavriniades, Zenon, (1976), *The Cyprus Conflict, National Identity and Statehood*.

Stavriniades, Zenon, (1999), "Greek Cypriot Perceptions", in: *Cyprus, The Need for New Perspectives*, Clement H. Dodd (ed.), England, The Eothen Press, pp.54-96.

Stephens, Robert, (1966), *Cyprus: A Place of Arms: Power Politics and Ethnic Conflict in the Eastern Mediterranean*, Great Britain, Frederick A. Praeger Inc.

Tocci, Nathalie, Tamara Kovziridze, (2004), "Cyprus", in: *Europeanization and Conflict Resolution, Case Studies from the European Periphery*, Bruno Coppieters, Michael Emerson, Michel Huysseune, Tamara Kovziridze, Gergana Noutcheva, Nathalie Tocci, Marius Vahl (eds), Gent, Academia Press, pp.63-106.

Trimikliniotis, Nicos, Umut Bozkurt, (2012), "Rethinking the Postcolonial Cypriot Statehood: The Cyprus Problem, Class Struggles, and Ethnic Conflict", in: *Beyond a Divided Cyprus, A State and Society in Transformation*, Nicos Trimikliniotis, Umut Bozkurt (eds), New York, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 47-66.

Volkan, Vamik D., (2008), *Kıbrıs: Savaş ve Uyum, Çatışan İki Etnik Grubun Psikanalitik Tarihi*, [Cyprus: War and Harmony: A Psychoanalytic History of Two Conflicting Ethnic Group] İstanbul, Everest.

Watts, Ronald L., (2007), "Multinational federations in comparative perspective", in: *Multinational Federations*, Michael Burgess and John Pinder (Eds), London and New York, Routledge, pp.225-247.

Weiner, Myron, (1970), "Political and Social Integration: Forms and Strategies", in: *Politics and Society Studies in Comparative Sociology*, Eric A. Nordlinger (ed.), New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, pp.197-209.

Xydis, Stephen G., (1973), *Cyprus: Reluctant Republic*. The Hague, Mouton.

Yakinthou, Christalla, (2009), *Political Settlements in Divided Societies, Consociationalism and Cyprus*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.