

“IS THERE NOTHING MORE?”: ETHNOCIDE, DEMOCIDE, IDENTICIDE, SPACIOCIDE, MEMORICIDE AND GENDERCIDE AGAINST TURKISH CYPRIOTS IN CYPRUS

Gökhan Ak^a

Abstract

The aim of the study is to examine the acts of oppression, intimidation, and terror perpetrated against Turkish Cypriots by the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo between 1945 and 1974 with the aim of ethnocide, democide, identicide, spaciocide, memoricide, and gendercide. Throughout history, humanity has witnessed numerous cases of massacres, killings, and ethnic cleansing. These crimes against humanity, generally described in the literature as “genocide,” have also been supported by a wide variety of sub-cide methods of extermination. In Cyprus, Turkish Cypriots were subjected to intense genocide acts supported by ethnocide, democide, identicide, spaciocide, memoricide, and gendercide by Greek Cypriots as well as by Greece, particularly between 1945 and 1974. The importance of this study lies in the fact that the ethnic cleansing actions carried out against Turkish Cypriots on the island in recent history have not yet been examined and analyzed within the framework of these sub-cide methods in the Turkish social sciences literature. This study is primarily based on qualitative research methodology and has utilized scientific research methods such as document analysis, systematic historical analysis, thematic analysis, and hermeneutics.

Key Words: Cyprus, Turkish Cypriots, Genocide, Sub-cides, Greece, Greek Cypriots, EOKA Terror.

^a Assist. Prof. Dr., İstanbul Topkapı University, Faculty of Economic, Administrative and Social Sciences, Department of Political Science and International Relations (Eng.), gokhanak@topkapi.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0674-9699.

“DAHASI YOK MU?”: KIBRIS’TA KIBRIS TÜRKLERİNE KARŞI ETNO-KIRIM, HALK-KIRIM, KİMLİK-KIRIM, MEKAN-KIRIM, ANI-KIRIM VE CİNSİYET-KIRIM

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, 1945 ile 1974 yılları arasında Rum-Rum Kıbrıs ikilisi tarafından Türk Kıbrıslılara karşı etnosit, democid, identicide, spaciocid, memoricide ve gendercide amacıyla gerçekleştirilen baskı, yıldırma ve terör eylemlerini incelemektir. İnsanlık tarihi boyunca sayısız katliam, cinayet ve etnik temizlik vakasına tanık olmuştur. Literatürde genellikle “soykırım” olarak tanımlanan bu insanlık suçları, çeşitli alt imha yöntemleriyle de desteklenmiştir. Kıbrıs’ta, özellikle 1945 ile 1974 yılları arasında, Kıbrıs Türkleri hem Kıbrıs Rumları hem de Yunanistan tarafından etnik soykırım, demosid, kimlik soykırımı, uzay soykırımı, anı soykırımı ve cinsiyet soykırımı ile desteklenen yoğun soykırım eylemlerine maruz kaldılar. Bu çalışmanın önemi, adada Kıbrıs Türklerine karşı yakın tarihte gerçekleştirilen etnik temizlik eylemlerinin, Türk sosyal bilimler literatüründe bu alt soykırım yöntemleri çerçevesinde henüz incelenmemiş ve analiz edilmemiş olmasından kaynaklanmaktadır. Bu çalışma, esas olarak nitel araştırma yöntemine dayanmaktadır ve belge analizi, sistematik tarihsel analiz, tematik analiz ve hermeneutik gibi bilimsel araştırma yöntemlerinden yararlanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kıbrıs, Kıbrıs Türkleri, Soykırım, Alt-kırımlar, Yunanistan, Kıbrıs Rumları, EOKA Terörü.

“I hope that no child in the world will ever have to experience anything like the suffering that children in Cyprus endured in 1963 and 1974.” (Neokleus, 2011:3)

Introduction

The island of Cyprus, both in mythology, associated with Aphrodite (Demiralp, 2011:100-101) and in ancient history, having been home to many but varied populations, states and civilizations (Hill, 1940-1952), is inevitably a true oasis in the middle of the Eastern Mediterranean, adorned with various beauties, surrounded by azure waters and pristine air of an enormous nature and landscape. Thus, Cyprus has always been a land of beauty, a supporter of a calm and

serene life. However, due to the evil spirit of humankind, perhaps that is why evil occurrences and events have also accompanied the fate of the island, and constantly existed there accordingly. For example, Ludwig (1942:450 cited in Erdoğan, 1993:8) likens the island of Cyprus to a defenseless but beautiful and anxious woman who has been subjected to countless adventures. Therefore, it would not be emphasized that Cyprus, the land of the mythological goddess of beauty Aphrodite, has also been the geography of various sorrows and lamentations throughout the history of civilization.

Cyprus is a bittersweet, yet volatile and challenging land, bearing both the beauty bestowed upon it by God and the dark times bequeathed by history. Therefore, Cyprus, from the past to the present, has inevitably evoked both beautiful feelings and unsettling impulses, like a “call from the void,” in those who have seen it. Indeed, the period in which these impulses were most intensely experienced on the island was the nearly hundred-year “barbaric history” between 1878, when the island ceased to be under Ottoman rule, and 1974, when the Turkish Cypriots were saved from genocide by Turkey. Therefore, it is possible to say that such impulses have been quite widespread and frequent feelings on the island, especially among the Turkish Cypriots, during this long period.

The fundamental reason for this is that the nearly hundred-year history of Cyprus between 1878 and 1974 is filled with various pains, sorrows, anxieties, and suffering for the Turkish Cypriots. Perhaps this is why the questions that Turkish Cypriots frequently asked and examined during the period 1878-1974 were: “What are you looking for? Certainty, peace? A day without pain, sorrow, suffering, and even death?” Because it is likely the painful truth that led Turkish Cypriots to ask these questions for almost a century, and subsequently dictated “never again”: *“The bodies exhumed at Muratağa, 12 miles northwest of Famagusta, were so broken and decomposed that a count was impossible, but Swedish Chief Inspector Lars Hakannson of the United Nations Peacekeeping*

Force said: ‘I am counting the heads. So far, I have seen 72, and there are more on Earth. There are at least 7 heads definitely identified as children.’ (Demirel, no date: 22-23)

Therefore, the “century of terror” inflicted upon Turkish Cypriots by the British, Greeks, and Greek Cypriots is an undeniable, yet depressing, truth. However, some disregard the truth; they believe what they want to believe. This is precisely the problem we are dealing with: the refusal of Greek Cypriot barbarians to acknowledge and accept their barbarity. Yet, despite all this denial by the genocidal barbarians, Turkish Cypriots wish to forget the violence and terror they endured in Cyprus between 1878 and 1974, the suffering they endured, and the hardships they faced. However, forgetting is an involuntary act; the more you try to leave something behind, the more its ghost pursues you.

This was also the case for Turkish Cypriots during that century-long period, and they were only able to escape the terrifying ghosts of all the violence, savagery, and barbarity they suffered through a blessed and happy development in 1974. This is the Turkish Armed Forces’ military intervention on the island in 1974, using its legal rights stemming from international agreements. This most successful peace-making and maintenance operation in recent history, in terms of protecting humanity and humanitarian values, brought peace, tranquility, and stability to all ethnic-indigenous communities on the island, including the Greek Cypriots, allowing the Turkish Cypriots to finally leave all their suffering behind in the dark times of history. Therefore, describing the period between 1878 and 1974 in Cypriot history as “dark times” (Baştan, 2002:iv), drawing on Hannah Arendt, would not be an exaggeration or an error. Consequently, failing to remember, recall, and ultimately forget those dark times is the most dangerous threat to the eternally enduring national existence of the Turkish Cypriots today, because, as Asaf (2009:167) says, “*Not forgetting something that shouldn’t be remembered... Not being able to remember something that shouldn’t be forgotten...*

Forgetting something that should be remembered... Memory plays two tricks on us.” Therefore, not forgetting and not allowing others to forget what was evilly committed against the Turkish Cypriots is a vital necessity.

The period between 1878 and 1974, but especially the 29 years between 1945 and 1974, is the darkest period in the history of Cyprus. And the victims of this period are the Turkish Cypriots who, despite the ethnic cleansing-based oppression, violence, brutality, terror, and barbarity they suffered at the hands of the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo, did not change their “Turkish Cypriot” identity. However, for the Turkish Cypriot who witnessed their people and their ancestral settlements being slowly destroyed through ethnic cleansing under the cruel terror of the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo, these experiences and their heart-wrenching memories are, so to speak, the demons of their lives. The dark times they lived through and their nightmarish memories, are the greatest traumas in the long centuries of peaceful life of the Turkish Cypriot. Therefore, these traumas and the intense, sharp, and terrible pain they caused could easily become a gateway for the evil responsible for them and completely enslave the soul of the Turkish Cypriot. Suffering can make a soul dependent on attachment. Various forms of oppression, anxiety, and trauma can make the innocent more vulnerable. However, despite everything, Turkish Cypriots have never relinquished their ethnicity, their ethnic identity, the cities, villages, and towns that connect them to their past and ancestors, their shared personal and public social spaces, and most importantly, their honor, dignity, and freedom, and have always championed independence. Turkish Cypriots have steadfastly resisted and fought against all forms of ethnic cleansing—ethnocide, democide, identicide, spaciocide, memoricide, and gendercide—perpetrated against them on the island. The greatest reward for this today is the independent, sovereign, and territorially integrated homeland of the Turkish

Cypriots, namely “the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC)”.

Within this framework, the problem addressed in this study is to examine the genocidal acts perpetrated against Turkish Cypriots by the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo on the island, in the context of certain sub-cide methods of genocide that supported the genocide. Therefore, the main objective of this study is to analyze the genocidal acts and various crimes against humanity committed by Greek Cypriots, who received full support from Greece in Cyprus, against Turkish Cypriots, particularly during the 1945-1974 period, to achieve their goal of uniting Cyprus with Greece -the main objective of their adopted Greek Megali Idea (namely Greek Great Idea)- using methods of genocide that support the genocidal acts as described in the genocide literature. The aim is to examine and analyze ethnic cleansing actions based on ethnocide, democide, identicide, spaciocide, memoricide, and gendercide. In this context, it is possible to classify the fundamental issues that affect the fulfillment of the study’s aim and the resolution of its problem as follows:

- (1) The basic conceptual framework in the genocide literature,
- (2) The basic theoretical framework of the phenomenon of crimes against humanity,
- (3) The relationship between the Greek Megali Idea and Cyprus,
- (4) The genocide and sub-cide actions suffered by Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus between 1945 and 1974.

Methodology and Literature Review

Within the scope of methodology, this study primarily adopts a qualitative research methodological approach. In that regard, this research makes use of some fundamental social science research methods, such as document analysis, thematic analysis, systematic

historical analysis, and discourse analysis, and also hermeneutics, in terms of advanced research methods.

As part of this research's literature review, a comprehensive search of written and printed literature was conducted for this article to obtain scientific data. Public and university libraries were frequently visited, and their databases of written and printed works were subjected to a rigorous literature review to obtain reference works. However, this research did not utilize primary data methods and sources such as interviews, surveys, observations, focus groups, experiments, or interview techniques. Instead, the study primarily utilized secondary data sources such as scientific books, articles, reports, theses, book chapters, and full proceedings within the scope of written and printed sources. These sources were primarily searched and found in public and university libraries, and secondarily on the internet. Those relevant to the topic and problem were separately read and analyzed. The scientific information contained within these sources was noted and classified in accordance with the study plan of this article. They were then incorporated into the article under the relevant heading, adhering to in-text citation and spelling principles.

Basic Conceptual Framework in Genocide Literature: “Ethnic Cleansing (Crime)”, “Genocide (Crime)”, and “Sub-Cide (Crimes)” within the Scope of Crimes Against Humanity

World history is filled with a wide variety of crimes committed against humanity. Chief among these is genocide, which can be described as the “crime of crimes.” Therefore, genocide, along with ethnic cleansing and related sub-cides, constitutes the most heinous crimes against humanity in history, considered the darkest crime in human history. Consequently, genocide, ethnic cleansing, and sub-cides, as “dark” and “radical evils” that devastate every life they touch, stand before us like ghosts. For no matter how much people

desire peace and tranquility, “evil” remains, and it always comes back, filling memories with black holes...

The Phenomenon of “Crimes Against Humanity”

The context of “Crimes Against Humanity,” as defined today, encompasses “*acts committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack against any civilian population.*” (Günel, 2013:51) Based on this definition, the material elements of crimes against humanity are:

(1) It is essential to emphasize that crimes against humanity are not isolated and occasional acts, but widespread or systematic actions (Cassese, 2008:98),

(2) The element of widespreadness can be said to emphasize the existence of a large number of victims or the geographical spread of victimization (deGuzman, 2011:130),

(3) On the other hand, the element of “systematicity,” which constitutes an alternative to widespreadness, relates to attacks that do not meet the conditions of widespreadness but are serious in terms of planning and organization (deGuzman, 2011:130),

(4) Another important issue in determining the general context of crimes against humanity is the nature of the “attack”, and it no longer matters in contemporary international criminal law whether the attack was committed in wartime or peacetime (deGuzman, 2011:131),

(5) The need for a general policy is also important in terms of the material element of crimes against humanity. Indeed, according to the decision of the Appeals Chamber of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, it is not necessary for a plan or a general policy to be among the constituent elements of crimes against humanity, even though they facilitate the proof of the attack (Delmas-Marty et al., 2012:32),

(6) The condition that the attack be against the “civilian population” in the general context of the material element in crimes against

humanity is another issue that needs to be addressed (Günel, 2013:54). The requirement that the targeted population be “civilian” is present in all definitions of crimes against humanity; therefore, it does not seem possible to extend these rules to include combatants during armed conflict (deGuzman, 2011:132). Indeed, the widespread and systematic killing of combatants during war is inherent in the definition of war; In this context, it may seem more appropriate for courts to refer to international humanitarian law regarding this issue (deGuzman, 2011:132-133). Furthermore, based on this definition, within the scope of the mental elements of crimes against humanity, two subjective elements must be present for a person to be determined to have committed a crime against humanity: the person must have committed the crime (murder, rape, torture, etc.) intentionally, and the person must be aware that a widespread or systematic attack is taking place (Cassese, 2008:114).

The Concept and Crime of “Ethnic Cleansing”

While it is undeniable that many practices throughout history can essentially be seen as “ethnic cleansing,” the conceptual and factual use of ethnic cleansing as a term to rid a country of a particular population can be traced back to World War II and Nazi Germany (Quigley, 1999:343-344). Three important factors in this are:

- (1) the use of ethnic cleansing actions as practices aimed at achieving ethnic homogeneity within a particular state territory,
- (2) the implementation of these practices as a fundamental state policy by Nazi Germany between 1930 and 1945,
- (3) the establishment of international legal codification aimed at preventing and punishing acts of genocide and sub-cide with ethnic cleansing objectives through the 1948 Genocide Convention.

However, the “remarkable” increase in the use of the term “ethnic cleansing” in genocide literature is due to massacres and killings that occurred in some much more recent wars. Indeed, internationally,

the concept of ethnic cleansing was used, on the one hand, particularly and intensely in the 1990s, to describe the massacres, killings, killings, and genocides that took place in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia, initially by journalists, and on the other hand, by politicians and subsequently by United Nations (UN) bodies, in relation to certain significant events in that region (Petrovic, 1994:344-345). Thus, it can be said that this concept began to be included in the legal field both as a result of the events during the dissolution of Yugoslavia and to surpass the concept of genocide (Kaya, 2024:266). Therefore, since the 1990s, the phenomenon of ethnic cleansing has begun to be viewed in the literature as an “umbrella term” encompassing acts of genocide, suicide, and crimes against humanity.

In this context, ethnic cleansing, which stands out as an umbrella concept in the genocide literature, encompasses acts aimed at removing members of a group from their places of residence to reduce their numbers, and which cause various violations of law (Quigley, 1999:344). It is argued that ethnic cleansing has a more geographical character (Lieberman, 2010:44) because it is directed towards making a part or all of a state’s territory ethnically homogenous by force or intimidation (Lieberman, 2016:17).

Therefore, acts of ethnic cleansing constitute an “umbrella” act for all crimes against humanity, regardless of geography. In this sense, ethnic cleansing, particularly as an attempt to reconstruct an ethnic indigenous population living in a country—and thus a constituent element of the modern state—using various methods of terror and violence, utilizes violations of important norms of international law as its primary means. That is why any act constituting an international crime or a violation of international humanitarian law and human rights law, even if not committed with the aim of ethnic cleansing, is considered as having been committed for that purpose and is accepted as representing elements of crimes serving the policy known as ethnic cleansing (Kaya, 2024:266-267).

The statutes and jurisprudence of international courts, the decisions of UN bodies, and doctrinal assessments indicate that the illegalities resulting in ethnic cleansing can be grouped into two main categories. The first, narrower category, includes acts of forced displacement and population transfer, which are considered material elements of international crimes as acts of ethnic cleansing. These constitute criminal acts punishable under international criminal law when they meet other conditions and requirements, according to the statute of the court to which they fall. The second, broader category, includes violations of international humanitarian law and human rights law. Violations aimed at removing an indigenous community, national group, or population from a particular country based on ethnicity, resulting in the expulsion of the relevant population through intimidation or coercion, constitute ethnic cleansing (Kaya, 2024:308-309). Therefore, it is possible to argue that ethnic cleansing is the main umbrella concept encompassing almost all crimes against humanity based on genocide and its various supporting sub-cide methods of extermination.

The Concept and Crime of “Genocide”

“Genocide” is a term with theoretical, typological, and conceptual dimensions that emerged relatively recently in political science literature. The term’s originator is Raphael Lemkin, a Polish-American lawyer of Ashkenazi Jewish descent (Segesser & Gessler, 2005). Lemkin, who conducted theoretical, conceptual, and legal studies on the diverse and widespread acts of ethnic cleansing and genocide consciously and systematically perpetrated by Nazi Germany both before and during World War II, coined the term “genocide” in the winter of 1942 and first used it in his book *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe* (Lemkin, 1944), thus contributing it to the literature (Köprülü, 2008:1). In this work, Lemkin, drawing on the ethnic cleansing practices carried out by the Nazis, categorizes genocidal techniques in various fields with examples. Accordingly, Lemkin classified genocide under eight main headings: political

genocide, social genocide, cultural genocide, biological genocide, physical genocide, religious genocide, and moral genocide (Lemkin, 1944:82-90).

Lemkin, who coined the term “genocide” from the inhumane acts that occurred during World War II, states in his famous 1944 work that the term “genocide” refers to the annihilation of a nation or ethnic group. Indeed, the concept of “genocide,” derived from the ancient Greek word “genos” (race, tribe) and the Latin word “cide” (to kill), is essentially an expression of the modern development of ethnic cleansing or genocidal acts that have existed since ancient times. However, Lemkin points out that the term “ethnocide” could also be used here (Lemkin, 1944:80, fn. 1) and also emphasizes that genocide does not only mean the direct and complete annihilation of a national group (Lemkin, 1944:81).

In this regard, Lemkin’s concept of genocide should be considered and accepted as the destruction of a national group’s fundamental institutions through various acts resulting from the implementation of a pre-planned scheme to annihilate that group. The purpose of this plan may be the dismantling of political and social institutions, the erosion of cultural, linguistic, and national sentiments, the destruction of the national group’s economic existence, and attacks against the security, freedom, health, and ultimately the lives of individuals belonging to such groups. The act of genocide is committed against the very existence of the national group, and the attacks directed at individuals are not against their personalities but are committed solely because they belong to a national group (Köprülü, 2008:7). However, it is important to note at this point that the act of genocide can be carried out by genocidal perpetrators not only against a national group but also against an ethnic indigenous community or a populace.

Lemkin’s scientific and academic efforts to achieve this goal ultimately led to the preparation of an international legal document

on genocide (Irvin-Erickson, 2017:27-28). Thus, the most important legal document in the genocide literature was born, marking the beginning of the process of recognizing genocide as a crime in both national and international legal systems. In this sense, the most important international legal codification of the genocide phenomenon was achieved through the United Nations 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (United Nations, 1951:158), by its more commonly known name “the 1948 Genocide Convention” (Harff, 1984:8-9). The actions that constitute the crime of genocide are listed in Article 2 of the 1948 Genocide Convention. According to the Convention; “(a) *Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious harm to the physical or mental integrity of members of the group; (c) Deliberately subjecting the group to living conditions resulting in the partial or complete destruction of its physical existence; (d) Taking measures aimed at preventing births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of this group to another group*” are sufficient to constitute the crime of genocide (Çoban, 2008).

The Concept and Crimes of “Sub-Cides”

Human history has witnessed many types of crimes over thousands of years. However, the most heinous of these are crimes against humanity, foremost among which is the crime of “genocide” (Koçkaya, 2019), which involves the mass extermination of human communities through ethnic cleansing in large numbers (such as mass killings involving hundreds of thousands, even millions of people) (Pinker, 2003:16). However, the crime of genocide is not alone in history; for genocide has certainly been carried out “intentionally” and planned as well, but exactly in conjunction with several complementary and supporting sub-cide methods of extermination. Therefore, ancient history is full of examples of both genocide and the numerous sub-cide methods that contributed to its perpetration.

Throughout history, it has frequently been observed that perpetrators of genocide, whether they knowingly and deliberately carried out genocides for centuries before 1948 or with much greater awareness and intent after 1948, have supported and completed their acts of genocide with various sub-cidal methods to end them as quickly and effectively as possible. These sub-cidal crimes, an undeniable reality in acts of genocide and ethnic cleansing, have, over time, surpassed the acts of genocide and ethnic cleansing themselves due to the harm, destruction, and suffering they cause; thus, humanity has witnessed the emergence of entirely new crimes against humanity as a result of the acts of genocide it has experienced. However, essentially, to support the completion of acts of genocide and ethnic cleansing and thus to complement them with the greatest “radical evil” (Arendt, 1951), there are many, but varied sub-cides that are used by the perpetrators as a means of supporting their genocidal and ethnic cleansing acts; for example;

- By directly targeting ethnically-oriented populations and destroying both their ethnocentric spirit, which is rooted in their ethnic origins, and their ancient social and ethnocentric cultural heritage; that is, “ethnocide” (Clavero, 2008),
- By killing and annihilating an unarmed population at the hands of government officials through armed violence, starvation through food shortages, in concentration camps, forced labor camps, and civil wars; that is, “democide” (Rummel, 1998),
- By indiscriminately burning, destroying, and leveling their collective settlements such as cities, towns, and villages, making them uninhabitable; that is, “urbicide” (Sipahi and Çakar, 2023),
- By destroying the human and public spaces they use in their daily lives, such as homes, hospitals, schools, religious temples, and parks; that is, “spaciocide” (Bardi, 2016),

- By destroying and/or obliterating places such as cemeteries, libraries, museums, and state archives; that is, “memoricide” (Webster, 2023),
- By assassinating high-ranking political figures in society, that is, “politicide” (Kimmerling, 2006),
- By assassinating the elite of society, that is, “eliticide” (Gratz, 2011),
- By assassinating the intellectual-enlightened segments of society, that is, “intellectual genocide” (Berhanu, 2017),
- By destroying or obliterating cinemas, theaters, important cultural and artistic venues, important works of art, ancient, historical, and archaeological sites, artifacts, and museums, and public sculptures; that is, “culturicide” (Schreiber, 2017),
- By polluting and destroying their environment and natural habitats, that is, “ecocide” (Brosch, 2002),
- By banning the use of their native languages and destroying all language-related resources, that is, “linguicide” (Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar, 2010),
- By aiming to destroy their existing information systems and erase traditional and local information sources, that is, “epistemicide” (de Sousa Santos, 2016),
- By deliberately destroying and negatively impacting the relationship between people and places, and also severing the bonds that support individual, social, and national identities; that is, “identicide” (Meharg, 2001),
- By systematically murdering people of a particular gender, in other words, they have been seen to implement new types of massacres, that is, “gendercide” (Warren, 1985).

All these and many more different kinds of sub-cides that have been frequently witnessed before having very various, peculiar

characteristics and evil goals are known as “sub-cides” in the genocide literature, but a more significant and crucial aspect of these sub-cides is that they are applied by the genocidal perpetrators either individually, in groups, or collectively (Hanafi, 2009:110-112).

Thus, it is critical to notice that these sub-cide types of genocide are implemented by perpetrators of genocide in a way that supports and contributes to the occurrence of ‘genocide’ -whose primary aim and objective is to subject ethnic indigenous peoples, national groups, or communities to ethnic cleansing by killing and eliminating them, though not on the scale seen before 1948, to some extent.

Theoretical Framework: Fundamental Theoretical Approaches to the Phenomenon of Crimes Against Humanity

Crimes against humanity point to an area that cannot be understood solely through the categories of crime and criminal. When faced with the crime of massacre, the first question that comes to mind for most people is not “who did it?”, but “how could this happen?” (Osiel, 2009:241). The theoretical definition of crimes against humanity, which continues to evolve as an international legal norm, is highly debatable. It is difficult to expect any single theory to encompass these crimes, which have many different facets. However, it is also illogical to consider crimes against humanity only as a norm that is subject to sanctions by international bodies when violated. Because if this were the case, it would be possible to label any violated norm of international law as a crime against humanity, thus leaving no factor to distinguish this category from others (Vernon, 2002:231).

Therefore, as Günel (2013:64) also points out, the interesting aspect of crimes against humanity is that the legal foundations of this norm have become the subject of very few legal and political scientists. Consequently, all thinkers who have addressed the theoretical aspects of crimes against humanity have approached the subject with different distinctions. For this reason, it would be appropriate to first mention the “Threat to International Peace and Security” approach

within the scope of theoretical approaches to crimes against humanity. According to this approach, the reason why crimes against humanity are judged by the international community is that these crimes pose a threat to world peace and security (deGuzman, 2011:128). The fact that these acts are committed during a state of war, that is, during conflicts between states, brings crimes against humanity to the international arena. This is why the Nuremberg Charter requires a connection to war for the prosecution of crimes against humanity (Günel, 2013:65). According to this approach, actions taken by sovereign states within their own territories, outside of war, are binding and legitimate. The abandonment of the requirement of a war link for the prosecution of crimes against humanity throughout history has necessitated the abandonment of this approach, which is based on threats to world peace and security (deGuzman, 2011:128).

The “Jurisdiction Gap Thesis” emphasizes that since crimes against humanity committed by states are not judged by domestic law, the prevention and punishment of such crimes can only be achieved by filling this jurisdictional gap (Vernon, 2002:234). Indeed, the concept of crimes against humanity is a suitable concept for filling this jurisdictional gap with international law. Therefore, according to this approach, crimes against humanity primarily unlock the doors of state sovereignty, thus enabling states to hold their leaders accountable for their wrongdoings (Robertson, 1999:375).

Another approach used to explain crimes against humanity is the “Humanity as Emotion” approach, which is fundamentally based on the premise that the crimes committed are inhuman. In this context, “humanity” does not refer to the totality of human beings in terms of numbers, nor to a specific characteristic of being human; rather, it emphasizes simply the act of being human. According to this theory, when crimes against humanity are considered as an emotion, they are, in their entirety and regardless of their form, type, scope, or scale, inhumane and inhuman crimes (Vernon, 2002:237). While

defining crimes against humanity from a humanitarian perspective may seem like an overly broad definition considering the nature of these crimes, this approach applies not to normal social crimes such as child abuse or rape in peacetime, but to inhumane acts committed during extraordinary times such as crisis, armed conflict, and war, which violate areas of special law such as the laws of war and humanitarian law. On the other hand, it is questionable how a quantitative approach to crimes against humanity would work, as making such a distinction would be contrary to the feeling of being human. Therefore, viewing crimes against humanity from a humanitarian perspective is not theoretically satisfactory (Günel, 2013:67).

According to the “State Action Thesis,” crimes against humanity are only those acts committed by state-affiliated actors in which the protective function of state power is abused. Crimes against humanity differ from human rights violations, and this difference stems from the fact that these crimes can only be carried out by a state or a state-like entity (Bassiouni, 2005:151-152; Schabas, 2008:960). The State Action Thesis is corroborated by historical events, as states and their governments have been the primary perpetrators in cases of genocide, ethnic cleansing, and sub-cide from the past to the present (Günel, 2013:68). This is because when state functions deviate from their legitimate roles and those in power begin to practice state terror, the state’s legitimate capacity for governance becomes a tool for the easy killing of people, acting like a terrorist. Furthermore, thanks to the legitimizing function of state authority, one part of the population can be persuaded to kill another, and the territory upon which the state is built can, from that moment on, become an inescapable trap for some of the population instead of a refuge (Vernon, 2002:245).

The “Dual Meaning of Humanity” approach distinguishes crimes against humanity from similar crimes and emphasizes their extremity, theorizing this through the dual meaning of the word

“humanity” (Luban, 2004:86). According to the first, crimes against humanity are not only crimes committed against the direct victims or their own communities, but are committed against all of humanity, regardless of individual communities. Second, crimes against humanity violate a fundamental characteristic shared by all humans that distinguishes them from other living beings. In its first sense, “humanity” emphasizes the totality of humankind; in its second sense, “humanity” is a value (Luban, 2004:87). According to Luban’s theoretical approach, for a crime to be considered a crime against humanity, it must simultaneously harm the concept of “humanity” in both senses (Günel, 2013:69).

Among the theoretical approaches to crimes against humanity discussed above, the one emphasizing the State Action Thesis is of particular importance to our research problem. The main reason for this is that all the crimes against humanity, including genocide, ethnic cleansing, and sub-cides perpetrated against Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus by the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo between 1945 and 1974, were perpetrated by Greece until 1960 and by the Republic of Cyprus after 1960.

The Direct Relationship Between the Greek Megali Idea and the Island of Cyprus and Turkish Ethnic Cleansing in Cyprus

The aim of establishing the relationship between the Greek Megali Idea and the island of Cyprus is to facilitate a much better understanding of the State Action Thesis theoretical approach, which attempts to provide abstract answers to the fundamental impetus and reasons for the crimes against humanity committed against Turkish Cypriots, particularly between 1947 and 1974. This is because the Greek Megali Idea is the key link in the chain of why ethnic cleansing-based crimes against humanity were committed against Turkish Cypriots by the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo during that period, and how these criminal acts were carried out using numerous sub-cidal methods against Turkish Cypriots.

In this context, the Greek Megali Idea emerged in 1792 to create a modern-day Hellenic nationalism among Ottoman Greeks and establish a Hellenic-based national identity. Since then, the Greek Megali Idea has been an ultra-nationalist and racist-fascist state doctrine that has continuously left its mark on Turkish-Greek-Cypriot relations (Ak, 2020:669). Megali Idea is one of the most remarkable irredentist or expansionist geopolitical state policies in world political history. This is because Megali Idea both led to the emergence of the Greek state in 1830 and aimed to mobilize Greek nationalism to unite the Greek-Cypriot ethnic groups in the surrounding regions of the new Greek state, including Cyprus, in pursuit of the “Greater Greece” conceptual dream. In this pursuit, Greece, backed by the British, French, and Russian Empires of the time, expanded its territory sevenfold at the expense of the Ottoman Empire in the past, and Türkiye by 1947 (Arınç, 2010:127).

The main aims and objectives of the Greek Megali Idea, of which the island of Cyprus is one of the main target geographies, can be listed as follows:

- (1) Securing the complete independence of the Greeks and thus,
- (2) The annexation of Thessaloniki and Western Thrace to Greece
- (3) The annexation of the Western Anatolian region to Greece,
- (4) The acquisition of Cyprus via annexation to Greece (namely, Enosis),
- (5) The acquisition of the Dodecanese Islands,
- (6) The annexation of the Aegean Islands,
- (7) The re-establishment of the Pontus Greek state,
- (8) The annexation of Gökçeada and Bozcaada to Greece,
- (9) Finally, the re-establishment of the Eastern Roman Empire as the Great Hellenic Empire, centered in Istanbul (Ak, 2012:317-318).

Greece's interest in the geography of Cyprus is essentially based on the remnants of the Eastern Roman Empire, whose presence on the island dates back many centuries, and the ethnic native Greek population, who were non-Muslim Ottoman citizens between 1571 and 1923. Seeing that Greece has expanded its territory at every opportunity since its establishment, and most recently, with the 1947 Paris-Italian Peace Treaty, gained sovereignty over some islands in the southern Aegean, such as Samos, Rhodes, Kos, and Kastellorizo from Italy, the Greek Cypriots became even more enslaved to the Greek Megali Idea, which they had embraced since the 1800s. Therefore, from 1947 onwards, the Greek Cypriots, acting in conjunction with the Greek state and receiving its full support, intensified ethnic cleansing actions against the Turkish Cypriots, who had held sovereignty over the island from 1571 until the British administration began in 1878. Ultimately, during the period 1945-1974, the Turkish Cypriots were subjected to intense and serious acts of ethnocide, democide, identicide, spaciocide, memocide, and gendercide by the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo on the island.

Ethnic Cleansing of Turkish Cypriots Through Ethnocide, Democide, Identicide, Spaciocide, Memocide, and Gendercide Committed by the Greeks-Greek Cypriots Duo

The Ottoman Empire conquered Cyprus in 1570-1571 to secure the Empire's safety in the Eastern Mediterranean. At that time, the island was inhabited by ethnic Orthodox Eastern Roman citizens, remnants of the Eastern Roman Empire, who had suffered under the intense political, economic, religious, and cultural pressure of the Latin Catholic Kingdom of Venice, which had ruled the island before the Ottomans. Immediately after the conquest, the Ottoman Empire abolished the heavy Venetian taxes imposed on these indigenous Greeks, permitted them to work in any profession/craft they desired, recognized their freedom of language, religion, and conscience, allowed the opening of all Orthodox places of worship, and

exempted Greek men, whom they declared non-Muslim Ottoman citizens, from military service (Karataş, 2006; Kenanoğlu, 2007; Eser, 2010).

Thus, following the French Revolution of 1789, which gifted the world with the socio-political understanding and ideology of nationalism, non-Muslim Ottoman populations such as Serbs and Greeks began separatist uprisings for independence, and the Greek state emerged on the historical stage in 1830. However, the main impetus that led to the emergence of ideas of nation and nationalism among the ethnic Orthodox Greek populations living both within the Ottoman Empire and in the surrounding regions was the Greek Megali Idea, which emerged in 1792. Therefore, the Greek Megali Idea, one of the most important factors in the formation of the modern Greek concept of nation and state, also affected the ethnic Orthodox Greeks in Cyprus, who had lived peacefully and harmoniously within the framework of the “Ottoman Millet System” as non-Muslim Ottoman citizens since 1571. The Greek Cypriots, who began to develop the idea and desire for independence from 1792 onwards, seized the most opportune moment for this in 1878. Indeed, within the framework of the governing provision of the Ottoman-British Defence Treaty of June 4, 1878, known as the “Cyprus Convention,” the island of Cyprus was leased by the Ottomans to Great Britain in 1878 (Sonyel, 1978:725, 736). Therefore, the period from 1878 onwards, when Ottoman rule on the island ended, and British sovereignty was established, can be seen as the beginning of the Greek-Cypriot atrocities launched by Greek Cypriots against Turkish Cypriots with the support of Greece.

However, the sovereignty of Cyprus was completely ceded by Turkey to Great Britain with the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne. Instead of decreasing –relatively- with this liberal-democratic, full British sovereignty, the oppression, violence, and persecution against the Turkish Cypriots continued to increase until 1947 due to the actions of the Greek Cypriots, motivated by separatist ideals stemming from

the Greek Megali Idea, who sought to unite Cyprus with Greece (also known as annexation [enosis]). When Greece gained sovereignty over many islands in the southern Aegean from Italy with the 1947 Paris Italian Peace Treaty, it turned its attention to Cyprus, the most coveted geographical target of the Greek Megali Idea, driven by the motivational effect of this expansion, and began to incite, indoctrinate, and organize the Greek Cypriots more seriously towards annexation to Greece from 1947 onwards.

In this regard, the ethnic cleansing actions carried out by the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo against the Turkish Cypriots between 1947 and 1974 occurred with varying but increasing intensity (Güler, 2003; Yürükel, 2005; Serter, 2008). Indeed, the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo, which carried out acts of oppression, violence, and terror aimed at ethnic cleansing against Turkish Cypriots at a relatively low intensity between 1947 and 1955, engaged in high-intensity ethnic cleansing activities amounting to genocide against Turkish Cypriots between 1955 and 1974. In this context, the Greek-Cypriot terrorist acts between 1955 and 1974, which became increasingly widespread and began to hold Cyprus hostage, were essentially carried out in three main phases with the aim of ethnic cleansing against Turkish Cypriots:

- In the first phase, covering the period between 1947 and 1955, it is possible to say that attacks and violence against Turkish Cypriots were of low intensity because Greek Cypriots did not receive full support from Greece and could not yet carry out ethnic cleansing activities against Turks on the island as planned and coordinated acts of terror.
- However, in the second period, that is, between 1955 and 1960, while the island was still under British administration, the Greek Cypriot terrorist organization EOKA, established in 1955 with the support of Greece, and the Greek Cypriot civilian militias organized

around it, launched intensive ethnic cleansing activities aimed at “annihilation” against Turkish Cypriots.

- The third phase of coordinated terror by EOKA and Greece witnessed more brutal, barbaric, and merciless, but also much more planned and results-oriented, Greek Cypriot-Greek ethnic cleansing actions against Turkish Cypriots. The main reason for this is that these actions stemmed from the efforts of both the Greek Cypriot administrators of the Republic of Cyprus, established in 1960, and the Greek governments of the time, to organize and implement them in a more conscious, planned, and coordinated manner to annihilate and destroy the Turkish Cypriots en masse. Therefore, the ethnic cleansing actions carried out by Greek Cypriot genocidal perpetrators, exhibiting various atrocities and barbarities, were intensified and continued at every opportunity, especially after 1960.

At this point, it is necessary to emphasize the following two issues:

- Firstly, the Greek-Cypriot ethnic cleansing actions aimed at a planned and coordinated genocide of Turks. Indeed, the history of the plans prepared by Greek Cypriots and Greeks to cleanse the island of Turks predates the 1974 Greek coup. The code name for these plans is “Iphesos,” which means “Volcano” in Turkish. This plan, consisting of thousands of pages, determined the locations of all Turkish or mixed villages to be subjected to genocide, and which units would attack which village. This plan was prepared between 1971 and 1974. The first implementation began in the summer of 1974 in the Turkish villages of Muratağa, Atlılar, and Sandallar (Anonymous, 2014:vii).
- Secondly, the EOKA, an ultra-nationalist and racist-fascist separatist Greek terrorist organization, holds a separate critical place and importance in the genocide and massacres perpetrated against Turkish Cypriots by the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo on the island between 1945 and 1974. This is because, with the aim of Turkish genocide, the Greek Cypriots, with the support of Greece, established the EOKA terrorist organization in 1954. Proof of

Greece's direct support for EOKA is the fact that the founder of the Greek terrorist organization was Greek Colonel Georgios Grivas (Yücel, 2021:51). The Greek-Greek Cypriot duo coordinated and carried out ethnic cleansing actions against Turkish Cypriots on the island through the EOKA terrorist organization within the Greek Cypriot community, primarily through its leader, Greek Colonel Georges Grivas, and former EOKA terrorists such as Glaskos Kliridis and Tassos Papadopoulos, who would later become leaders of the Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus.

On the other hand, the actions carried out by Greek-Cypriot perpetrators of genocide on the island in the three phases mentioned above were brought to an end by Turkey's intervention in the 1974 Cyprus Peace Operation, within the framework of its right of guarantee stemming from international law and agreements. Therefore, it is crucial to emphasize at this point that the 1974 Cyprus Peace Operation is the most significant event on the island after the 352 years of Turkish rule between 1571 and 1923, a period of peace, tranquility, stability, prosperity, and justice. In 1974, Turkey, like a single bright spot shining in the eternal darkness, presented itself as a moral superpower by saving the Turkish population in Cyprus. Therefore, it is evident that the methodology of "genocide plus sub-cide" was applied in the massacres, killings, and genocide perpetrated against Turkish Cypriots, particularly between 1945 and 1974, by the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo. Indeed, Turkish Cypriots were subjected to various acts of massacre and genocide by the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo, who also received support from the British colonial administration on the island from 1923 onwards, and these actions transformed into planned and conscious ethnic cleansing actions amounting to genocide against Turkish Cypriots between 1947 and 1974. Therefore, among the sub-cides that supported the ethnic cleansing activities carried out by the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo in Cyprus, especially between 1947 and 1974, in full view of the entire international community and

organizations, and which included various crimes against humanity, “ethnocide,” “democide,” “identicide,” “spaciocide,” “memoricide,” and “gendercide” stand out, and it is possible to describe and name this crime against humanity committed in recent Cypriot history in a general framework as “Turkish genocide in Cyprus.”

Because in any armed conflict witnessed throughout world history, those who suffer the most are always the “non-combatants,” that is, civilians (i.e. the civilian population), and this was also the case in Cyprus during the 51 years between 1923 and 1974; in the 51 years of terror inflicted on the island by the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo, the civilian Turkish Cypriot population suffered the greatest harm, and the civilian Turkish population, which constituted the Turkish Cypriots, suffered the most casualties. However, the exact number of Turkish Cypriots killed, injured, maimed, abducted, and whose fate remains unknown (missing) due to the ethnic cleansing-based attacks, terror, kidnappings, and extrajudicial killings perpetrated against Turkish Cypriots by the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo between 1923 and 1974 is not precisely known.

Therefore, although the number of actions carried out by Greek-Cypriot and Greek genocidal perpetrators, particularly during the 1947-1974 period, with the aim of genocide and ethnic cleansing against Turkish Cypriots is in the hundreds (Gibbons, 1969, 2003; Oberling, 1982; Neokleus, 2011), due to the limitations of the volume and scope of this study, the “ethnocide,” “democide,” “identicide,” “spaciocide,” “memoricide,” and “gendercide” actions suffered by Turkish Cypriots during this period are presented with the most striking and impactful examples of cases and events presented below:

- “Turkish Ethnocide” in Cyprus: The “Sinde Massacre,” perpetrated by Greek Cypriots on July 12, 1958, is a prime example of Turkish ethnic cleansing. On this date, a convoy of four vehicles carrying Turkish Cypriots from İnönü to work was ambushed on the Sinde-

Kukla road towards Famagusta by Greek Cypriot militants, including EOKA terrorists. The attackers opened fire on the bus, killing five Turks and wounding three others. On July 13, 1958, Greek Cypriot terrorists carried out the “Atlılar Massacre,” killing three Turks who were grazing their animals in the rural area of Atlılar village. On July 15, 1958, Greek Cypriot terrorists carried out a massacre, brutally murdering 6 Turks living in the villages of Arnayi, Matyat, Ziyamet, Livatya, Balikitre, and Lakadamya, wounding many others, and burning down Turkish houses in the villages (Gökhan, 2003:6-10).

- “Turkish Democide” in Cyprus: The most extensive of the Greek-Cypriot ethnic cleansing attacks, also known in the history of the Cypriot genocide as the “Bloody Christmas Events of 1963,” took place on December 21-22, 1963, in the village of Ayvasıl (Türkeli). According to Harry Scott Gibbons, a reporter for the London Daily Express who was taken to mass graves by Turkish authorities along with Red Cross members on January 11, 1964, 21 Turks, including two-week-old babies, were murdered and buried en masse by EOKA and civilian Greek terrorists. According to information obtained by the Red Cross from Greek Cypriots, the number of Turks murdered was at least 30 (Gibbons, 2003:3). In December 1963, 364 Turkish Cypriots were murdered by Greek Cypriot terrorists (Oberling, 1982:120). This death toll reached 500 with the Greek ethnic cleansing attacks carried out in 1964 (Yürükel, 2005:67).

- “Turkish Identicide” in Cyprus: The Greek-Greek Cypriot duo, with the deliberate aim of destroying and negatively impacting the relationship between Turkish Cypriots and their centuries-old living spaces, and also to sever the bonds supporting their individual, social, and national identities, subjected Turkish Cypriots to forced migration from at least 103 villages where they lived mixed with Greeks, especially during the period between 1960-1974; causing them significant losses of property, materials, tools, and equipment at every opportunity (Durukoğlu & Salik, 2016:129).

- “Turkish Spaciocide” in Cyprus: The 1963-1964 Events, documented by the United Nations Secretary-General, and the terrorist attacks by Greek Cypriots against Turkish Cypriots, which involved genocide and forced displacement, were recounted by Giorgio Bocca, a reporter for the Italian newspaper *Il Giorno*, who was in Cyprus at the time, in the newspaper’s January 14, 1964 issue: “*We are currently witnessing the forced displacement of Turks from their villages. In this merciless terror perpetrated by the Greeks, thousands of people (Turks) have been forced to leave their homes and lands ...*” (Cited in Yürükel, 2005:67). According to official records, during the 1963-1964 crisis, upwards to 25,000 Turkish Cypriots fled from their homes, often leaving all their belongings behind in a vast exodus. These comprised 18,667 inhabitants from 103 Turkish Cypriot and mixed villages, as well as several thousand who fled from provinces, towns and cities like Nicosia, Baffos, Limassol, Larnaka which were only partially evacuated (Oberling, 1982:120).
- “Turkish Memoricide” in Cyprus: Greek-Cypriot attacks also resulted in the burning of Turkish villages, mosques, and schools, and the destruction of cemeteries (Kilercioğlu, 2007:169-170; Bozkurt, 2005). On July 28, 1958, the Hala Sultan Tekke, one of the most sacred places for Turkish Cypriots, located near the Salt Lake in Larnaca, was targeted for arson by Greek Cypriot terrorists (Serter, 2008:112).
- “Turkish Gendercide” in Cyprus: In Cyprus, particularly during the period 1947-1974, Greek and Cypriot terrorists and civilian militias committed various acts of gender-based genocide against Turkish Cypriot women, primarily rape. These acts against women were generally carried out in conjunction with the killing of men in settlements where ethnic cleansing was implemented. For example, on August 15, 1975, EOKA militants gathered all the men in Taşkent Village, loaded them onto two buses, shot them dead, and buried their bodies in various locations. A quarry near Limassol is one of

the burial sites for the victims of Taşkent. A Greek Cypriot named Andreas Dimitriu, a former EOKA terrorist, confessed to the South Cypriot newspaper *Alithia*, describing the massacres and rapes they committed against Turkish Cypriots in Tashkent as follows (Cited in Göktürk, 2017:163); “...*We did everything together with the legal forces of the state [Republic of Cyprus]. We rounded up 89 Turkish men in the village. They didn’t know they were going to be killed. Those who were rounded up were taken away by soldiers from Hirokita. Meanwhile, the soldiers who came also raped some young women in revenge. The Turkish men who were rounded up were then killed en masse and buried in pits dug by bulldozers... That’s what happened back then...*”

Again, *Politis*, one of the newspapers known for its seriousness in the Greek Cypriot side, based on the account of two Greek Cypriot civilian militiamen, whose names were not revealed but who stated that they were “ready to testify if summoned to court,” explained the unknown aspects of the massacre that was a disgrace to humanity in the villages of Sandallar, Atlılar, and Muratağa on August 14, 1974, as follows (Cited in Göktürk, 2017:166); “*When the Turks entered Cyprus, about 40 EOKA-B members, instead of going to fight, engaged in other activities. They rounded up the men from three Turkish villages and sent them as prisoners to Maraş. They allowed the women, whom they had gathered in a school, to return to their homes. Then they went to the Turkish villages and initially started stealing animals. Not content with this, they entered houses and harassed the women, stealing their gold. Afterwards, they started raping women and girls without distinction. They went to the village coffee houses and boasted about their actions as if they were accomplishments. They would hold a gun to the temples of women who resisted. The rapes continued for nights on end.*”

Conclusion

One of the fundamental aims in genocide studies is the belief that the more accurately and impartially the evils of the past are examined and understood, the greater the chance of success in accurately and impartially interpreting and shaping the future. Therefore, genocide studies must work by both understanding and remembering history, and by drawing both knowledge and lessons from it. In this way, the recurrence and perpetuation of past events can be prevented as much as possible; furthermore, the possibility of creating a future with maximum good and minimum evil can be increased accordingly. However, while the boundaries of centuries-long brotherhood in Cyprus should have developed within an environment of sustainable peace, tranquility, and prosperity, the Greek “Meali Idea” (Idea) has transformed the boundaries of brotherhood into a plea for the sharing of various kinds of pain, sorrow, and grief.

Essentially, while the current socio-political situation in Cyprus—a two-state solution comprising the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, a sovereign, independent state with territorial integrity for Turkish Cypriots, and the Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus, where Greek Cypriots maintain their presence—is both an undeniable reality and an irreversible state of affairs, the main culprits behind the island’s current state are the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo. However, nothing between Turks and Greeks in Cyprus should have ended this way. Yet, due to the revisionist ambition, barbarity, and tyranny that the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo has pursued towards Cyprus for nearly two centuries, almost every Turkish Cypriot has had their life flash before their eyes like a film reel at least once. The fundamental reason for this is that Turkish Cypriots are one of the most deeply rooted, indigenous national groups on the island, but also one that lived under the greatest fear of death, especially between 1945 and 1974. This was inflicted upon the Turkish Cypriots by the racist-fascist Megali Idea of the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo and its radical spirit of evil. Indeed, the Turkish

genocides and massacres caused by this malevolent spirit in Cyprus were described – objectively and in the name of humanity – by some civilian eyewitnesses, such as a German tourist who was on the island at the time, as follows: *“It is inconceivable that the Greeks committed such barbarity. Members of the Greek National Guard represented the highest level of savagery with their actions. They entered Turkish homes and, without any mercy, shot women and children. They slit the throats of many Turks and raped women.”* (Yürükel, 2005:70-71)

The fundamental finding of this study is that the Greek-Greek Cypriot duo’s fascist-expansionist and racist policies against Turkish Cypriots, particularly between 1947 and 1974, yielded greater effectiveness and benefit in achieving their genocidal goals through various sub-cidal methods, primarily ethnocide, democide, identicide, spaciocide, memocide, and gendercide, rather than outright genocide. Within this framework, the study analyzes some of these destructive genocidal processes applied to Turkish Cypriots, particularly in the contexts of ethnocide, democide, identicide, spaciocide, memocide, and gendercide, all aimed at ethnic cleansing. Therefore, the study does not aim to establish any legal connection or accountability between historical genocide accusations against Greece and the Greek Cypriot Administration. On the contrary, at this point, the study may offer some rational suggestions to present-day Greece and the Greek Cypriot Administration regarding a realistic self-examination shaped by the problem addressed in this study. Namely, before making unfounded and unjust accusations against other states, societies, and histories in the international community, it would be far more honest and conscience-soothing for political entities like Greece and the Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus, which appear quite ‘willing and enterprising’ in these matters, to first examine their own histories, conduct a thorough self-examination, and express genuine remorse; to focus their attention and energy on making amends for

the losses they have systematically caused over centuries, as well as their own losses.

References

- Ak, G. (2012). Megali İdea, hissiyat, önyargı ve güvensizlik fenomenleri bağlamında Türk-Yunan ilişkilerine bir bakış. In Ulvi Keser (Ed.), *Mare Nostrum Adalar Denizi'nden Kıbrıs'a: Akdeniz ve Sorunlar* (pp. 314-322). AKAUM Yayınları.
- Ak, G. (2020). Bıçak kemiğe dayandı: KKTC'nin tanınması ve yapılması gerekenler. In Fatma Çalik Orhun (Ed.), *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Kıbrıs: Dün, Bugün, Yarın* (pp. 667-686). Gazi Kitabevi.
- Anonim. (2014). *1955-1974 Adım Adım Soykırım: Muratağa-Atlılar-Sandallar Cilt-III*. 4.b. Muratağa-Atlılar-Sandallar Şehitlerini Yaşatma Derneği Yayınları.
- Arendt, H. (1951). *The origins of totalitarianism*. Schocken Books.
- Arınç, K. (2010). Türk-Yunan anlaşmazlığına jeopolitik ve jeostratejik bir yaklaşım. *Journal of Turkish Research Institute*, (7), 127-156.
- Asaf, Ö. (2009). XXIII bellek -341-. In *Kırılmadık bir şey kalmadı* (p. 167). YKY.
- Bardi A. S. (2016). The “architectural cleansing” of Palestine. *American Anthropologist*, 118(1), 165-171.
- Bassiouni, M. C. (2005). *The legislative history of the ICC*. Transnational Publications.
- Baştan, Ş. A. (2002). *Karanlık zamanlarda Arendt okumak*. (Published MA Thesis). Çankaya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Berhanu, G. (2017). Ethiopia: Intellectual genocide in the making? The strong and pervasive evidence of ethnic inequalities. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 4(13), 133-165.

- Bozkurt, İ. (2005). *Bir gecede*. Cem Yayınları.
- Broszimmer, F. J. (2002). *ECOCIDE-A short history of the mass extinction of species*. Pluto Press.
- Cassese, A. (2008). *International criminal law*. Oxford University Press.
- Clavero, B. (2008). *Genocide or ethnocide, 1933-2007: How to make, unmake, and remake law with words*. Giuffrè Editore.
- Çoban, E. (2008). Uluslararası hukukta soykırım suçu ve suça zemin hazırlayan toplumsal yapılar: Ruanda örneği, *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, 5(17), 46-72.
- deGuzman, M. M. (2011). Crimes against humanity. In William A. Schabas & Nadia Bernaz (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of international criminal law* (pp. 121-137). Routledge.
- Delmas-Marty, M., Fouchard, I., Fronza, E., & Neyret, L. (2012). *İnsanlığa karşı suç*. (Berna Ekal, Trans.). İletişim.
- Demirel, F. (no date). *Never again*. Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus Publications.
- Demiralp, D. (2011). Söylenceden düşünbilime Kıbrıs'lı Afrodit - Hesiodos'tan Proklos'a bir aşk ve güzellik tanrıçasının öyküsü. *LAÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(2), 98-110.
- de Sousa Santos, B. (2016). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Routledge.
- Durukoğlu, S., & Salik, S. (2016). *Kaybolan millet: Türklerin uğradığı işkence, sürgün, katliam ve soykırımlar sözlüğü*. Tuzla Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları.
- Erdoğru, M. Â. (1993). Osmanlı idaresinden önce Kıbrıs ve Kıbrıslılar. *Tarih ve Toplum*, (117), 6-8.

- Eser, Ü. (2010). *Millet sisteminin tarihi arka planı: Gayrimüslim cemaatler için özerk bir alan. Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13(24), 204-212.
- Gibbons, H. S. (1969). *Peace without honour*. Ada Publishing House.
- Gibbons, H. S. (2003). *Kıbrıs'ta soykırım [Genocide Files]*. 2.b., Near East Publishing.
- Gökhan, M. R. (2003). *Kıbrıs'ta Rum-Yunan mezalimi*. 2.b. Yeni Avrasya Yayınları.
- Göktürk, T. B. (2017). Kıbrıs'ta Rumların gerçekleştirdiği 1974 katliamları. *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, 116(228), 159-170.
- Gratz, D. (2011). Elitocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina and its impact on the contemporary understanding of the crime of genocide. *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, 39(3), 409-424.
- Güler, A. (2003). *Dünden bugüne Yunan-Rum terörü*. Emre Yayınları.
- Günel, H. (2013). *Hannah Arendt'in düşüncesinde insanlığa karşı suçların temellendirilmesi*. (Published PhD Thesis). İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Hanafi, S. (2009). Spacio-cide: Colonial politics, invisibility and rezoning in Palestinian territory. *Contemporary Arab Affairs*, 2(1), 106-121.
- Harff, B. (1984). *Genocide and human rights: International legal and political issues*. Graduate School of International Studies.
- Hill, G. F. (1940-1952). *A history of Cyprus*, 4 vols. Cambridge University Press.
- Irvin-Erickson, D. (2017). *Raphael Lemkin and the concept of genocide*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Karataş, A. İ. (2006). Osmanlı Devleti'nde gayrimüslimlere tanınan din ve vicdan hürriyeti. *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(1), 267-284.

Kaya, G. (2024). Uluslararası hukukta etnik temizlik kavramı çerçevesinde 1989'da Bulgaristan'dan Türkiye'ye zorunlu göç. *AHBVÜ Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28(3), 263-314.

Kenanoğlu, M. M. (2007). *Osmanlı Millet Sistemi: Mit ve gerçek*. Klasik Yayınları.

Kilercioğlu, O. S. (2007). *Unutulan bedel: Kıbrıs Türk'ünün acı ve cesaret dolu yılları*. Fark Yayınları.

Kimmerling, B. (2006). *The real legacy of Ariel Sharon*. Verso.

Koçkaya, B. (2019). *The crime of genocide and question of genocidal intent in international law*. (Published MA Thesis). Galatasaray University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.

Köprülü, T. (2008). *Uluslararası ve ulusal ceza hukukunda soykırım suçu*. (Published PhD Thesis). Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Lemkin, R. (1944). *Axis rule in occupied Europe*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Lieberman, B. (2010). 'Ethnic cleansing' versus genocide?. In Donald Bloxham & A. Dirk Moses (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies* (pp. 42-60). Oxford University Press.

Lieberman, B. (2016). *Korkunç kader: Modern Avrupa'nın oluşumunda etnik temizlik*. (Damla Tanla Kurt, Trans.). Heretik Yayıncılık.

Luban, D. (2004). A theory of crimes against humanity. *Yale J. Int'l Law*, 29, 85-167.

Ludwig, E. (1942). *The Mediterranean - Saga of a sea*. Whittlesey House.

- Meharg, S. J. (2001). Identicide and cultural cannibalism: Warfare's appetite for symbolic place. *Peace Research*, 33(2), 89-98.
- Neokleus, P. (2011). *Tarihe ışık tutan anılar: 1955-1974 Kıbrıs*. (Melis Kızıldağ, Trans.). Kalkedon.
- Oberling, P. (1982). *The road to Bellapais – The Turkish Cypriot exodus to Northern Cyprus*. Columbia University Press.
- Osiel, M. (2009). *Making sense of mass atrocity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Petrovic, D. (1994). Ethnic cleansing - An attempt at methodology. *European Journal of International Law (EJIL)*, 5(3), 342-359.
- Pinker, S. (2003). *The blank slate: The modern denial of human nature*. Penguin Books.
- Robertson, G. (1999). *Crimes against humanity*. Allen Lane.
- Rummel, R. (1998). *Statistic of democide: Genocide and mass murder since 1900*. LIT Verlag.
- Quigley, J. (1999). State responsibility for ethnic cleansing. *U.C. Davis Law Review*, 32(2), 341-388.
- Schabas, W. A. (2008). State policy as an element of international crimes. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 98(3), 953-982.
- Schreiber, H. (2017). Cultural genocide-culturecide: An unfinished or rejected project of international law?. In G. Michałowska & H. Schreiber (Eds.), *Culture(s) in International Relations* (pp. 319-346). Peter Lang Verlag.
- Segesser, D. M., & Gessler, M. (2005). Raphael LEMKIN and the international debate on the punishment of war crimes (1919-1948). *Journal of Genocide Research*, 7(4), 453-468.
- Serter, V. Z. (2008). *Kıbrıs'ta Rum-Yunan saldırıları ve soykırım: Göç-acı ve Gözyaşı*. Genelkurmay ATASE Yayını.

Sipahi, E. B. & Çakar, R. (2023). Soykırımın mekândaki iz düşümü olarak kentkırım anlatıları: Bosna Hersek örneği üzerinden belgesel film analizi. *İnsan ve Toplum*, 13(1), 159-195.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Dunbar, R. (2010). Indigenous children's education as linguistic genocide and a crime against humanity? A global view. *Gáldu Čala*, 1, 7-126.

Sonyel, S. R. (1978). İngiltere Dışişleri Bakanlığı belgelerine göre: Osmanlı Padişahı Abdülhamit 48 saat içinde Kıbrıs'ı İngilizlere nasıl kiraladı. *Belleten*, 42(168), 725-744.

United Nations. (1951). *United Nation treaty series: Treaties and international agreements registered or filed and recorded with the Secretariat of the United Nations*, (Cumulative Index No. 1, Volumes 1 to 100, Registration Period 14/12/1946-07/09/1951). UN Secretariat Pubs.

Vernon, R. (2002). What is crime against humanity?. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 10(3), 231-249.

Warren, M. A. (1985). *Gendercide: The implications of sex selection*. Rowman & Allanheld.

Webster, S. (2023). Revisiting memoricide: The everyday killing of memory. *Memory Studies*, 17(6), 1408-1428.

Yücel, O. (2021). EOKA Terör Örgütü'nün saldırılarının Kuzey İrlanda gazetelerine yansıması 1955-1960. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 4(8), 48-58.

Yürükel, S. M. (2005). *Soykırımlar tarihi I: Batının insanlık suçları*. Near East Publishing.