OSCE-ODIHR 2007 HUMAN DIMENSION IMPLEMENTATION

MEETING 24 September- 5 October/ Warsaw

Kirlangic Cultural Association

Address: Sht. Salahi Sevket sok, No.16, Nicosia/ North Cyprus

e-mail: kirlangickultur a gmail.com

Turkish Cypriots' Problem of Identity

Historical Overview:

The Cyprus Problem was a problem of two conflicting nationalisms (Turkish and Greek), thus was a matter of two opposing imaginations which emerged during the 1950s and lasted until today. The advent of British colonialism in 1878 and political technologies of the colonial rule played a significant role in the emergence of this conflict, especially in the rise of the Greek Cypriot national mobilization for Enosis (union with Greece).[1] In the mid-1950s, EOKA[2] took up an armed struggle against colonial rule in order to achieve union with Greece and in a very short time this anti-colonial struggle became popular among the Greek Cypriot community under the leadership of the Cypriot Orthodox Church. In fact, the Greek Cypriots' anti-colonial struggle was interpreted as one for liberation; however, from the angle of the Turkish Cypriots it was a mere disaster since it aimed to assimilate Turkish Cypriots inside the

---

[1] The Enosis movement was part of a greater project of Greek nationalist mythology, the Megali Idea, which was elaborated in the 1840s. The Megali Idea was a belief "in the necessity of building up a greater state of two continents and five seas to cover all Greek speaking Christian Orthodox part of the Byzantine Empire". This was a type of irredentist policy that was based on the effort to raise ethnic consciousness amongst the ethnos (nation) in the diaspora. According to the agenda of the Megali Idea, "it is the patriotic duty of all 'true' Greeks to work for the liberation of all historically Greek lands, now inhabited by Greeks under foreign rule". As descendants of Hellenic heroes, the Greek nation was much larger than the Greek nation state. Hence, the struggle against the foreign dominated Greek territory would not only liberate this peculiar civilization, but also unite it. So, the Megali Idea was a project of uniting Western Thrace, Twelve Islands, Aegean Region, Imros, Bozcaada and Cyprus with Greece. Zenon Stavrinides, *The Cyprus Conflict*, (Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi yayınları,1995), pp.12-17.

[2] EOKA (Ethniki Orghanosi Kyprion Aghoniston) : National Organization of Cypriot Fighters. It was firstly established in 1955.

Greek nation and to unite "the old Ottoman land" with Greece. As a response to rising Greek nationalism, the very first signs of Turkish nationalism in Cyprus flowered and was organized around the proposal of the return of Cyprus to Turkey (after the British withdrawal). At that time, Britain invited Turkey to take part in the issue and to represent Turkish Cypriots' concerns as their "motherland". In the climate of the Cold War, Britain's invitation was not only a strategic attempt for balancing the power relations along the lines of its benefits, but also the indication of the British colonial power technology of "divide and rule".[3] As two members of NATO, Turkey and Greece, were involved in the issue, the "Cyprus Problem" was brought on to the world stage in the UN meetings, therefore it transformed into an international problem.

At the end of the 1950s, (which was also the period of the British colonial dismantlement), this problem took the shape of a problem of statehood since the guarantor states of Cyprus (Britain, Turkey and Greece) had signed the London-Zurich Accords of Treaty and Guarantee and molded an imposed settlement for the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus. According to this imposed settlement, which neither the Greek Cypriots nor the Turkish Cypriots could be a party to in its final stages, neither community had the right to modify the constitution of the Republic without the consent of the guarantor powers. The Republic of Cyprus was declared in 1960 as the independent and non-aligned state of Cypriots, with the presidential system of government- a Greek Cypriot president and a Turkish Cypriot vice-president with veto powers, a 70:30 ratio of Greek Cypriots to Turkish Cypriots in the legislature and a ratio of 60:40 in Greek to Turkish Cypriot representation in the Cypriot army.[4] Because of the paradox between the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus as an "independent state" and the exclusion of both Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots from the constitution process, the 1960 independence settlement did not satisfy anyone except Britain. As Michael Moran puts briefly, the 1960 Accords purported to give Cyprus independence, but these accords were not primarily agreements between, or solely for the benefit of, the

---

[3] Adamantia Pollis, "Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: the Case of Cyprus", *Comparative Politics*, No. 4, (July 1973), pp. 575-599.

[4]Kyriakos Markides, The *Rise and Fall of the Cyprus Republic*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977).

two communities in Cyprus.[5] Unfortunately, the guarantor states were not willing to defend the 1960 constitution; nor did Turkey or Greece do anything to promote cooperation that would foster coexistence of the two communities. As a result of the Greek Cypriots' insistence on Enosis and the Turkish Cypriots' fear of the erosion of their rights by the Greek Cypriot leadership, there emerged some deadlocks in the legislative and executive branches of the new Republic. These deadlocks turned into an absolute political crisis in 1963, when the president Makarios called for thirteen modifications to the Constitution[6] that fed the Turkish Cypriots' fears, hence led to intercommunal violence as well as the withdrawal of the Turkish Cypriots into the enclaves. The imprisonment of the Turkish Cypriots in the enclaves and the terrorist attacks waged by the EOKA-B paved the way for awful deaths and bitter experiences, which latterly would be used as the main ingredients of the national memory projects.

It should be stated that the terrorist campaign waged by EOKA-B targeted not only Turkish Cypriots, but also more moderate forces of the Greek Cypriot community and the Makarios government. According to Vangelis Calotychos, Makarios angered the ruling dictatorship in Greece and the U.S. Administration because of his insistent resistance to Greece's interference in the island's internal affairs.[7] It could be argued that Makarios' relations with the non-aligned countries and the Soviet Union[8] led EOKA-B to stage a coup and assassinate Makarios. The assassination failed, but the EOKA-B paramilitaries came into power. This incident gave Turkey the opportunity of "invading" Cyprus. The Turkish Republic, by using its rights defined in Article IV of the Treaty of Guarantee[9], came to the island as one of the guarantor states of the Republic of Cyprus

---

[5]Michael Moran, "Cyprus and the 1960 Accords: Nationalism and Internationalism". Paper presented at a bicommunal gathering organized by the Oslo International Peace Research Institute, Nicosia, April 5, 2001.
[6] Zaim M. Necatigil, *The Cyprus Question and the Turkish Position in International Law*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

[7] Vangelis Calotychos, "Interdisciplinary Perspectives: Difference at the Heart of Cypriot Identity and Its Study", in *Cyprus and Its People, Nation, Identity and Experience in an Unimaginable Community, 1955-1997*, edited by Vangelis Calotychos, (Colorado: Westview Press, 1998), p.7.

[8] Mehmet Hasgüler, *Kıbrıs'ta Enosis ve Taksim Politikalarının Sonu*. (İstanbul: İletişim yayınları, 2000).

[9] The limits of Guarantor states' action was defined in Article IV of the Treaty of Guarantee: " In so far as common or concerted action may prove impossible, each of the three guaranteeing Powers reserves the right to take action with the sole aim of re-establishing the state of affairs established by the present Treaty."

on 20 July 1974, and has stayed illegally until today. From that time on, the Cyprus Problem started to be articulated as a problem of international law where the Turkish Republic was accused of invading the territories of an independent Republic.

After the Turkish July Operation, Cyprus was divided into two. Following the division and re-settlement of the Turkish Cypriot population in the North, the Turkish Cypriots first constituted the Turkish Federated State of Cyprus in 1975 and then declared the establishment of the TRNC (Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus) in 1983[10]; while the Greek Cypriots have unilaterally appropriated the internationally recognized Republic of Cyprus. During the post-74 era, the problem of statehood took forms that were more convoluted and filled with problems of recognition and legitimacy where both leaderships of the island claimed their legitimacy as opposed to each other's "legitimate national claims". Dressed with the principles of international law, the problems of statehood, legitimacy and recognition were discussed in the intercommunal talks promoted by the UN, under the topics of demilitarization, the return of refugees, the proportion and ownership of land, the type of the new proposed state etc;. Unfortunately, all discussions ended with stalemates as Denktas and different Greek Cypriot leaders like Makarios, Kyprianou, Vassiliou and Clerides did not want to sacrifice their national claims. Usually, these tradeoffs concluded with a crisis because of the Greek Cypriots' concentration on the three freedoms (freedom of movement, settlement and property ownership) and Turkish Cypriots' insistence on a loose confederation of two independent states.[11] In general, the Greek Cypriot leadership has tended to highlight the events of 1974, so as to erase the Turkish Cypriots' suffering in the pre-74 era. They preferred to de-emphasize the constitutional and intercommunal aspects of Cyprus in order to describe the problem as merely an international one whereby Turkey as a foreign state illegally invaded an independent state. On the other hand, the Turkish Cypriot leadership focused on the inter-ethnic violence of the early 1960s and regarded Turkey's July

---

[10] According to the UN Security Council, establishment of the TRNC was "legally invalid"; this is why only Turkey recognized the TRNC or the "pseudo-state" as the Greek Cypriots call it.

[11] See: Faruk Sönmezoğlu, "The Cyprus Question and the UN, 1950-1987", *International Journal of Turkish Studies,* vol. 11, 1995, and   CAMP, Glen D. "Island Impasse: Peacemaking on Cyprus 1980-1994" in *Cyprus and Its People, Nation, Identity and Experience in an Unimaginable Community, 1955-1997.* edited by Vangelis Calotychos (Colarado: Westview Press, 1998), pp. 135-156.

Operation as peace enforcing. The differences in the two leaderships' interpretations of the past events were the basic reasons of the formation of different, even conflicting concerns. For example, while Greek Cypriots put the withdrawal of the Turkish army as the prerequisite to any solution, Turkish Cypriots, at least on the official level, were explaining the Army's existence in terms of security. All of these different policies were the outcomes of each side's efforts to represent the past according to their official arguments as well as to claim sovereignty against each other.

Reading the Greek Cypriot hegemony over the Cypriot Identity

One of the considerable effects of the 1974 division was the decline of Hellenic nationalism at the expense of Cypriotism, an ideology that emphasized the common features of the two communities. These common features were mainly "the common land Cyprus", "a common state", "past peaceful coexistence" and especially "the political independence of the island" which all operated as metaphors to narrativize Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots *as if a unified nation*. Certainly, the most important component of the discourse of Cypriotism was "the political independence of the island" and it was narrativized together with the demand of autonomy against foreign powers. The Greek Cypriot official standpoint which lies beneath this narrative was based on the argument that "*Turkey as a foreign power came and invaded both the land and the rights of an independent Republic*". This argument was a novel one because until the division in 1974, the independence of the Republic was not a widespread demand of Greek Cypriot officials and the idea of Enosis dominated Greek Cypriot politics (even during the period in which Makarios flirted with the non- aligned movement). As Xydis explains, the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus was a great disappointment for the Greek Cypriot community, because this state was forcing them to live equally together with "an unimportant minority" (Turkish Cypriots) rather than the great Hellene nation to which they felt belonged.[12] During the first days of the Republic, Makarios and his colleagues were evaluating the new state as an "anomaly"[13] and emphasizing that the Zurich and

---

[12] XYDIS, Stephen G. **Cyprus: The Reluctant Republic**, Paris, Mouton, 1972.
[13] KIZILYÜREK, Niyazi. **Milliyetçilik Kıskacında Kıbrıs**, pp.103-104.

London Agreements created a state, not a nation. Departing from Makarios's point, it is possible to argue that the term Cypriot referred only to the citizen of the Republic of Cyprus which was nothing more than a space of constitutional rights; it was neither a nation nor even an entity to which one would want to belong. However, a short survey on the narrativization of Cypriotness reveals that the narrativization of *the Cypriot* has always displayed different (imaginings) meanings in various historical periods. This is why I prefer to show the different dimensions of this position rather than oversimplifying Cypriotism as merely a constitutional space (as it done by the Republic of Cyprus today).

The term Cypriot became visible in the writings of some Marxist[14] and liberal[15] Greek Cypriots during the 1930s and the 1940s. In these writings "the Cypriot" was usually narrativized as a de-ethnicized common ground that was expected to render possible the collaboration between the two communities as well as the modernization of the island. This "common ground" was in fact invented by British colonial rule[16] which was trying to construct some form of political base that would ease the application of its governmental strategies. Needless to say, this imagined ground was not attractive for the Greek Cypriot society who was already interpellated as a member of the great Hellenic culture and had embarked on a national struggle against the British.[17] For the Greek Cypriot nationalists "at the rise of history there lies a fact that the island of Cyprus has been Hellene"[18] and if they were have to be identified with something, this identity would have to be "the Hellenes of Cyprus", not "the Cypriots".

[14] According to Mavratsas, during the two decades following the 1920s, the elements of Cypriotism were appeared in the manifestos of the Cyprus Communist Party (which transformed into AKEL in the 1940s) and in the newspapers called Pirsos and Neos Anthropos. Not surprisingly, according to Marxists, nationalism was consequence of false consciousness. This is why; they gave priority to class struggle. A.Adamantos, F. Yoannu and Plutis Servas were prominent figures of Marxist Cypriotism during the 1940s. MAVRATSAS, Ceaser. **Politics, Social Memory and Identity in Greek Cyprus since 1974.** Ethnic and Racial Studies, vol 20, no 4, 717-737

[15] Liberal version of Cypriotism was supported by N. Lanitis, who established the Progressive Party in the 1940s. According to Lanitis, two communities of the island should cooperate for economic development and modernization, on the basis of Cypriotness**. MAVRTSAS, Ceaser. Elen Milliyetçiliğinin Kıbrıs'taki Yönleri,** p.

[16] ATEŞİN, Hüseyin M. explains that officially it was the British who used the phrase of Turkish Cypriots in the place of Muslim community of the island. **Kıbrıs'ta İslami Kimlik Davası**, İstanbul, Marifet Yayınları, 1996.

[17] ATTALIDES, Michel A. **Cyprus: Nationalism and International Politics**, New York, St. Martin Press, 1979

[18] From the speech of Makarios in KIZILYÜREK, Niyazi. **Milliyetçilik Kıskacında Kıbrıs**, pp.106

From the very beginning of the 1930s until the division of the island in 1974, the "Hellenes of Cyprus" had insistently fought in order to convince "Mother Greece" to integrate Cyprus in the center of the Hellene culture. However "Mother Greece" was intent on protecting its good relations with Britain and in some cases with Turkey. This is why it could not sustain the Enosis movement explicitly nor could it provide the full support that the Greek Cypriot nationalists needed.[19] As it is explained in many historical accounts, Greece supported the idea of Enosis but it was too weak to state it openly and maintain the required power. In the atmosphere of the Cold War, the conversion of any tension into a political crisis was not difficult and Greece (after Venizelos's coming to power in the 1930s) had started to step back from the idea of Enosis for the sake of its future alliance with Britain. Even after the Second World War, when the British pursued a strategy to give some form of autonomy to Cyprus by relying upon the newly invented international principles of decolonization and self-determination, Greece did not collaborate with the Greek Cypriot nationalists who were crying for Enosis.[20] Moreover, in the 1950s, this weakness of Greece was transformed into efforts to pacify the Enosis struggle by arguing that "it is Greece who will say the last word about the future of Cyprus and the Cypriots (the Greek Cypriots) should wait until the Mother permits the struggle for Enosis". Not surprisingly, Greece's tendency to take off the luster of the Enosis movement was creating big tensions between Athens and Lefkoşa, and this tension was usually translated into predicaments between two countries where the term *Cypriot* kept popping up as a means of articulating Greek Cypriots' demands of Enosis. In these cases of disagreement, the *Cypriot* was narrativized together with the demands of self-determination both against Greece's and Britain's pacifying strategies: "Cypriots want to decide the future of the island".[21] As we know, Greek Cypriots were the majority of the total population of Cyprus and any referendum or plebiscite for self-determination would mean the approval of the idea of Enosis, hence the *Cypriots who wanted to decide the future of the island, hence to integrate Cyprus to Greece* were the Greek ones, not the

---

[19] SÖNMEZOĞLU, Faruk , **Türkiye- Yunanistan İlişkileri ve Büyük Güçler: Kıbrıs, Ege ve Diğer Sorunlar,** İstanbul, Der Yayınları, 2000.

[20] It is known that after the 2nd World war, Greece was in a horrible situation especially because of its invasion by Nazi Germany. This was making Greece more dependent to the Britain. As far as Greece knew that the Britain did not prefer to leave the island, but wanted to give a limited autonomy to Cyprus that would render the continuity of its power, it did not support the Enosis demands of the Greek Cypriots.

[21] For the details of self-determination issue see: http:// www.greece.org/ Cyprus/ documents.htm. 3.5.2005

Turkish Cypriots. That is to say, the concept of Cypriot which became visible at the moments of political predicaments between Greece and the Greek Cypriot nationalists was born as a space of distancing Cyprus from the pacifying strategies of Greece, hence as a space of insisting on Enosis; and just because of these reasons it was already a barred space for Turkish Cypriots.

On the other hand, sometimes the Marxists (the AKEL) were using *the Cypriot* in order to interpellate the Turkish Cypriots as members of the *Cypriot working class* and to invite them to join the anti-colonial struggle[22], but these invitations remained unanswered since AKEL's anti-colonial struggle also indicated Enosis.[23] When we look at the AKEL's narrativization of the *Cypriot*, we see that under the jargon of the *Cypriot working class,* this political party narrativized Cypriotness as a decontextualized entity emptied out of any cultural difference and political conflict among the two communities or as an arbitrary ground where everything seemed to be purged out of ethnic and national imagination; and therefore reduced only to the matters of class struggle (where the class differences between two communities were also disregarded). As`the following excerpt from the speech of Plutis Servas (General Secretary of AKEL in the stated period) will show, for AKEL, Cyprus was an inseparable part of the Hellenic patria and the *Cypriots'* salvation struggle against the *foreigners* (the British) meant nothing but Enosis with Mother Greece.

> "If we were English, national salvation would have meant Enosis (unification) with England, if were French with France, and if we were Russian with Russia. If we were Cypriot, national salvation would have meant the independence of Cyprus and an independent Cypriot authority. But are we Cypriots? I mean a Cypriot nation? Is there, generally, a Cypriot nationality? … Are there indicators of a separate nationality in Cyprus? Let's see. First of all, there is no Cypriot language, there is only a dialect. Everyone knows that we speak Greek… Plus, there is not a different psychology in Cyprus. Us Cypriots, we do not believe in a different religion that the Hellens believe in, in Greece. There are no differences in historical traditions between Cyprus and Greece. Us Cypriots, we do not have different customs from those of the Greeks. There is no other culture in Cyprus, than that of the Greeks. Plus, here we do not have different economic conditions.

---

[22] KIZILYUREK, Niyazi. **Milliyetçilik Kıskacında Kıbrıs,** p.93
[23] ADAMS, Thomas, W. **AKEL: The Communist Party of Cyprus**, Stanford, California, Hoover Institution Press, 1971.

If there are some differences, this is because of the foreign influence and dominance in Cyprus. We are not far, geographically, from Greece. Geographically, we are within the frontiers of Greece and we are an extension of the Greek islands. As a conclusion, there is no such thing as a Cypriot nation, and cannot be; a peculiar Cypriot nationality cannot be formed. On the contrary, yesterday, today and always, we are an inseparable part of the Hellenic land… And there is no doubt that the salvation for a Hellenic Cyprus can mean nothing but reunification with our motherland, from which we have been separated by force.[24]

These sentences which begin with "We Cypriots" and then construct cultural, religious, economic, psychological, traditional and geographical *sameness* between the Hellenes of Greece and the Greek Cypriots reveal that, unlike the claims of the members of AKEL, by definition the *Cypriot* was imagined to the exclusion of the Turkish Cypriots and addressed only the Greek Cypriot society. It neither signified the communists' will for coexistence, nor even suggested their motivation to have equal rights with their Turkish Cypriot "comrades". In other words, the communist narrativization of the Cypriot cannot be thought to differ from the Greek Cypriot nationalist desires of integrating Cyprus with Greece.[25] As I will explain below, mainly because of this inextricable connection between the narrativizations of the Cypriot and the Hellene, the post-74 discourse of Cypriotism came on the stage as an ideology which carried nationalistic reflexes that would amalgamate Cypriotism and Hellenism in its own baggage. In that sense, the pre-74 narrativization of the *Cypriot* should not be taken into consideration as the narrativization of the national identity of the people living in Cyprus, but as a pragmatic channel to dominate the Tyrkish Cypriot society which on the one hand connoted everything about Cypriotness as the insignificant geographical details of Hellenism in Cyprus and on the other hand, paved the way for the Republic's determination of the terms of a Cypriot identity.

According to many historians, Cypriotism was heavily put into operation in the mid- 1960s, when the political disputes between Athens and Lefkosa about the type and

---

[24] Aneksartito, 18th march 1943", in KIZILYUREK, Niyazi. **Milliyetçilik Kıskacında Kıbrıs** , pp: 94-95
[25] At that point it is important to note that the fantasies and desires lying underneath the Greek Cypriots' mobilization for Enosis are important for understanding the narrativization of Hellenism in Cyprus. Unfortunately, such work would not be attempted in this thesis not for reasons of importance but for reasons of space and scope.

time of Enosis reached its peak. In the stated period, Greece supported the Acheson Plan (1964)[26] and was ready to make some concessions to Turkey in order to integrate Cyprus, while Makarios and the AKEL were insisting on *Atofia- Enosis* (pure integration). When the Greek Junta came to power in 1967, discussions around the type and time of Enosis were sharpened and took the shape of a total political crisis between Makarios and the Junta. Whilst the Greek Junta was positioning itself against Makarios who was too intransigent to collaborate for Greece's type of Enosis, Makarios was using the last channel remained to achieve Atofia Enosis.

This channel was Cypriotism which later would serve as the ground on which the discourse of Cypriotism would be constructed. At the hands of Makarios, Cypriotism was becoming a shield against Greece where the *Cypriot* was narrativized as the citizen of an independent Republic who could decide the right time for pure enosis, rather than the one who was directed and ordered by Greece to give concessions to Turkey or the Turkish Cypriots. Evidently, after the Turkish Cypriots abandoned the Republic in 1963, this Cypriot citizen was indicating only the Greek Cypriot again and it was now being narrativized as a constitutional space in which *the Cypriot* would be seen to support the independence of the Republic against foreigners. From a different angle, *the Cypriot* of the 1940s and the 1950s, which was already a barred space for the Turkish Cypriots, was now being dressed up with the citizenship of the Republic of Cyprus in order to enlarge the political area that would legitimize the Greek Cypriot invasion/domination of the Republic as well as the struggle for Atofia Enosis.

> As long as peace is kept, I prefer the current situation to a bad solution. There is already a Hellenic government on the island. The Turks are not in the government anyway. Therefore, I do not think we should rush into a solution.[27]

> Today, us Cypriots, we control the government in its entirety. There is neither a Vice-President who can veto things nor three Turkish ministers. All ministers are Greek Cypriots. Internationally, it is only out government that is recognised. Why

---

[26] For the details of the Acheson Plan, see: SÖNMEZOĞLU, Faruk. **ABD'nin Türkiye Politikası (1964-1980)**, İstanbul Der Yayınları, , 1995, pp.16-20

[27] Barışın korunması durumunda, kotu bir çözüme şimdiki durumu tercih ederim. Adada zaten Helen bir hükümet bulunmaktadır. Türkler zaten hükümete katılmıyorlar. Bu yüzden çözüm için acele etmemeliyiz diye düşünüyorum. From Makrios's meeting with the Greek Junta, in KIZILYUREK, Niyazi. **Milliyetçilik Kıskacında Kıbrıs**, p.24

should we accept the Turks amongst us again? Today, Turks can only guard the border line, which means only 3% of the land. They are economically in a very difficult situation, since they do not have rich natural resources. At the end, they will abide by our decisions and leave.[28]

As Makarios's and Glafkos Clerides's words indicate, a Hellene dominated Republic cleansed from the Turks would, one way or another, become the instrument of achieving pure Enosis; this is why there was no need to force any solution that would be against the claims of the Hellenes of Cyprus. Yet, the Greek Junta was not thinking in the same way. In the beginning of the1970s, the Junta was very busy finding a political base that would make it achieve an immediate Enosis and simultaneously strengthen its political power in the international area. In a very short time, these disputes brought the Junta's coup against Makarios on July, 15, 1974 and it was followed by Turkey's "invasion" of the island on July, 20, 1974.

For the Greek Cypriot community, the 20th of July was the beginning of the bitter days[29]: many of them had to leave their properties in the north, some were killed or wounded badly, some went missing and could not be found until today[30]and unfortunately, all of them lived the bitter experience of being invaded. The *Cypriots* who used to be the "superior" community and who desired to integrate Cyprus to Greece started to loose everything that they had and "mother Greece" was neither attempted to save her children from the invasion, nor even tried to stop their pain. This was an

---

[28] Bugün biz Kıbrıslılar hükümeti bütünüyle denetliyoruz. Ne Vetolu Cumhurbaşkanı yardımcısı ne de üç Türk bakan vardır. Bütün bakanlar Rum'dur. Uluslararası toplumda sadece bizim hükümetimiz tanınıyor. Neden Türkleri yine içimize alalım? Bugün Türkler sadece mevzileri denetleyebiliyorlar; yani toprağın sadece %3 unu. Zengin kaynakları olmadığı için ekonomik açıdan çok zor durumdalar. Sonunda bizim kararlarımıza uyacaklar ya da çekip gidecekler. From Glafkos Klerides's speech republished in **Fileftheros Newspaper** in 20th September 1992, translated and published by **Yeniduzen Newpaper** in 21st September 1992

[29] LOIZOS, Peter. **The Heart Grown Bitter**.

[30] As a result of the 1974 Operation, 1619 Greek-Cypriots were reported as missing. It is said that, most of them were soldiers or reservists, captured during the battles by the Turkish military force. According to the Greek Cypriot reports, among these people, there were many civilians, women and children, arrested by the Turkish "invasion" troops, within the area controlled by the Turkish army after the cease of the battles and far away from the military front. Although there are photographs showing these people either being arrested or being transferred to and imprisoned in Turkey, none of them has ever returned. The number of the missing has been recently reduced to 1587 after the discovery of the remains of some missing persons, using DNA identification methods. http:// www.missing-cy.org

unexpected and disappointing change in the lives of the Greek Cypriots which in turn paved the way to a temporary rise of Cypriotism at the expense of Hellenic nationalism.

With the rise of Cypriotism, the reunification of the island and the withdrawal of Turkish troops came to have top priority in the political strategy of the Greek Cypriots and as a consequence of this political strategy, the emphasis shifted from Enosis to the independence of the island. More specifically, the idea of "integration with Greece" was being replaced with the idea of establishing strong cultural and political ties with Greece through the frame of an independent Cypriot Republic. So the metaphors that I hinted at the beginning of this section, "past peaceful coexistence" , "the common land Cyprus", "a common state" and "the political independence of the island" came on the stage as novel ideological tools for the new narrativization of the *Cypriot.* The declarations of the New Cyprus Association exemplify these shifts and shed light on the new narrativization of Cypriotism.

> Now that the tears are dry, now that the anger and despair have gone we must think: we have been happy, we have been honest, tolerant and liberal. We had been leading a serene and carefree existence and we were silent. Now we are paying for our silence. We, the silent majority, must search our mind and our conscience so that we can realize the sudden awakening of the seven days. Our children and the coming generations expect us to act so that they will not find themselves in the same position.[31]

Although these words were employed with the purpose of reflecting the suffering of the *Cypriots* and their will to reunite the island, sentences like "we have been happy, we have been honest, tolerant and liberal" were only referring the "happy old days" of the Greek Cypriots rather than the imagined Cypriot community. Between 1963 and 1974, many Turkish Cypriots were either murdered or obliged to live in segregated enclaves and all of them were economically cut off and socially isolated; so it was difficult for them to commemorate the past as 'happy old days'. The Neocypriots, as Mavratsas calls them, were inventing a past emptied of conflicts in which the two communities 'shared a happy life'. This could only be done at the expense of silencing Turkish Cypriots' suffering during the pre-74 era. If we consider that the nation as a narrative strategy

---

[31] MAVRATSAS, Ceaser. "Politics, Social Memory and Identity in Greek Cyprus since 1974" **Ethnic and Racial Studies**, vol 20, no 4, p.724

operates as a bunch of silencing strategies[32], then it would be possible to argue that the post-74 narrativization of the *Cypriot* was devised as the new national pedagogy composed of various silencing technologies that left no room for the Turkish Cypriots to invent its own past. Needless to say, this invented past appeared as one in which the different temporalities of the Turkish Cypriots were dissolved into the constructed "past peaceful coexistence" and where the antagonisms between the two communities were covered up under the guise of "de-ethnicized, common political interests".[33]

According to some writers the Neocypriots' emphasis on the de-ethnicized, common political interests of the two communities (which may be different from the Greek or Turkish states) was a meaningful challenge to both nationalisms; a closer look at this pedagogy however, shows that the new narrativization of the Cypriot was not that different from the Hellenic interpretation (pre-74 interpretation) of the term. In my opinion, if ideology (as the dominant interpellating discourse that paves the way for acting "as if there is a unity") emerges at the very moment when one argues that his/her point is not ideological,[34] then Neocypriots' "anti-nationalist declarations" were as ideological as the demands of Hellenic nationalism. After all, the Neocypriots were narrativizing the Cypriot as an abstract entity the theoretical subject of which could only be the Greek Cypriot. For example, the sentences in which Neocypriots were calling for a reevaluation of their lives "by thinking first and foremost as Cypriots and then as Greeks, Turks or others"[35] without "denying their national origins"[36] made it obvious that *the Cypriot* was not imagined as de-ethicized, but as the privileged setting for staging the *fantasy of a unified Cypriot community under Greek Cypriot domination.* What I mean is that, the new narrativization of the Cypriot opened a space where Cypriotness was equalized with citizenship of the Greek Cypriot dominated Republic of Cyprus (from which the Turkish Cypriots were already excluded) and it allowed the narrativization of the Cypriots as a unitary entity.

---

[32] TROUILLOT, Michel R. **Silencing the Past, Power and the Production of History**. Boston, Beacon Press, 1995, p.8
[33] MAVRATSAS, Caesar. "Politics, Social Memory and Identity in Greek Cyprus since 1974", p. 721
[34] ZIZEK, Slavoj. "Specter of Ideology" in **Mapping Ideology,** London, New York, Verso, 1994, p.22.
[35] MAVRATSAS, Caesar, "Politics, Social Memory and Identity in Greek Cyprus since 1974", p. 724
[36] MAVRATSAS, Caesar, "Politics, Social Memory and Identity in Greek Cyprus since 1974", p.725

> Cypriots had decided to establish their own state in 1960. However, they did not comprehend the fact that this state was needed faithful and obedient citizens. When the 74 war exploded, the state was left without its citizens, and some of them were ready to turn their humiliation of the state into a fatal hit.[37]

The Republic of Cyprus had been established reluctantly by both the Turkish and Greek Cypriots and its formation had been heavily pushed forward by the so-called guarantor states of Cyprus.[38] This is why the sentence which states that *the Cypriots decided to establish their own state* does not only reveal how the Greek Cypriots read their present interests or politics back into the invented past, but also shows that the post-74 *Cypriot* was once again narrativized as a decontextualized ground emptied out of the heterogeneous character of politics. By signifying the Republic of Cyprus as the Cypriots' own state, the Neocypriots produced the "common state" as the basis on which the overwriting of cultural differences in the imagined Cypriot nation becomes possible.

On the other hand, Neocypriots explained their aims as a way "not to distance Greek Cypriots from Greece, but to show the world that they have a different constitution and foreign policy from Greece."[39] This aim was mainly elaborated for the sake of popularizing the Greek Cypriot official view that explains Turkey as an invader/imperialist power which came to Cyprus to violate the rights of an independent Republic. This anti-imperialist vision, in turn, played an important role in the new narrativization of the Cypriot that was constructed as a vague space on which the Greek Cypriots' old desire of speaking in the name of "the inferior Turkish minority" was incorporated into the construction of the Cypriot citizen. More profoundly, the new Cypriot narrative described Turkish Cypriots as the citizens of the Republic whose rights had also been violated by Turkey. If we consider that Turkish Cypriots did not see the Turkish July operation as an "invasion", then it is possible to argue that the new Cypriot also introduced as a series of phantasmatic operations that produced sameness between the two communities and allowed a narrative of the *many as one* against the same Other

---

[37] MAVRATSAS, Caesar, **Elen milliyetçiliğinin Kıbrıs'taki Yönleri,** Lefkoşa, Galeri Kültür Yayınları, 2000, p.67

[38] MORAN, Michael. **Cyprus and the 1960 Accords: Nationalism and Internationalism.** Paper presented at a bicommunal meeting organized by the Oslo International Peace Research Institute, Nicosia, April 5th 2001.

[39] MAVRATSAS, Caesar, **Elen milliyetçiliğinin Kıbrıs'taki Yönleri** ,p.66

(Turkey). In short, while seeking the demise of nationalism, Neocypriots were reproducing it by dissolving and absorbing Turkish Cypriots' story in the new discourse.

> The danger of the partition of Cyprus or the dissolution of our state is imminent and the responsibility for preventing this belongs mainly to *us, the Cypriots* and no country outside Cyprus can help effectively either because it has not the power or because its interests are not always identified as ours.[40]

Since the New Cyprus Association's priority was to stop the dissolution of the Republic of Cyprus, the Neocypriots were attempting to convince their audience by arguing that "without the conception of Cypriot citizenship, there can be no Cyprus"[41]. The metaphor of "common land Cyprus" was born from this equalization of Cyprus with the Cypriot citizenship; which on the one hand, functioned as the key metaphor of the spatialization of *the fantasy of unified Cypriot community* inside the territories of the Republic and on the other hand, operated as the main element of imagining/constructing a Cypriot nation for an already established Republic. Nevertheless, the Cypriot nation which they highlighted as a unitary entity composed of both Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots was a collective illusion that masked the reasons of the Turkish intervention and the political concerns of the Turkish Cypriots. This is why for a long time Turkish Cypriots would be the specter of the Neocypriots' imagined Cypriot.

---

[40] MAVRATSAS Caesar, **Elen milliyetçiliğinin Kıbrıs'taki Yönleri**, p.69
[41] MAVRATSAS, Caesar. "Politics, Social Memory and Identity in Greek Cyprus since 1974", p. 731