

ONE STATE OR TWO? THE SEARCH FOR A SOLUTION TO THE CYPRUS PROBLEM

Nicola Solomonides

ABSTRACT

The island of Cyprus has been the site of severe ethnonational conflict. As a result, there have been numerous attempts to deal with the situation, ranging from a power-sharing constitution, the partition of the island with the separation of the Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot communities, to the Annan Plan, which attempted to establish a federal solution for the island. As such, Cyprus provides a useful case study of the effectiveness of various methods of ending ethnic conflict. Due to the failure of the 1960 Constitution and its attempt at consociational democracy, and as a result of the rejection of the Annan Plan, the possibility of a two-state solution merits consideration. This paper evaluates the reasons for these failures by measuring up the practical facts of the Cyprus situation to the relevant political theory, and, in light of renewed efforts to solve the 'Cyprus Problem', attempts to determine the best possible future solution for Cyprus, and whether this is more likely to be along the lines of a bizonal, bicommunal federation, or the emergence of two separate states.

Keywords: ethnic conflict; divided society; consociationalism; partition; population transfer; federalism; Annan Plan

INTRODUCTION

The divided society of Cyprus, having been regarded as “a hotspot of ethnic violence”, and “exemplary of intractable ethnonational conflicts”,¹ provides a useful case study of consociational democracy, partition and federalism as attempted solutions for ethnic conflict. The 1960 Constitution provides an example of a failed attempt at consociational democracy; the partition following the 1974 Turkish invasion, while successful in terms of ending violence, has still left dissatisfaction on both sides; and the Annan Plan, proposing a federal solution, was largely rejected. This essay seeks to examine each of these approaches and will attempt to determine the best possible future solution for Cyprus: whether this is

¹ Pollis 1979, in Papadakis, Peristianis, and Welz, 2006, 5

more likely to be along the lines of a bizonal, bicomunal federation, or the emergence of two separate states.

It will first be necessary to look at a brief historical outline of the island's ethnic conflict. I will then consider the constitution of 1960 as a failed experiment in consociational democracy, by looking at the conditions necessary for successful implementation of power-sharing agreements and determining the absence of these conditions in Cyprus. Next I will look at the issue of partition, by examining the theory of partition as a means of ending conflict, and by looking at how partition was implemented in Cyprus, and how it has fared over the years at keeping conflict at bay. The Annan Plan proposed a federal solution for Cyprus, so I shall consider the conditions necessary for federalism to be successful, and then consider whether these conditions are present in the case of Cyprus. I will argue that, as with the experiment in consociationalism, the necessary conditions for federalism are markedly absent. I will conclude that, as a result of the successful outcome of partition in keeping conflict at bay, and due to the hardening identities and hostilities between the communities over time, it is necessary to either consider the option of a two-state solution, or to gingerly attempt, over time, some form of shared decision-making which could potentially create the conditions necessary for a federal structure. However, I will argue that, at least for the time being, no such structure is appropriate.

A TURBULENT HISTORY

The British colonial period, beginning in 1878, witnessed the rise of Greek and Turkish nationalism in Cyprus: Greek-Cypriots strove for *enosis*, the union of Cyprus with Greece; Turkish-Cypriots demanded *taksim*, partition of the island. From 1955, the *enosis* movement took the form of an armed insurrection led by EOKA², and in 1957, Turkish-Cypriots set up their own armed organization, TMT³. The opposed aims of the two major ethnic groups and the British policies of exacerbating divisions, for instance by enrolling Turkish-Cypriots as auxiliary policemen against the EOKA insurrection, led to violent interethnic confrontations⁴.

British colonial rule ended in 1960, and an independent state, the Republic of Cyprus, was created as a compromise solution reflecting the opposed interests of the two antagonistic ethnic groups; however, independence did not satisfy the aspirations of either group. Both

² National Organization of Cypriot Fighters

³ Turkish Resistance Organization

⁴ Pollis 1979, in Papadakis, Peristianis, and Welz, 2006, 2

continued to pursue their respective aims of *enosis* and *taksim*, resulting in interethnic violence in 1963.

In 1964 the United Nations came to Cyprus to maintain peace. By 1967, interethnic violence had died down. A coup on July 15, 1974, against the then president of the Republic, Archbishop Makarios, by the pro-union faction EOKA B, prompted Turkish military intervention, dividing the island: Greek-Cypriots fled to the south and Turkish-Cypriots moved to the north. Since then, the Greek-Cypriot-controlled Republic of Cyprus has remained the only internationally recognized state in Cyprus, while the self-declared Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC), established in 1983, has not gained international recognition.

Since 1974, the largest international effort to solve ‘the Cyprus Problem’ was the ‘Annan Plan’, a negotiated UN-brokered constitutional arrangement. It called for a federal, bicomunal, bizonal solution, and culminated in referenda on both sides. The plan was rejected on the Greek-Cypriot side by a majority of 76%, even though it was accepted on the Turkish-Cypriot side⁵. The attempt therefore failed, as had the previous attempt at a solution: the 1960 Constitution.

THE 1960 CONSTITUTION: AN ATTEMPT AT CONSOCIATIONAL DEMOCRACY

When it comes to managing and settling ethnic conflicts, power-sharing arrangements often seem appropriate: the former antagonists have to work together and make decisions by consensus, the ultimate goal being to turn opponents into partners. This concept of conflict regulation, called ‘consociational democracy’ (a form of government, involving guaranteed group representation), is often suggested for managing conflict in deeply divided societies. This concept can only be successful under specific conditions.

Lijphart⁶ has identified four key characteristics of consociational democracies: (1) *Government by grand coalition* – the government includes representatives from all groups in society; (2) *Proportional representation* – all groups are adequately represented within the executive, parliament, legal system and public service; (3) *Mutual veto* – each group has the opportunity to block political decisions using its veto rights, the aim being to foster consensus-building and compromise; (4) *Segmental autonomy* – each group enjoys some degree of self-government, maintaining its own elected bodies and institutions, leaving

⁵ By 66 percent

⁶ Lijphart, 1977

only few issues to be coordinated with other segments of society, thus allowing for different culturally-based community laws.

The 1960 Cyprus constitution embodied all the principles of consociational democracy. The president, a Greek-Cypriot, and the vice-president, a Turkish-Cypriot, were to be elected by their respective communities and were to share prerogatives and executive power. A 50-member house of representatives was composed of 35 Greek- and 15 Turkish-Cypriots elected by their respective communities. Either the president or the vice-president could veto legislation passed by the house of representatives in the areas of foreign affairs, defense, and internal security, but not legislation passed in the communal chambers. The principles of grand coalition and proportionality were further strengthened by the provisions that the council of ministers, the legislature and the public service were all to be apportioned in a ratio of 70% Greek-Cypriot and 30% Turkish-Cypriot, while the army was to have a 60:40 ratio. Measures for autonomy included separately elected communal chambers as well as provisions for separate municipalities in the five main towns, reflecting the separation of the ethnic populations in urban areas.

However, the state of affairs established by the constitution lasted only three years, due to “[c]hronic disagreement, growing deadlock, and mounting acrimony between the communities”⁷. It is thus necessary to examine certain favorable conditions⁸ under which consociationalism is more likely to be successful, and see whether these were present in Cyprus.

The first favorable condition is a balance of power, whereby the state or region is not dominated by a clear majority group. Instead there exists a relative equilibrium between groups, either through the existence of a number of groups, none of which constitutes a majority, or the existence of two practically equal segments. Secondly, similar socioeconomic conditions across the groups are favorable. Indeed, “[t]he smaller the economic and social differences between the groups, the better the conditions for consociationalism”⁹. Thirdly, the existence of overarching loyalty is very important, as the disparate groups share a feeling of belonging to one nation/region, and are held together by a common loyalty. Fourthly, a multi-party system ensures that each group is represented by several political parties or movements. Fifthly, the existence of cross-cutting cleavages is important, whereby the population is characterised by cleavages which cut across ethno-national/linguistic lines, preventing the creation of homogeneous groups.

⁷ Bose, 2007, 75

⁸ Lijphart, 1977; Schneckener, 2002

⁹ Schneckener, 2002, 211

The sixth favorable condition is that of comprehensive participation: all relevant groups are represented at the negotiating table and in the power-sharing system itself. It is important that the agreed consociational structure was developed by the groups themselves and not forced upon them by external powers. This will help ensure the seventh favorable condition: that the consociational solution is not questioned by any side, and all parties to the power-sharing arrangement are interested in maintaining the agreed status quo. Eighth, it is important that elites occupy a dominant position in society, whereby the political leadership of each group is able to win internal support for compromises and agreements¹⁰. Finally, territorial segmentation is believed to be helpful, as, where groups live territorially segregated, it is possible to combine consociational democracy with territorial arrangements to allow more regional self-rule for each group.

We shall now consider whether these conditions were present in Cyprus. Firstly, there was no equilibrium between the two communities, but clear domination by the Greek-Cypriot group¹¹. Secondly, there were huge socioeconomic disparities between the groups: the Turkish population was clearly disadvantaged in comparison to the Greek majority, and this split deepened after independence. Thirdly, and possibly most significantly, there was no overarching loyalty which united the two communities, nor was there the concept of a common, inclusive Cypriot identity. Indeed, “[t]he Cypriots were not a single people with differing tendencies but, rather, two different peoples...Greeks and Turks on Cyprus thought of themselves as Greeks and Turks, not as Cypriots”¹². Fourthly, there was no multi-party system in Cyprus, but rather, national fronts existed in each camp, marginalizing any internal, potentially more moderate position. Fifthly, there were no cross-cutting cleavages (this was reinforced by the constitution, which separated the population into two electorates), and bi-communal parties did not exist at all. Sixth, there was no comprehensive participation in the negotiating process. The guarantor powers (Turkey, Greece and Great Britain) established a solution, while the two ethnic groups in question were only partly and indirectly involved in negotiations. As the power-sharing constitution was written and tabled by international mediators, it was viewed, especially by the Greek-Cypriots, as having been forced upon them. According to Lijphart, “consociationalism cannot be imposed against the wishes of one or more segments in a plural society and, in particular, against the resistance of a majority segment”¹³. As for the seventh favorable condition, respecting the status quo, the Greek-Cypriots did not want to give up their former hegemonic position, while the Turkish-Cypriots largely supported

¹⁰ Over time, experiences of such compromises and agreements could serve as reference points of cooperation, thus creating a tradition of elite accommodation.

¹¹ Which represented almost 80% of the population

¹² Coughlin, in Gai, 2000, 224

¹³ Lijphart (1977: 160), in: Coughlin, in Gai, 2000, 227-8

separatist options. With both sides oriented towards the nation-state model, power-sharing was seen as insufficient for safeguarding the ethno-national identities. Eighth, the leaders of the two communities did not exhibit a spirit of moderation and refused to compromise. Finally, regarding territorial segmentation, while the groups lived in segregated neighborhoods, the population was still, to a large extent, mixed.

Furthermore, “the infant Cypriot state’s experiment in consociational government was doomed to break down because...it lacked any provision for close, neutral, international supervision and mediation during its implementation”¹⁴. But more importantly, the constitution itself proved to be unworkable, especially with the mutual veto power resulting in repetitive deadlock. In short, the conditions prevailing in Cyprus at the time of the implementation of the constitution did not favor success.

THE “SOLUTION” OF PARTITION

Sustained wars produce and reinforce hatred that does not end with the violence¹⁵, so how can groups of people who have been killing one another come together to form a common government and/or society? According to Kaufmann¹⁶, they cannot. His theory is based on the premise that, in ethnic wars both hypernationalist mobilization rhetoric and actual atrocities harden ethnic identities to the point that cross-ethnic political appeals become futile; indeed “restoring civil politics in multi-ethnic states shattered by war is impossible because the war itself destroys the possibilities for ethnic cooperation”¹⁷. Furthermore, intermingled population settlement patterns create security dilemmas due to the escalation of each side’s mobilization rhetoric presenting a real threat to the other, and because intermingled population settlement patterns create defensive vulnerabilities and offensive opportunities. Such security dilemmas intensify violence, and de-escalation is not possible unless the groups are demographically separated, as “[s]eparation reduces both incentives and opportunity for further combat”¹⁸. Furthermore, while Kaufmann does not deny the existence of other possible solutions such as peace enforcement by international forces, he claims that they only last as long as the enforcers remain. Ultimately, “as long as either side fears, even intermittently, that it will be attacked by the other, past atrocities and old hatreds can easily be aroused”¹⁹.

¹⁴ Bose, 2007, 79-80

¹⁵ Licklider, 1995, 681-690

¹⁶ Kaufmann, 1996

¹⁷ Ibid, at p 137

¹⁸ Ibid

¹⁹ Ibid, at p 174

There are, however, objections to this theory. Groups may not necessarily see their identity as ‘hardened’ as Kaufmann suggests; there may be divisions within ethnic groups. Kaufmann’s theory also raises problems for people of mixed ethnicity – to which side of the partition do they belong? Moreover, it has been suggested by Sambanis²⁰ that partition quite possibly not only fails to address the issues, but moreover results in conflict on a different level. Furthermore, as Kumar²¹ suggests, the process of partition is hardly straightforward, and can create problems. For instance, there is a clear human rights issue involved in population transfers²².

Following the outbreak of violence in Cyprus in 1974, the two communities were strictly separated, resulting in the partition of the island with the Turkish-Cypriots occupying the North, and the Greek-Cypriots the South. However, this was hardly a straightforward process, taking about 14 years to establish. Following the collapse of the constitution in December 1963, the governmental machinery of the Republic of Cyprus was operated by Greek-Cypriots. Turkish-Cypriots were confined to decisions affecting the administration of their own communities. During this period, a quarter of the Turkish-Cypriot population became refugees and more than half of these gathered in armed enclaves. The intercommunal violence in 1963 and 1964 led the Turkish-Cypriots to conclude that physical, geographical separation of the two communities was essential to their safety and security. In 1963, the ‘Green Line’ divided Greek- and Turkish-Cypriots in Nicosia, the island’s capital, after which, ethnic conflict intensified. In 1964 the Turkish-Cypriot community declared support for partition. Conflict continued to escalate until, in 1974, the Turkish invasion reinforced the de facto partition of the island. Forced population movements from 1963, and especially in 1974, produced internal flows and disruptions involving displaced persons. Approximately 200,000 Greek refugees moved south of the ‘Green Line’, and around 60,000 Turkish-Cypriots moved north²³. Movements of people from Anatolia and other parts of Turkey to the north have since been induced to alter the demographic balance.

While the partition of Cyprus was hardly smooth and uneventful, it succeeded in ending the violence that had previously plagued the island. In fact, the situation has remained remarkably stable since 1974²⁴, especially in comparison with the escalating ethnic

²⁰ Sambanis, 2000

²¹ Kumar, 1997

²² This can be seen in Cyprus, concerning property of Greek-Cypriots in the North and, to a lesser degree, that of Turkish-Cypriots in the South. People on each side claim it is a violation of their property rights that they cannot use and/or profit from their properties on the opposite side of the ‘Green Line’, and many cases have been taken to the European Court of Human Rights on this precise matter.

²³ Cranshaw, ‘Cyprus Revolt’, p 395; Polyviou, ‘Cyprus’, p 203, Kaufmann, 1998, 151

²⁴ Kaufmann, 1998

violence from 1955-1974. Nevertheless, critics have argued that, regardless of the fact that there have been virtually no casualties since, the partition and the population exchange actually made the conflict worse. According to Kumar, “the division of Cyprus is little more than a long standoff that remains volatile and continues to require the presence of UN troops”²⁵.

Admittedly, the partition of the island, while it quelled the violence, did not *solve* the problem behind it. The first attempt at power-sharing in 1960 was unsuccessful, and over the years identities have certainly hardened. This, along with over 30 years of partition, does not bode well for the possibility of a shared future for the island. Indeed, partition is said to entrench differences and possibly even institutionalise them. According to Varshney²⁶, interethnic networks and communication are necessary to build bridges between communities and prevent ethnic violence. The argument is that, because interethnic and intraethnic networks of civic engagement “build bridges and manage tensions, interethnic networks are agents of peace, but if communities are organized only along intraethnic lines and the interconnections with other communities are very weak or even nonexistent, then ethnic violence is quite likely”²⁷. By extension, a multiethnic society with few connections across ethnic boundaries is very vulnerable to ethnic disorders and violence. Applying this theory to Cyprus, we conclude that violence is likely as there are no such interethnic networks. While, in the 1990s an energetic bicomunal movement for change emerged, seeking to address the past and look to a shared future through dialogue and bicomunal activities, it had limited impact on society at large. This was largely due to the ‘damage’ done by history, and the biased presentation of this history on both sides, especially through the education systems. There is undeniably a presentation of opposed historical claims. Indeed, in the divided capital, there is on each side a Museum of National Struggle, the historical narratives of which express both sides’ official constructions of the past, ending up with totally opposed stories²⁸. Indeed, “history is often quoted as proof of the impossibility of rapprochement and cohabitation”²⁹, largely as a result of the fact that “the hegemonic discourse within each of the two main ethnic communities on the island has been emphasizing their very different cultures and each group as a part of two separate ‘mother-nations’”³⁰.

²⁵ Kumar, 1997, 29

²⁶ Varshney, 2001

²⁷ Ibid, p 363

²⁸ Papadakis 1994, in: Papadakis, Peristianis, and Welz, 2006, 6

²⁹ Papadakis, Peristianis, and Welz, 2006, 112

³⁰ Ibid, at p 102

Yet despite the lack of reconciliation, the situation has remained relatively calm for over 30 years. Nevertheless, neither side is entirely happy with the current arrangement. The Greek-Cypriots have still not accepted the partition of the island as the end of the story, calling for reunification. Turkish-Cypriots, on the other hand, are more in favour of division, however, the TRNC is not currently internationally recognised. It is worth noting, however, that since the opening of the checkpoints in April 2003, people from both communities have crossed over in substantial numbers³¹, and the absence of violence is noteworthy, perhaps giving some hope for the future. However, as Kumar points out, “ethnic partitions have never been reversed; their implementation has inexorably driven communities further apart”³².

A FEDERAL SOLUTION?

Following the population transfer and definitive separation of the two communities, it became possible to consider a solution of territorially based federalism. Classical arguments in favour of federalism assert that some form of federalism or decentralization of government power “enhances national unity and consensus, promotes security, protects citizens against encroachment by the state, limits ethnic conflict, and safeguards individual and communal liberty”³³. There is some debate concerning the merits of symmetric devolution of power³⁴ versus asymmetric devolution³⁵. The idea of symmetric devolution is that, by dividing up an ethnic enclave, conflict is diffused. Indeed, federalism has significantly contributed to peace-making processes, as it offers a balance between unity for common purposes and separation for ethnic or other local reasons.

Majorities tend to favour the option of federations³⁶, while minorities tend to prefer confederations³⁷ or asymmetrical devolution/autonomy. Heintze³⁸ defines autonomy as where parts of a state’s territory are authorised to govern themselves in certain matters by

³¹ About 40% of Greek-Cypriots say they have never crossed, about 50% say they have crossed once or a few times in the past but no longer, and about 10% still cross over. By comparison, about 30% of Turkish-Cypriots have never crossed, about 25% have crossed once or a few times in the past but no longer, and about 45% still cross over. (“The UN in Cyprus: An Inter-Communal Survey of Public Opinion by UNFICYP”, <http://www.unficy.org/UNFICYP%20Survey.htm>)

³² Kumar, 1997, p33

³³ Wibbels, 2006, 167

³⁴ Ie federalism

³⁵ Ie autonomy

³⁶ Watts (1998) defines a federation as “a compound polity combining constituent units and a general government, each possessing powers delegated to it by the people through a constitution, each empowered to deal directly with the citizens in the exercise of a significant portion of its legislative, administrative, and taxing powers, and each directly elected by its citizens” (p 121)

³⁷ Watts (1998) defines confederations as “a species of federal system in which the institutions of shared rule are dependent on the constituent governments, being composed of delegates from the constituent governments and therefore having only an indirect electoral and fiscal base” (p 121)

³⁸ Heintze, in Suksi, 1998

enacting laws and statutes, but without constituting a state of their own³⁹. According to Rothchild and Hartzell⁴⁰, autonomy mitigates the problem of security issues by reassuring groups and giving them a degree of control. They also note that there is a positive correlation between autonomy and stable peace-agreements. However, Mozaffar and Scarritt⁴¹ draw attention to the fact that in creating autonomous units, drawing the boundaries can increase conflict. Cornell⁴² appears to agree with this view and notes that creating an autonomous unit could be a step towards secession. Indeed, this is the chief concern with autonomy, and Brancati⁴³, while conceding that decentralized systems can have the positive effect of reducing rebellions, points out that autonomy encourages the creation of regional parties and increases local incentives to rise to power within local institutions; over time, increasing the power of local parties could potentially lead to secession. It is precisely for this reason that Greek-Cypriots would be most unwilling to consider granting autonomy to the Turkish-Cypriots in the North.

Due to the prolonged separation of the two communities on Cyprus, any settlement will have to assume a territorial dimension. A federation is often advanced as the best way to manage the nationalistic problems of the two communities. However, while the Greek-Cypriot community is in favour of a unitary federal state, the Turkish-Cypriot community favours a looser confederation⁴⁴, chiefly due to concerns that, in a federal state, they would become an impoverished minority. However, the Greek-Cypriot community rejects the option of a confederation because they believe it would allow the TRNC to become a sovereign state.⁴⁵

Ultimately, whether federal structures provide an adequate solution depends on the existence of several factors, similar to those conducive to consociationalism. However, “echoing Lijphart’s analysis of the conditions conducive to consociational democracy, Maurice Vile asserts that no two-unit federation has ever survived... ‘the danger of an irreconcilable confrontation between the units in a two unit federation is so great that sooner or later it would lead to a civil war, secession, or both’”⁴⁶. This does not bode well for Cyprus.

³⁹ Ibid, p 7

⁴⁰ Rothchild and Hartzell, 1999

⁴¹ Mozaffar and Scarritt, 1999

⁴² Cornell, 2002

⁴³ Brancati, 2006

⁴⁴ ‘The UN in Cyprus: An Inter-Communal Survey of Public Opinion by UNFICYP’, <http://www.unficyp.org/UNFICYP%20Survey.htm>

⁴⁵ Bindebir, Handshin, Jovanovic, Rieck, 9

⁴⁶ Coughlan, in Ghai, 2000, 237

One factor favourable to the establishment of a federation is the existence of cross-cutting cleavages. Where the member states' alliances are subject to more than one cleavage, political tensions will be cancelled out since an individual cleavage does not become entrenched in the system. Indeed, it is the absence of alternative coalitions in bi-communal systems that results in the confrontation of the two communities on every issue. In Cyprus, there are no cross-cutting cleavages, but two homogeneous groups. Disagreements over issues can potentially destabilise the system because they may lead to the dissatisfaction of the minority group. In the absence of an overarching Cypriot nationalism, the result is the confrontation of two *ethnies* (if not nations) on the same island.

Connected to the factor of cross-cutting cleavages is the number of units of a federation: "the Canadian case shows the necessity of a substantial number of member states in a federation. Only in this way, can the competing interests of the units be pacified"⁴⁷. Yet, the ideal federation for Cyprus is considered to be bicomunal and bizonal, yet "to reduce any state to only two sectors, brings intolerance and the ability to control tensions becomes more difficult"⁴⁸. This would therefore be problematic, since both communities are very nationalistic and lack commitment to a common authority; they would find themselves in "a zero-sum-game situation"⁴⁹. Furthermore, in federations, decision-making is majoritarian. Due to the numerical imbalance between the two communities, the Turkish-Cypriots, as the minority, would have to place their trust in this mode of decision-making, yet this does not seem likely.

It is also important that there exists goodwill and commitment in order to make a federation successful. Indeed, the success of a federation depends on tolerance and compromise among the leaders and the communities, and "unless co-operation and basic consensus exist, the viability and the success of a federation will be in doubt"⁵⁰. Yet these factors are absent in Cyprus: the two communities both fear and mistrust each other, as do the respective community elites, looking protectively toward the outside motherland states.

Ultimately, a federal arrangement is a second-best solution for both communities⁵¹. Greek-Cypriots, as the majority, prefer a unitary state but would settle for a federation with a

⁴⁷ Khashman, 1999

⁴⁸ Beaufays, 1988, 77

⁴⁹ Ibid

⁵⁰ Khashman, 1999

⁵¹ Bahcheli, 2000, 203

strong central government⁵² to secure the reunification of the island, hence their emphasis on the ‘three freedoms’: freedom of movement, freedom to own property, and freedom to settle anywhere on the island. By contrast, Turkish-Cypriots, having exercised self-rule for so long, prefer to maintain a separate Turkish-Cypriot state, but would settle for an arrangement that creates two sovereign and loosely connected states⁵³. However, “Greek-Cypriots consider acceptance of Turkish-Cypriot sovereignty as tantamount to legitimating the island’s partition”⁵⁴, and have therefore rejected it. Indeed, there is a general fear among Greek-Cypriots that a federation will serve as a stepping stone to secession.

Therefore, the essential prerequisites for an integrated government are absent in Cyprus. This was the reason for the collapse of the 1960 power-sharing agreement. Without sufficient trust and a sense of shared identity, a federal solution is unlikely to fare any better. Regarding the option of a confederation, in a bicomunal setting such arrangements create a risk of mutual vetoes and immobilisation. There is thus no reason to assume that a confederation would be any more viable than a federation in Cyprus⁵⁵.

In November 2002 the first version⁵⁶ of the ‘Annan Plan’ was circulated. It proposed a loosely federal union in which the constituent territorial units would have maximal autonomy, and the limited joint institutions at the federal level would operate on the basis of consociational norms. The United Cyprus Republic would consist of a Greek-Cypriot constituent state over 72% of the island’s territory and a Turkish-Cypriot constituent state over the other 28%. The constituent states would have jurisdiction over all matters except foreign policy, EU affairs, and central bank functions, which would be the province of the federal government. On April 24, 2004, 64.9% of Turkish-Cypriots said *Evet* (Yes) to the Annan Plan, while, across the Green Line, 75.83% of Greek-Cypriots said *Oxi* (No). In his post-mortem Annan noted that “the sheer size of the No vote raises... fundamental questions”⁵⁷.

CONCLUSION: A FUTURE SOLUTION?

⁵² ‘The UN in Cyprus: An Inter-Communal Survey of Public Opinion by UNFICYP’, <http://www.unficy.org/UNFICYP%20Survey.htm>

⁵³ ‘The UN in Cyprus: An Inter-Communal Survey of Public Opinion by UNFICYP’, <http://www.unficy.org/UNFICYP%20Survey.htm>

⁵⁴ Bahcheli, 2000, 207

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, p 214

⁵⁶ There were to be four subsequent versions of the plan, incorporating minor modifications on various issues, but the fundamentals would remain unchanged.

⁵⁷ Bose, 2007, 100

The island of Cyprus has been the site of severe ethnonational conflict. As a result, there have been numerous attempts to deal with the situation. Practically every conceivable formula has been attempted to accommodate the interests of Greek- and Turkish-Cypriots: a power-sharing agreement in 1960, the de facto partition of the island and the separation of the two communities in 1974, and finally, an attempt in the form of the Annan Plan to establish a federal solution for the island. However, each attempt at ‘solving’ the island’s problem has failed. The 1960 constitution only lasted three years because the conditions necessary for consociational democracy were absent, and 44 years later the Annan Plan and its proposed solution of a confederation was rejected. Nevertheless, “[d]espite the failure of the latest peace efforts...both sides remain committed to the principle of federalism”⁵⁸. However, without the presence of a shared identity and trust between the two communities, there is no reason to expect that a bicomunal federation would fare any better than the power-sharing experiment of 1960.

The most ‘successful’ measure has been that of partition. Ethnic violence on Cyprus, which reached crisis on several occasions between 1960 and 1974, has been negligible since the partition and population exchange following the Turkish invasion. As a result, the possibility of a two-state solution merits serious consideration. Naturally, there is resistance from most Greek-Cypriots regarding such action, as it would seem in effect to legitimise the Turkish occupation. However, an acknowledged two-state solution may be unavoidable. It would naturally involve partition, predictably along similar lines to those which already exist, and measures would need to be taken regarding the issue of property. For those individuals who have property on opposite sides of the Green Line, there would have to be some form of compensation, either in monetary form⁵⁹, or in the form of a scheme of ‘property exchange’, whereby, for instance, a Greek-Cypriot with land in the north can trade properties with a Turkish-Cypriot who has land of equivalent value in the south⁶⁰. This way both are able to take advantage of their property rights. It must be stressed, however, that a two-state solution would not be regarded as ideal, especially by the majority of Greek-Cypriots. Nevertheless, it cannot be completely excluded from the list of possible options, as, in light of the literature explored earlier, the most popular option of a bizonal, bicomunal federation, is hardly promising in the existing circumstances.

It must, nonetheless, be noted that since the opening of the checkpoints, there has been a great deal of coming and going without incident, and this is certainly positive. Therefore,

⁵⁸ Pollis 1979, in Papadakis, Peristianis, and Welz, 2006, 24

⁵⁹ Involving the receipt of a sum equivalent, or near to that of the property’s value

⁶⁰ This would not always be possible, however, as neither the value nor the area of property owned by Greek- and Turkish-Cypriots on opposite sides of the Green Line is equal

another possible option, instead of a two-state solution, could be to tentatively take modest steps toward some degree of shared decision-making and communication between the two communities. This strategy could perhaps, in time, build the conditions necessary for a more confident use of federal structures. Indeed, the more exposure to each other across the dividing line, hopefully the more open the climate will become towards reconciliation. However, unless and until such a situation is achieved, nothing could be worse for either community than to place themselves within inappropriate constitutional arrangements yet again⁶¹.

REFERENCES

- Bahcheli, Tozun. "Searching for a Cyprus Settlement: Considering Options for Creating a Federation, a Confederation, or Two Independent States", *Publius*, 30, no. 1-2 (Winter/Spring 2000): 203-216.
- Beaufays. "Belgium: A Dualist Political System?", *Publius*, 18 (Spring 1988): 77.
- Bermeo, Nancy. "What the Democratization Literature Says – Or Doesn't Say – about Postwar Democratization", *Global Governance*, 9, no.2 (April-June, 2003)
- Bindebir, Handshin, Jovanovic, Rieck. *Federalism, Decentralization and Conflict Management in Multicultural Societies*, <http://www1.worldbank.org/wbiep/decentralization/library1/federalism.pdf>
- Bose, Sumantra. *Contested Lands: Israel-Palestine, Kashmir, Bosnia, Cyprus and Sri Lanka*, London: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Brancati, Dawn. "Decentralization: Fuelling the Fire or Dampening the Flames of Ethnic Conflict and Seccessionism?", *International Organisation*, 60, no. 3 (2006): 651-686.
- Bryant, Rebecca. *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*, London: I.B. TAURIS, 2004.
- Coakley, John. "Approaches to the Resolution of Ethnic Conflict: The Strategy of Non-Territorial Autonomy", *International Political Science Review*, 15, no. 3 (1994): 297-314.
- Cornell, Svante E. "Autonomy as a Source of Conflict: Caucasian Conflicts in Theoretical Perspective", *World Politics*, 54 (2002): 245-276.
- Crepaz, Markus, Thomas Koelble, and David Wilsford, eds. *Democracy and Institutions: The Life Work of Arend Lijphart*, Ann Arbor. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2000
- Downes, Alexander. "The Holy Land Divided: Defending Partition as a Solution to Ethnic War." *Security Studies* 1, no.4 (2001): 58-116.

⁶¹ Milne, 2003

- Duchacek, Ivo, ed. "Bicommunal Societies and Politics." Special issue of *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 18, no 2 (Spring 1988).
- Gai, Yash, ed. *Autonomy and Ethnicity: Negotiating Competing Claims in Multi-Ethnic States*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Hannay, David. *Cyprus: The Search for a Solution*. London: I.B. TAURIS, 2005.
- Hazell, Robert and Richard Rawlings, eds. *Devolution, Law-Making, and the Constitution*. London: Imprint, 2005.
- Heintze, HJ. "On the Legal Understanding of Autonomy" in *Autonomy: Applications and Implication*, edited by Mark Suksi. Cambridge: Kluwer Law International, 1998.
- Horowitz, Donald. "Explaining the Northern Ireland Agreement: The Sources of an Unlikely Constitutional Consensus." *British Journal of Political Science* 32 (2002): 193-220.
- Kaufmann, Chaim. "Possible and Impossible Solutions to Ethnic Civil Wars." *International Security* 20, no. 4 (Spring 1996): 136-175.
- Kaufmann, Chaim. "When All Else Fails: Ethnic Population Transfers and Partitions in the Twentieth Century." *International Security* 23, no.3 (Fall 1998): 120-156.
- Khashman, Zeliha. "Is a Federal Structure Really an Appropriate Political Solution for Multiethnic Societies? The Case of Cyprus." *Perceptions: The Journal of International Affairs* 4, no. 2 (June-August 1999).
- Kumar, Radha. "The Troubled History of Partition". *Foreign Affairs* (January/February 1997): 22-34.
- Licklider, Roy. "The Consequences of Negotiated Settlements in Civil Wars, 1945-1993." *American Political Science Review* 89, no 3 (1995): 681-690.
- Lijphart, Arend. "The Wave of Power-Sharing Democracy". In *The Architecture of Democracy: Constitutional Design, Conflict Management, and Democracy*, edited by Andrew Reynolds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Lijphart, Arend. *Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.
- Lijphart, Arend. "Constitutional Design for Divided Societies." *Journal of Democracy* 15, no. 2 (April 2004).
- Lijphart, Arend. "Consociational Democracy." *World Politics* 21, no.2 (January 1969).
- McGarry, John and Brendan O'Leary, eds. *The Politics of Ethnic Conflict Regulation: Case Studies of Protracted Ethnic Conflicts*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Milne, David. "One State or Two? Political Realism on the Cyprus Question." *The Round Table* 92 (January 2003) Basingstoke. www.weltpolitik.net/texte/policy/milne.pdf
- Mozaffar, Shaheen and James R Scarritt. "Why Territorial Autonomy is Not a Viable Option for Managing Ethnic Conflict in African Plural Societies." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 5, no. 3-4 (1999): 230-253.

- Papadakis, Yiannis, Nicos Peristianis, and Gisela Welz, eds. *Divided Cyprus: Modernity, History, and an Island in Conflict*. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2006.
- Rothchild, Donald. "Settlement Terms and Postagreement Stability" in *Ending Civil Wars: The Implementation of Peace-Agreements*, edited by Stephen John Stedman, Donald Rothchild and Elizabeth M Cousins. Boulder: Lynn Rienner Publishers, 2002.
- Rothchild, Donald and Caroline Hertzell. "Security in Deeply Divided Societies: The Role of Territorial Autonomy." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 5, no 3-4 (1999): 254-271.
- Sambanis, Nicholas. "Partition as a Solution to Ethnic War: An Empirical Critique of the Theoretical Literature." *World Politics* 52, no.4 (2000) 437-483.
- Schnekener, Ulrich. "Making Power-Sharing Work: Lessons from Successes and Failures in Ethnic Conflict Regulation." *Journal of Peace Research* 39, no. 2 (2002): 203-228.
- Smith. *Federalism, The Multiethnic Challenge*. New York: Longman Group Ltd, 1995.
- Stedman, Stephen John, Donald Rothchild and Elizabeth M Cousins, eds. *Ending Civil Wars: The Implementation of Peace Agreements*. Boulder: Lynn Rienner Publishers, 2002.
- Tir, Jaroslav. "Dividing Countries to Promote Peace: Prospects for Long-Term Successes of Partitions." *Journal of Peace Research* 42 (2005): 545-562.
- UNFICYP. "The UN in Cyprus: An Inter-Communal Survey of Public Opinion", 2007.
<http://www.unficy.org/UNFICYP%20Survey.htm>
- Van Parijs, Phillippe. "Power Sharing versus Border-Crossing in Ethnically Divided Societies" in *Designing Democratic Institutions*, edited by Ian Shapiro and Stephen Macedo. New York: New York University Press, 2000.
- Varshney, Ashutosh. "Ethnic Conflict and Civil Society: India and Beyond" *World Politics* 53 (April 2001): 362-398.
- Watts, Ronald. Federalism, "Federal Political Systems, and Federations." *Annual Review of Political Science* 1 (1998) 117-137.
- Wibbels, Erik. "Madison in Baghdad? Decentralization and Federalism in Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 9 (2006): 165-188.