INSECURITY AND TRUST IN CYPRUS: RETHINKING THE SECURITY DILEMMA WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE CYPRUS PROBLEM

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

İPEK BORMAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

SEPTEMBER 2012

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Meliha ALTUNIŞIK

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Hüseyin BAĞCI

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Atila ERALP

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Atila Eralp	(METU, IR)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sevilay Kahraman	(METU, IR)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip Yalman	(METU, ADM)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Bilgin	(Bilkent, IR)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Özgehan Şenyuva	(METU, IR)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Surname: İpek BORMAN

Signature:

ABSTRACT

INSECURITY AND TRUST IN CYPRUS:
RETHINKING THE SECURITY DILEMMA WITHIN THE CONTEXT
OF THE CYPRUS PROBLEM

Borman, İpek
Ph.D., Department of International Relations
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Atila Eralp

September 2012, 223 pages

This thesis rethinks the security dilemma within the context of the Cyprus problem. It analyzes and problematizes the established political discourses and societal insecurities in Cyprus. It basically contends that the Cyprus problem should be reconceptualized from a critical security perspective, utilizing the fatalist, mitigator and transcender logics of insecurity. In that regard, it advances the idea that the security paradox in Cyprus should be rethought with the aim of transcending it through reconciliation and trust-building. The thesis takes attention to the scope of human agency, both at the state and human society levels, in the processes of reconciliation and trust-building, and concludes that these processes are key in transforming the two communities in the island into a post-national and pluralistic community of Cyprus.

Keywords: Cyprus Problem, Security Dilemma, Critical Security, Trust and Reconciliation

ÖZ

KIBRIS'TA GÜVENSİZLİK VE GÜVEN:
KIBRIS SORUNU BAĞLAMINDA GÜVENLİK İKİLEMİNİ
YENİDEN DÜŞÜNMEK

Borman, İpek
Doktora, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Atila Eralp

Eylül 2012, 223 sayfa

Bu çalışma, Kıbrıs sorunu bağlamında güvenlik ikilemini yeniden düşünmektedir. Kıbrıs'ta yerleşik siyasi söylemleri ve toplumsal güvensizlikleri incelemekte ve sorunsallaştırmaktadır. Temel olarak; anarşi, düzen ve güven merkezli güvensizlik mantıklarından yararlanılarak, Kıbrıs sorununun eleştirel güvenlik bakış açısıyla yeniden kavramsallaştırılmasını savunmaktadır. Bu anlamda, Kıbrıs'taki güvenlik paradoksunun uzlaşı ve güven inşaası yoluyla aşılması bakımından yeniden düşünülmesi fikrini öne sürmektedir. Bu çalışma, ayrıca, gerek devlet gerekse de toplum düzeyinde insan faktörünün uzlaşı ve güven inşaası süreçlerindeki rolüne dikkat çekerek, bu süreçlerin adadaki iki toplumu millet sonrası ve çoğulcu bir topluma dönüştürmede anahtar olduğu sonucuna varmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kıbrıs Sorunu, Güvenlik İkilemi, Eleştirel Güvenlik, Güven ve Uzlaşı

To My Angels;

Nazif, Onur, Mustafa and İlkay

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express her deepest gratitude to her advisor, Prof. Dr. Atila Eralp, for being both a personal and academic mentor throughout her doctoral studies and life at METU.

The author would also like to thank to the distinguished members of the examining committee; Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip Yalman, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Bilgin, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sevilay Kahraman and Assist. Prof. Dr. Özgehan Şenyuva for their guidance, advice, criticism, encouragements and insight during and beyond her research and writing.

Moreover, the author extends her appreciation to Mehmet Ali Talat, Özdil Nami, Tufan Erhürman, Mehmet Dana and Aslı Erkmen for their constant help and motivation throughout her doctoral studies.

Many thanks also go to a long list of invaluable friends and family, yet most importantly to my brother Hüseyin, sister-in-law Pınar, my nephews and niece who have come to be my greatest supporters and indeed caretakers in the most depressing and needed times.

There are also those who have embraced me no matter what and brought me to the moment I currently enjoy with their unyielding support, unfading light and unending inspiration, empathy, sympathy and love. My parents Onur and Nazif, my husband Mustafa and my son İlkay; I can never find the right words to express my gratitude and appreciation for each one of you. You have been my angels all the way through…

PREFACE

On the morning of 23 April 2003, my phone rang just when I was preparing to start to a new day in Ankara where I was studying at the time. On the phone, there was a close friend telling me that she was at the border of Ledra Palace – not a checkpoint then – and she was about to cross to the southern part of the long-divided capital of Cyprus, Nicosia. Although a very old friend, the 'thing' in her voice was very new to me as it was to her; an instantaneous expression of highly dense and unexpected emotions that I cannot duly put into words even today. I fell down onto the chair tongue-tied and with my heart broken. A very strong and strange enthusiasm had spontaneously captured my mind and my heart. I wanted desperately to be there among those hundreds of Turkish Cypriots who were trying to cross to the southern part of the island, alas, most of whom for the first time in their lives. I remember myself being carried away with a wide variety of thoughts and emotions that day, particularly trying to figure out what it meant to be crossing to the south – a well-established taboo, which at that very explicit moment was on the process of destruction.

It had indeed been a (Turkish Cypriot) communal taboo to be in an act of crossing to the south. Hence, it was physically and officially not possible to cross due to the existence of borders and barbed wires all along the island, yet in essence as a result of the ban of the Turkish Cypriot authorities. Crossing to the south had been forbidden since the exchange of population that occurred in 1975, and for those Turkish Cypriots who were born after 1975 it was as if Cyprus was physically formed only of the northern part.

The existence of the southern part had been a nostalgic story, or rather a mythological tell-tale our grandparents and parents used to narrate us. My mother, who was born and raised in 'Leymosun', or Limassol, in the southern coast of the island, always talks about the 'good old days' she had had in her

ancestral city. But those good old days were shuttered in her memories with the fact that as a newly-wed she was forced to leave before moving onto her new house which had been turned into a shelter for Turkish Cypriot resistance fighters. Her eyes always water when she remembers that she had to leave all her belongings behind and that she does not even have a single picture from her childhood to show to her children and grandchildren. For my father, a 'Bafidi' (a villager of Paphos in the southern coast), those 'beautiful' grapevines he had worked in the summer time during his childhood had been deserted to rot. In his memories, in fact, he had never been a child, but a 'soldier' since his mid-teens. For both, going back is not an option at all. 'Let everyone stay where they are.'

Let alone the southern part, it was as if the Greek Cypriots were also almost non-existent in the island and imagined by the Turkish Cypriots as a human specie that can only be encountered abroad, but not in the island. To most of the Turkish Cypriots, they were not even perceived as neighbours as no form of contact existed between the two communities in the island. We didn't know what there was beyond the border and we were 'taught' not to wonder, not to ask and not to know. And a very considerable number of us did so until that day…

That day, when the Turkish Cypriot authorities had lifted the ban, people all over the island rushed to the Ledra Palace border to confront the unthinkable without knowing what to expect and what to find. I was heartbroken, because I was missing the 'whole thing' – the communal act of crossing. That sense of missing urged me to go to Cyprus in the shortest possible time and experience in person the act of crossing. Of course, my individual crossing was not like the one of 23 April 2003, hence the density of my emotions couldn't be underestimated comparing to the ones of 23 April 2003.

Nearly after a month, when we arrived at Ledra Palace, a checkpoint then, with my friend who rang that day to give me the news, I was still feeling very enthusiastic in a bizarre way. At the Turkish Cypriot checkpoint, we handed our Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus identity cards to the Turkish Cypriot police for inspection and filled out a visa form as if we were crossing from one country to another. The Greek Cypriots had become our 'new neighbours' overnight and we were now allowed to encounter with them in the island. It was indeed a huge leap forward for the sake of reconciliation between the two communities, but the immediate adversarial official statements of both leaderships were still made at the expense of reconciliation between the two communities. After we got the approval from the Turkish Cypriot police, we started walking towards the UN-protected buffer zone and as we passed by the sign 'Goodbye – Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus', I could almost hear my heart beat aloud. As the sound of my heart carried on with a hasty rhythm, we walked through the buffer zone – a dead zone frozen at the year of 1974 with destroyed houses that were reminiscent of the war. In the middle of the buffer zone, there was the Ledra Palace Hotel, a city hotel once that has been a shelter for the UN soldiers since 1974, as the only 'living' space in the entire dead zone. As we passed by the hotel, we heard the sound of music coming from one of the rooms and couldn't turn a blind eye to the beach towels airing at the balconies. I instantly remembered a friend who worked for the UN telling me that it was very popular among the UN circles to make fun of the UN forces in Cyprus as 'beach-keepers' rather than 'peace-keepers'…

As we approached the Greek Cypriot checkpoint, my uneasiness increased and my heartbeat spread all over my body. When my friend told me not to worry, I realized that I was absolutely frightened! It suddenly occurred to me that I had a very negative image of a 'Greek Cypriot policeman', which I 'assumed' of deriving from the one and only history textbook that we studied at the secondary school and which was certainly not giving a humane account of the Greek Cypriot policemen in particular and the authorities in general. Flashing in

my mind was a textbook 'decorated' with images of piles of dead civilian Turkish Cypriots whose ruptured brains could easily be identified even from the sleazy black and white print of the book. When the policeman started talking to us sympathetically in Turkish, I was indeed perplexed and felt sorry for my own prejudices that instantly surfaced and which I became aware of their existence at that very moment. After it turned out to be a routine check of identity (this time the check aimed at whether I was a 'genuine' Turkish Cypriot or a 'settler' who came to the island after 1974), upon my first step I came directly with a wall sign writing 'free areas of the Republic of Cyprus' on it. I thought my act of crossing had been full of symbolic politics all the way along and I was a bit agonized by it. When we finally reached the real-life street where ordinary people just kept going around, I imagined myself passing through a suffocating time capsule and reaching to the wonderland where I yearned so long to see. Nevertheless, my strange feelings continued to haunt me. On the one hand, I felt relaxed as I had left all the 'hard' stuff behind and wouldn't be confronted anymore by any act of interrogation about my identity. On the other hand, the sense of insecurity that accompanied my 'Turkish Cypriot identity' never left me alone especially during my initial journeys to the south; a disturbing feeling that has been rendered irrelevant over time, yet has never completely vanished… Although crossing to the south has become a routine and mostly an 'entertaining' activity for most of the Turkish Cypriots today, that sense of insecurity continues to prevail, especially when examined within the context of a possible settlement of the Cyprus problem.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The historical narrative of the politics in Cyprus is ever presented as a foredoomed failure, as it is characterized by a relentlessly enduring state of conflict. The island of Cyprus has indeed become synonymous with conflict in the sense that the perseverance of the problem is an ordinary affair, a well-established status quo, or an out there reality. Hence, it is a widely used expression that Cyprus has become a deathbed for many politicians and diplomats, local and international alike, who had dealt with the conflict over the years.

The political roots of this conflict can arguably be traced back to the imperial history of the island. However, due to the pertinacity and the intractability of the conflict for decades, these political roots have continued to strike new root problems with severe ramifications on the societal, cultural, economic and ecological structures of the island. Consequentially, the Cyprus problem has created over a stretch of the time many political and societal discourses that are pigeonholed through constant fatalism both in the minds and the practices. These problematic discourses within the context of the Cyprus problem have constituted and sustained insecurities at the socio-political levels through a continuous process of mutual implication. The political and societal insecurities have especially become visible in terms of their capability of resisting a long-awaited solution to the problem when the first comprehensive settlement plan (the Annan Plan) was put to separate, simultaneous referenda in 2004. The Greek Cypriots voted an overwhelming 'no' with upshots in relation to their concerns over security. As a matter of

fact, these insecurities have continued to prevail to such an extent that the Turkish Cypriot historic breakaway from fatalism, which had been aspired by the promise of transformation and reintegration with the world, was dramatically shifted within a couple of years.

In a blatantly oversimplified analysis, there exists a security problem, or rather a 'security paradox', in Cyprus perceptible both in scope of the ongoing negotiations and, far more importantly, in the way the two communities conceive each other.[1] Almost a decade has passed since the opening of the first crossing point in Cyprus, yet Cyprus is still a divided island in physical and political terms as well as in minds. Even worse, despite reciprocal crossings and availability of daily contacts, the societal gap between the two communities is wide as ever and reconciliation in its literal sense is non-existent.

The security paradox that has been constructed over the course of the modern history of Cyprus is well-entrenched both over the discourses and the practices of security. These discourses and practices around which the security aspect of the Cyprus problem has been shaped over the years hold little promise for a future political settlement in the island. This is mainly because the prevailing security conception is well-embedded in the mainstream political thinking as well as within the societal fabric as 'the key underlying problem'; suggesting that the security aspect is the very essence and a *natural* part of the problem that has rendered a solution in Cyprus not

[1] As phrased by Booth and Wheeler, a 'security paradox' refers to "a situation in which two or more actors, seeking only to improve their own security, provoke through their words or actions an increase in mutual tension, resulting in less security all round." See Ken Booth and Nicholas J. Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma: Fear, Cooperation and Trust in World Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 9.

possible to date. This problematic thinking on security in particular and the Cyprus problem in general is continuously fed by the essentially fatalist discourses that consciously construct an exclusionary image of the other which is naturally inhumane and untrustworthy. Moreover, in practical terms, the security aspect, which has also become a political taboo as dealt within the context of the Cyprus problem, is an area where two antagonistic identity constructs are solidified in mutually exclusive security policies. As the end result of the Annan Plan referenda shows, such exclusionary security policies do not only resist flourishing the seeds of a sustainable solution, but also naturalize and legitimize the antagonistic identity constructs and societal insecurities within the two communities.

Security in Cyprus has always been a concomitant aspect of realist and strategic thinking on the problem. Indeed, it has been theorized strictly within the parameters of traditional approaches that acquired its value due to the strategic importance of the island, which is presented in historical narration as lying at the crossroads of civilizations and imperial geopolitics. This strategic thinking on Cyprus has vastly imbued it a symbolism whose solution cannot be pursued and indeed attainable outside its strategic prism. Looking from this prism, it is assumed that the inherent dynamics of the problem can only be understood through its 'international' character and can only be dealt within the confines of wider regional and global strategic considerations. In fact, besides the interests of 'motherlands' Greece and Turkey and involvement of the UN, the solution of the Cyprus problem has been given as a duty to numerous US and British special representatives, as talented as Richard Holbrooke and David Hannay. Notwithstanding the 'great efforts' of these international actors, Cypriots have come to be seen as spoiled (inferior) children of sun and golden beaches, who have failed these

'peaceful' initiatives, while people are dying brutally elsewhere as a result of structural and systemic violence. On the other hand, the main political actors *inside* the island have been perceived through the tie of an umbilical cord, as being mere subordinates of their mothers' intentions and interests and as local heroes ever in posts to protect their overarching ethnic identities and national causes on the island.

This problematic prism of the Cyprus problem tells the whole story of failure from this study's perspective. As a matter of fact, the potential geopolitically and strategically informed remedies for the solution of the Cyprus problem are vastly exhausted. Not only these remedies have produced a futility vis-à-vis a peaceful solution, they have also furnished the status quo, defined in terms of conflict, as an ordinary affair of the Cypriots. Indeed, the Cypriot scene has become habitual in enduring fatalist political discourses and their embodiments, as the key public figures and the practices of the problem remain intact against the fluidity of time and over the changing generations. However, the story is a lot different inside the island. Although polished by the strategic factor, the security problems are inherently societal with implications over the political discourses practiced by the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot political actors. The security problems are also inherently historical and those societal insecurities cannot be broken off from the human made, historical constructedness of the Cyprus problem. For that matter, this study argues that as long as this deliberate lack of rethinking security in Cyprus from the prism of socially and historically constructed insecurities continues, effective analytical tools for reimagining security will always be bypassed and prospects for transcending the security paradox in Cyprus will always be missed.

As implied above, what is further problematic in the traditional thinking on security in Cyprus is the essentially objectivist conceptions of security and identity. In the mainstream approaches to the Cyprus problem, security is theorized as a pre-given and a rather regressive concept, devoid of its instrumental value as a way of de-naturalizing the established discourses and structures with the aim of exploring different readings on security. Indeed, the fatalist and negative framework provided for security in Cyprus has worked towards constraining the conceptual and methodological ability for bringing forward potential alternative readings in addressing and problematizing the insecurities at state and human society levels. This is very much illustrative within the context of the Cyprus problem where security is primarily seen and operationalized as a fixed and complete phenomenon, rather than a social construct; thereby disallowing any flexibility and fluctuation over its perceptions and practices that are in fact generated through the social processes of construction and negotiation. In simple terms, such a rigid, and hence narrow, conception of security merely serves to constantly inform antagonistic identities and exclusive security policies, which are also regarded as exogenously given. Furthermore, as the state is treated as a blackbox with pre-given identities and interests, the conventional wisdom on the problem suggests that there is a fatalistic inevitability as regards those antagonistic identities and exclusive policies. This is mainly because state and identity are perceived to be existing prior to social interaction and historical development – a conceptualization that further complicates the naturalized and legitimized discourses and practices of a blackboxed state. In that sense, the state, as it is, has been denuded as an objectivist entity with no possibility of being transformed and transforming its alleged pre-given identities and interests, which are in fact socially constructed.

When looked from the perspective of the traditional security dilemma conceptualization, the story does not differ in essence. As informed by the rational actors and their rational interests, who and which exogenously exist as objectivist entities, an unbreakable intractability revolves around the Cyprus problem and there cannot be imagined an escape from the security paradox, despite the fact that efforts might be tried out for a settlement of the conflict. The need for conceptualizing and practicing the Cyprus problem out of its conventionally fixed parameters and beyond its traditional scope is thus long over-due. Critical, alternative approaches have to come aboard if the security paradox in Cyprus is to be challenged and resolved. As theory and practice are mutually implicated, questioning the very epistemological and ontological basics of the exclusionary identity constructs and insecurities in Cyprus will pave the way for imagining alternative policies both at the state and inter-societal levels. Hence, at the crux of insecurities lies the human society, nevertheless constituting and being reconstituted by the political discourses. Without attempting to unveil the fatalism over those contradistinctive identities and untangle insecurities at the human society level, which even inhibit the very availability of face-to-face contacts and encounters between the two communities to be transformed into a sound inter-communal dialogue, a sustainable peace will never be realized, even if on document a settlement is agreed. As societal traumas, fears and mistrusts are enmeshed in the historical and practical scenery of Cyprus, attributable to the experiences of Cypriots in relation to the respective 'tragedies' of 1963 and 1974, the political discourses that have created them in the first place have to be problematized so as to bring forward alternative logics for resolving the security paradox.

In that regard, this study aims to rethink the Cyprus problem through 'the logics of insecurity' as phrased and theorized by Booth and Wheeler in *The Security Dilemma: Fear, Cooperation and Trust in World Politics*.[2] Building upon these logics of insecurity (i.e. fatalist, mitigator and transcender), this study attempts to bring out the discursive political (re)construction of exclusive identities and insecurities that prevail at state and human society levels. Booth and Wheeler's rethinking on the security dilemma advances indeed a critical framework for re-conceptualizing the security paradox in Cyprus with the aim of transcending it against the condition of uncertainty and through trust-building. This is where such rethinking fundamentally differs from the conceptualization of the security dilemma from a societal perspective that has come to the fore at the wake of inter-ethnic violence dominating the world politics in the immediate post-Cold War period. And this is also primarily why this study attempts to utilize the conceptual framework of the former rather than the latter. As an inter-communal affair, the Cyprus problem may be characterized as a societal security dilemma given the inter-ethnic violence originated by and pursued through competing nationalisms.[3] However, rather than providing the tools for effectively problematizing the political and societal insecurities and thus opening up the possibilities for resolving the security dilemmas, the societal security dilemma perspective "seeks to explain how security concerns over group identity can escalate to the point of ethnic violence."[4] Therefore, as such, the

[2] For an earlier contribution of Booth and Wheeler as regards conceptualizing the security dilemma from a critical perspective, see also Nicholas J. Wheeler and Ken Booth, "The Security Dilemma," in John Baylis and N. J. Rengger, eds., *Dilemmas of World Politics: International Issues in a Changing World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

[3] For a comprehensive account of the 'societal security dilemma', see Paul Roe, *Ethnic Violence and the Societal Security Dilemma* (London and New York: Routledge, 2005).

[4] Ibid., p. 74.

societal security dilemma, instead of bringing forward a critical and alternative rethinking on the security dilemma with a clinch on potential transformation, provides for a problem-solving approach through the same epistemological grounds of the traditional security dilemma conceptualization, with societies taking place of states and the ambiguity of nationalisms taking place of the ambiguity of weapons. Moreover, even though the role of identities is highlighted in the construction of nationalisms and ethnic violence, the same rational logic of fatalism pertains, yet this time in the form of an 'emerging anarchy' inside the state. Therefore, while the societal security dilemma applies the methodological toolkit of traditional security dilemma conceptualization to within the state, Booth and Wheeler critically question such rationalist conceptualization with an end-goal towards transforming the established identities and transcending the security dilemmas. Although Booth and Wheeler's study focuses mainly on practices of security dilemma between the states, their deliberate attempt in disclosing the possibility of transformation through the logics of insecurity and in directing attention to the scope for human agency, provides a more effective basis for problematizing the political discourses and societal insecurities in Cyprus with a view to exploring ways out of the predicament in which states and inter-communal relations are perceived to be entrapped.

Hence, Booth and Wheeler aim not only to provide analytical insights for effecting a conceptual rethinking, but also to introduce the main tools in imagining the transformation of identities and the eventual transcendence of security dilemmas. As such, the main tool that emerges from this rethinking is building trust, a long undermined concept in the study of world politics. Trust, however, is not approached by Booth and Wheeler as a rational choice to be established between the political actors, but as a transcender idea to be

'embedded' within the inter-societal relations. Derivatively, trust needs flourishing not only at the state level, but far more importantly at the human society level with an ability of changing the nature of these relations. They basically contend that without trust embedded at the human society level, rational choices and efforts towards finding a settlement will only take the form of conflict resolution, but will not be peacemaking. When trust is not rooted in people's minds, security dilemmas are doomed to reappear.

Instead of a thinking of the Cyprus problem as a regressive security practice through objectivised conceptions of state and identity, the conceptual process of trust-building implies a change attributable both to the state and the human society. As Booth and Wheeler argue, "if trust between former enemies is to go beyond *contingent cooperation* and become *embedded*, there has to be reconciliation between hostile communities."[5] Therefore, reconciliation emerges from their rethinking as a means for putting the political and societal insecurities under critical and historical scrutiny with an aim for delineating the social constructedness of identities and with a goal towards transforming the relations between the two communities through trust-building. In fact, these insecurities affect Cypriots deeply and personally. As Bleiker has correctly put, "once these artificial demarcations of identity have become internalized in language, school curricula, political institutions, moral discourses, and the like, their mythical origin appears more and more real until the ensuing worldview, and the conflicts that they generate, seem inevitable, even natural."[6] Without problematizing these insecurities that are built into the psyches and the very societal fabric of

[5] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 254.

[6] Roland Bleiker, *Divided Korea: Toward a Culture of Reconciliation* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), p. 116.

Cypriots, neither reconciliation nor trust is possible in Cyprus. And for reconciliation and trust to acquire meaning for the human society and to find grounds to flourish, state discourses and practices have to be pressurized through constant politicization. It derives that the discourses and practices of the state on the one hand and societal insecurities on the other hand are informed and reinforced through a mutual implication.

For these purposes, this study attempts to politicize the security practices of Turkish and Greek Cypriot established discourses with a view to questioning the insecurities from a critical perspective. It follows that the security paradox in Cyprus is not a destiny of Cypriots, rather it is a reified reality that needs to be de-crystallized into its historical, social and political variables that have constructed and naturalized exclusive identities and insecurities. Indeed, in addressing those elements of insecurities and also of trust-building, this study also maintains an interdisciplinary approach, taking stock of a vast array of anthropological studies that have greatly contributed to the understanding of the psychological and societal processes of the conflict. Moreover, due to reasons outlined earlier, this study consciously pursues a rethinking of the Cyprus problem out of its wider strategic prism, which implies an inability of contextualizing the problem outside its strategic connotations. This is not to suggest that strategic implications do not have any value in constituting and informing the security paradox in Cyprus. On the contrary, the political discourses and societal insecurities are very much affected by the non-Cypriot actors throughout its history. However, although implicated by the interests of those actors, the Cyprus problem is inherently a Cypriot one. Those political discourses and societal insecurities resist above anything else transforming the two communities, which have acquired over the course of history exclusionary ethnic identities and internalized

competing security policies, into a post-national and pluralistic community of Cyprus. Hence, the Annan Plan episode clearly shows that despite the efforts and backing of the non-Cypriot actors, including the motherlands, it was the (Greek) Cypriot community who failed the plan and the reunification of the island. This is notwithstanding to the fact that the role played by the international actors, such as the EU and the UN, was not without its discontents. However, as the main endeavour rests upon resolving the security paradox and enabling a rethinking on the Cyprus problem through reconciliation and building trust *between* the two communities, this study will nevertheless touch upon the wider strategic contexts and the role of regional and international actors to the extent this endeavour necessitates.

In light of this framework, the study is premised upon three parts. In the first part, it is aimed to provide the theoretical setting upon which the empirical analysis is conducted. For that matter, Chapter 2 brings forward Booth and Wheeler's assumption of security dilemma 'as an idea whose time has come' and why security dilemma is still a relevant tool in understanding world politics. The chapter then engages in providing a conceptual overview of traditional approaches both to security and security dilemma, and analyzes the basic assumptions upon which both have been theorized by the dominant schools of realism and neo-realism during and after the Cold War. In turn, the chapter attempts to set down how critical security perspectives have implicated both concepts through the idea of theorizing security as a derivative concept and an inherently political process. Moreover, as theorized by Booth and Wheeler, the chapter ends with the introduction of the logics of insecurity, mainly fatalist and mitigator logics informing the rational thinking on the security dilemma. Chapter 3 delineates the basic assumptions of Booth and Wheeler's rethinking on the security dilemma in

relation to its nature, the role of human agency and the importance of choice in affecting the security dilemma. Therefore, the chapter lays the grounds for the transcender logic upon which trust emerges as a central theme in transforming the security dilemma. The chapter brings forward the assumption that trust and transformation through the logic of community are in fact mutually implicated.

The second part of the study aims to forward a rethinking of the Cyprus problem within the given theoretical premises. In that sense, as a first attempt, Chapter 4 provides the grounds upon which the fatalist logic of insecurity has come to dominate the political and societal contexts of the Cyprus problem. Then, it provides for an account of how the security paradox in Cyprus is (re)constructed through socio-historical and political practices as informed by this logic of fatalism. It appears that the construction of antagonistic nationalist identities, starting with the colonial rule of the island and that continued through the immediate post-colonial period, has resulted in (re)constituting competing historical narratives with differentiated traumas and sources of insecurity. When coupled with the ensuing state practices in the post-violence period of the island, exclusively defined ethnic identities and contending visions for the future have brought up the fatalism that informs and reinforces the security paradox. Chapter 5, on the other hand, advances the empirical analysis on re-conceptualizing the security paradox in Cyprus through critically elaborating on a specific period of Cyprus negotiations between 2004 and 2010, which has brought immense transformations to the socio-political life and the conduct of formal negotiations in Cyprus. Furthermore, the role of trust is examined within that specific period by applying and testing the properties of trust, as identified by Booth and Wheeler. What is strikingly instrumental in that period is the

practice of 'security dilemma sensibility' by the Turkish and Greek Cypriot leaderships that provided for easing the security paradox into a security dilemma through mitigation. A relative change has finally come through the role of human agency and by the value of choices of the political actors. Tragically, this unique period in the history of the Cyprus problem that was characterized by high expectations and transformative changes did not successfully contribute in resolving the security dilemma and even turned in an instant blow the transcender tide back to its fatalist inevitability. This appears mainly as a result of the inefficiency even of the mitigator leaderships and their policies in problematizing the established security practices and addressing the societal insecurities, which were simply overlooked and undermined vis-à-vis the high politics of formal negotiations. Therefore, the post-2004 period in Cyprus emerges as a confirmation of Booth and Wheeler's assumption that when mistrust has seeped into the society, the only way for transforming the relations both at the state and human society levels and therefore transcending the security dilemma is through operationalizing trust-building and reconciliatory mechanisms that will effectively address the political and societal insecurities. Especially for making a better sense of how and why the test on trust-building has failed during that unique period, apart from an analysis of the statist and top-down perspectives of the mitigator leaders as regards the settlement of the problem, the study also engages into personal interviews conducted with prominent political actors in explaining the causes of failure from a critical perspective.[7]

[7] Personal interviews were conducted with Mehmet Ali Talat, the former President of TRNC, on 5 May 2012; Özdil Nami, a CTP member of the parliament and the former negotiator of the Turkish Cypriot side as the Special Representative of Mehmet Ali Talat on 22 May 2012; Ergün Olgun, former Under-Secretary of TRNC Presidency and a long-time advisor of Denktaş on 5 August 2012 and an anonymous Greek Cypriot interviewee on 2 July 2012.

In the final part; Chapter 6, with a view to putting an emphasis on the human agency in transforming the security dilemma, analyzes the existing practices of reconciliation in Cyprus and then moves on to explore the prospects for reconciliation and trust-building through the use of the polling data available and the results of the focus groups conducted by the author of this study. The use of the polling data has contributed mainly in informing how inter-communal perceptions of ethnic identity, fear of renewed violence and mistrust toward the other have shaped and continue to shape the political and societal insecurities on multiple grounds that eventually constrain reconciling exclusive security policies and also attaining a sound inter-communal dialogue. On the other hand, the analysis of the study of three focus groups, consisted of a Turkish Cypriot focus group, a Greek Cypriot focus group and an inter-mixed one, reveals clearly the need for reconciliation and trust-building for transforming the antagonistic nationalist identities into a post-national identity and a pluralistic community of Cyprus. The focus groups have emerged instrumental in bringing the value of human agency and showing that Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot individuals are more open to empathy and more articulate on the human dimension of the other's suffering when they mutually interact, listen, understand and respond to one another. Although it appears that trust-building at the societal level is a challenging task, testing the properties of trust at a more individual level has indeed flamed that wink of trust as an ever attainable goal through the social processes of interaction and reconciliation.

PART I

RETHINKING THE SECURITY DILEMMA: IN AND OUT OF UNCERTAINTY AND TRUST

CHAPTER 2

THE SECURITY DILEMMA: *AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME*?

"*The security dilemma is an idea whose time has come*" declare Booth and Wheeler in their seminal work on this proverbial concept.[8] Although proverbial, the authors contend that the security dilemma is a concept which "many [scholars] have only partially understood, few have developed, and plenty have ignored."[9] Behind this exclamatory remark lies their conviction that the concept has been largely misconceived and discredited by the traditional thinking, and its significance has not been properly recognized despite its ubiquity.[10] They argue, on the contrary, that "it should be regarded as the most fundamental concept of all in security studies, and as such should be at the centre of a reformed agenda of this field."[11] Pointing to "the extent of the theoretical and practical horizons it opens up," Booth and Wheeler claim that "an understanding of the dynamics and potentialities involved in thinking about the security dilemma gets to the heart of the central questions of security studies more profoundly than do even the traditional canons of concepts such as 'war', 'strategy', 'conflict' and the rest."[12]

[8] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 18.

[9] Ibid., p. xi.

[10] Ken Booth and Nicholas J. Wheeler, "Uncertainty," in Paul D. Williams, ed., *Security Studies: An Introduction* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), pp. 133-134.

[11] Ibid., p. 133.

[12] Ibid., p. 134.

The concept of security dilemma, born at the wake of the Cold War, has invariably connoted an essentialist and positivist account of relations between states and has, indeed, echoed the pessimism of the realist school of thought that dominated the discipline of International Relations at the time. That is to say, the security dilemma has been perceived as entailing the basis of the logic of relations between states, whose basic drive for policy and action stems from the perception of either flawed, egoistic nature of human beings or the anarchic nature of the international system. Both has necessitated maximizing state interests 'defined in terms of power' – predominantly military power – to ensure their survival in an insecure world characterized by relentless competition and constant uncertainty. Especially within the dynamics of the Cold War period, and under the hegemony of the realist political thought, the concept has occupied a central place in relation to the overarching realist/neorealist conceptions such as rational egoism, anarchy, power, competition, uncertainty, fear and, most importantly, survival. Consequently, the writings of the early theorists of the security dilemma – John H. Herz and Herbert Butterfield – can ostensibly be interpreted within the confines of such realism.[13] In this respect, Roe asserts:

[13] Butterfield maintained a purely classical realist conceptualization of the security dilemma in the sense that the 'Hobbesian fear' resulting in the 'irreducible dilemma' is rooted in innate psychological condition and 'man's universal sin'. See Herbert Butterfield, *History and Human Relations* (London: Collins, 1951). Herz, on the other hand, pointed to a 'socio-political condition' culminated in 'anarchic society' and necessitated 'kill or perish'. See John H. Herz, "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma," *World Politics*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (January 1950) and John H. Herz, *Political Realism and Political Idealism: A Study in Theories and Realities*, 2nd impression (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951). For that matter, either an 'irreducible' or a 'security' dilemma, derived either from a psychological or a structural condition, both theorists more or less agree that there is a fatalistic inevitability that leaves no room for transcending it. However, Herz openly distanced himself from the classical realists, such as Butterfiled and Morgenthau, in two repects. Firstly, he placed the cause of the security dilemma in a socio-political condition named anarchy, not in an innate psychological condition – an indication for structural realist orientation. Secondly, while starting as a realist, he acknowledged that "students of international relations have an obligation to search for improvement," declaring that he developed "a theory midway between extreme realism and utopian idealism," which he labeled as 'realist liberalism' or 'non-utopian idealism' – an indication which Booth and Wheeler argue containing the features of a much normative approach with a room for slightly mitigating, if not escaping the security dilemma. See John H. Herz, "The Security Dilemma in International Relations: Background and Present Problems," *International Relations*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (2003), p. 413.

> Since Butterfield and Herz's original observations, the security dilemma has come to occupy a central place in IR. This is mainly due to the Cold War period: arms racing between the United States and the Soviet Union and the concomitant theoretical hegemony of the realist and neo-realist paradigms. For many writers, the security dilemma seemed to explain well political-military relations between the two superpowers.[14]

"The [security] dilemmas ... are as new as today's newspaper headlines ('Russia threatening new cold war over missile defence', declared the Guardian on 11 April 2007) and as old as international history."[15] Hence, the history of the concept has developed in conjunction with, and in parallel to, the intellectual/conceptual history of the discipline of International Relations to the extent that the metamorphosis of the latter has greatly impacted the metamorphosis of the concept itself. Indeed, Booth and Wheeler's re-conceptualization of the security dilemma has demonstrated this correlation in a very lucid, yet sophisticated manner through the 'three logics of insecurity', which will be dealt with later in this and ensuing chapters. It was during the initial periods of the Cold War, however, that *the* security dilemma, as a concept and a conceptual tool, has found its way through the traditional thinking of the discipline and "has arguably turned out to be *the* favoured tool for realist/neo-realist analysis."[16]

If such a ubiquitous and central concept, how can it then be assumed as an 'idea whose time has come'? For the answer, Booth and Wheeler return to

[14] Roe, *Ethnic Violence and the Societal Security Dilemma*, p. 2.

[15] Booth and Wheeler, "Uncertainty," pp. 136-137. While referring to 'as old as international history', Booth and Wheeler recall that "in the first significant account of war in the West, the security dilemma was thought to be the underlying cause," citing Thucydides, who wrote in the fifth century BCE and argued that "what led to war in ancient Greece between Athens and Sparta was the growth of Athenian power and the fear this had caused in Sparta." See ibid.

[16] Roe, *Ethnic Violence and the Societal Security Dilemma*, p. 2.

Herz himself; who is widely acclaimed as the pioneer theorist of the security dilemma and who also coined the term itself.[17] In 2003, half a century after its first conceptualization, Herz wrote:

> The greatest turning point came rather with the break-up of the Soviet bloc in 1989, and the arrival, once more, of a multipolar system. The most powerful unit, the United States, was able to feel secure, without any noticeable enemy and thus in a position to work to lessen the security concerns of other members of an international community that now could operate in cooperation, with the help of the world organization and its affiliated branches, in the interests of peace. A 'new world order' seemed possible and in the offing. But matters went in the opposite direction. Apparently, in the aftermath of 1989, states were not ready to think and act in terms other than the traditional ones of enmities and alliances, with conflicts to be resolved through power and threats of force. Thus, instead of a widely expected 'peace dividend' after 1989, many states continued arming with increased defence budgets, thus increasing security concerns everywhere.[18]

Herz's text was rather an alarming reflection of the immediate post-9/11 global order with retrospection to the end of the Cold War. Herz was confident that the main issue – survival – remained intact, despite the paradigmatic shift that came with the end of the Cold War and was further exacerbated with the 9/11 attacks. Further to the problem of the Third World,[19] he pointed to a "dual threat to human survival;" the threat of weapons of mass destruction, and the ecological threat "caused by the confluence of . . . the tremendous growth of human population and the

[17] John H. Herz, "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma," *World Politics*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (January 1950) appears to be the first scholarly article on the concept of security dilemma, which was later elaborated by Herz himself in *Political Realism and Political Idealism*.

[18] Ibid., "The Security Dilemma in International Relations," p. 414.

[19] Herz openly declared his frustration over the policies of the US in the wake of the 9/11 attacks. He was especially critical of the US 'war on terrorism', which he stressed that would never end, unless the US started to deal with its causes; i.e. poverty and fundamentalism in the Third World that resulted in the misery and exploitation of its masses. See ibid., p. 415.

deterioration of the human habitat."[20] Therefore, for Herz, besides the fact that the states – powerful or not – still preferred to play the old chess game through delegating unnecessary power on military build-up, the scope of threats has also multiplied with the emergence of new ones that render the individual capacities of states meaningless and cannot be overcome through the accustomed, old moves. Indeed, while old security predicaments, such as nuclear proliferation, competition for non-renewable sources and great power rivalry continue to be relevant, the challenges faced by today's global security environment go beyond the dual threat that Herz pinpointed and encapsulate a wide variety of new security predicaments, transnational and intranational in nature, ranging from religious fundamentalism, organized crime and international terrorism to the proliferation of all types of weapons, poverty in the weak states, ethnic clashes, mass migration and ever-increasing economic disparity within the global world. In fact, from the globalization standpoint, the dual processes of fragmentation and integration were simultaneously at play at the wake of the post-Cold War world order.[21]

It is against this background that Herz maintains "security problems and the security dilemma are still of great importance, today perhaps more than ever."[22] Yet, pointing to a normative direction within the confines of his 'realist liberalism', Herz concludes: "A radical turn in attitudes and policies is required," for which he cites the "surprising success of the European nations," who are "still sovereign and independent," were able to reach "a stage of trust and collaboration where war between any of them has become

[20] Ibid., p. 416.

[21] John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, 5th edition (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 233.

[22] Herz, "The Security Dilemma in International Relations," p. 412.

unthinkable."[23] For Booth and Wheeler, such a normative understanding provides the basis for why the concept is more relevant than ever: *The security dilemma is an idea whose time has come*, because the concept is "increasingly relevant to thinking about fear, cooperation and trust in the twenty-first century . . . that it has become globalized in today's colliding worlds and changing contexts".[24] What Booth calls as 'The Great Reckoning' implies that the "politics has entered a period of unprecedented insecurity, when human society locally and globally will increasingly come face-to-face with its most fundamental self-created difficulties."[25] In other words, as the issues surrounding today's global security environment still embody the traits – fear, uncertainty and survival – of the security dilemma that now alarmingly operates at multiple levels and involves multiple referents beyond the state, the concept requires rethinking and readapting as a tool to come up to the global challenge and open up critically the prospects for transcending both the existing and the emerging security predicaments, particularly whose solutions prove no longer to be compliant with what the traditional thinking has to offer. However, before elaborating in depth on the relevance of rethinking the security dilemma in today's globalized world and its contributions to the field of security studies within its changing contexts, it is necessary to have a thorough comprehension of the security dilemma as a

[23] Ibid., p. 416.

[24] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 18.

[25] Ibid., "Uncertainty," p. 143; For the idea of 'The Great Reckoning', see Ken Booth, *Theory of World Security* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), which he explains: "The threats to our safety are proliferating and growing in destructiveness. They include the multidimensional predicaments of globalisation, inflamed religious and cultural sensibilities, militant nationalism, growing disparities in life chances between the haves and the have-nots, the inexorable rise of the world's population (which will create future challenges that almost everybody today prefers to ignore), and on and on. The sheer quantity of issues threatening political turmoil, as Lenin might have said, has a quality all of its own… human society globally is living in a New Twenty Years' Crisis. It began, symbolically, on 11 September 2001, and is part of a more general crisis facing the world in the first half of the twenty-first century." Ibid., pp. 1-2.

concept as well as of its transformation in conjunction with the conceptual history of the International Relations in general and the security studies in particular.

Security and its Dilemmas

From a critical security perspective, the security dilemma can be acclaimed as a primitive and anachronistic concept. This is primarily because of the fatalism it endorses in relation to the power-politics competition in which the states, as the primary objects to be secured, are perceived to be entrapped. Undoubtedly, the security dilemma has been traditionally conceptualized in a way that the state is perceived to have a pre-determined and fixed identity, or rather as an exogenous entity existed in isolation from social interaction and historical process. Hence, the security dilemma, itself, has been presumed as an unchanging and inescapable reality, meaning that the dynamics of the security dilemma never allow for a transformative change and, thus, is a constant phenomenon or a reified reality that cannot be transcended over space and time.

Notwithstanding Butterfield's early conceptualization of the security dilemma as a cause of the 'Hobbesian fear', which is mostly attached to the innate psychological condition of human beings and the inability to enter into the 'counter-fear' of others, the security dilemma has come to acquire a more structural and consequentially neorealist basis as studied and practiced in the ensuing years of the Cold War. Under the international system that is driven by anarchy, thereby lacking any authority capable of order, states have to look to their own efforts for protection and survival, which relatively

justify a constant struggle for power between states.[26] As this self-help system is characterized by suspicion, competition and conflict between states, priority is irrefutably accorded to strategic power, which reduces security to military power and that forms the basis of state interest.[27] Therefore, from this point of view, even though defensively motivated and having benign intentions, states are required to maximize their interests through accumulation of military power, which in turn creates the strictures that feed the insecurity of the others, who are conceived of unable to properly detect the real motives of those states due to the 'other minds problem' that is generated by the 'unresolvable uncertainty'.[28] Charles Glaser declares, in this sense, that "the security dilemma is the key to understanding how in an anarchical international system states with fundamentally compatible goals still end up in competition and war."[29]

"Like security itself, the security dilemma might also be regarded as an 'essentially contested concept', with several different formulations apparent

[26] For the structural conceptualization of the security dilemma during the Cold War, mainly see – apart from Herz as cited earlier – Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976); Robert Jervis, "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma," *World Politics*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (1978); Glen H. Snyder, "The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics," *World Politics*, Vol. 36, No. 4 (1984).

[27] Scott Burchill, "Realism and Neo-realism," in Scott Burchill, Richard Devetak, Andrew Linklater, Matthew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smith and Jacqui True, *Theories of International Relations*, 2nd edition (New York and London: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 70-102; David Mutimer, "Critical Security Ctudies: A Schismatic History," in Alan Collins, ed., *Contemporary Security Studies*, 2nd edition (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 86.

[28] To clarify; 'other minds problem', conceptualized by Martin Hollis and Steve Smith in *Explaining and Understanding International Relations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), is "the inability of the decision-makers in one state ever to get fully into the minds of their counterparts in other states, and so understand their motives and intentions with confidence." See Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 4; 'unresolvable uncertainty' means that "governments (their decision-makers, military planners, foreign policy analysts) can never be 100 per cent about the current and future motives and intentiosn of those able to harm them in a military sense." See ibid., "Uncertainty," p. 134.

[29] Charles Glaser, "The Security Dilemma Revisited," *World Politics*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (1997), p. 171.

in IR literature," Roe claims.[30] However, whether security is an essentially contested concept or not is itself a contested subject among the scholars of the security studies.[31] Indeed, it goes without saying that, in world politics, security means different things for different people, with different socio-political, ideological and class orientations, and who live under different social, economic and political conditions. In other words, security is intersubjectively created.[32] Moreover, security, both ontologically and epistemologically, varies extensively depending on the political theory from which assumptions about security *derive*. Booth describes this situation as follows:

> There is no politics-free definition of security in world politics. There is no simple conceptualization of the stipulative definition around which everybody, from all theoretical perspectives, can agree. We must recognize, on the contrary, that all conceptualizations (and operationalizations) are necessarily theory-driven.[33]

Even though a standard dictionary definition of security may be provided, which can arguably be simplified as "being or feeling safe from threats and danger,"[34] a neutral *singular* meaning cannot be attributed to security. Hence, "what it means to be or to feel free from the absence of threats in world

[30] Roe, *Ethnic Violence and the Societal Security Dilemma*, p. 8.

[31] See Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for Intenrational Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991); David Baldwin, "The Concept of Security," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 1, (1997); Bill McSweeney, *Security, Identity and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Steve Smith, "The Contested Concept of Security," in Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics* (Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005); Booth, *Theory of World Security*.

[32] Ken Booth, "Security and Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist," in Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams, eds., *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases* (London: UCL Press, 1997), p. 106.

[33] Ken Booth, "Critical Explorations," in ibid., ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics* (Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005), p. 21.

[34] Ibid., pp. 13 and 21; see also ibid., "Security and Emancipation," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (1991), p. 319.

politics depends upon whether the security issue being considered is by a political realist, a Marxist, a feminist theorist, a racist, a liberal internationalist, or whatever."[35] In that sense, security cannot be treated as an *essentialist* concept, but rather as an *essentially derivative concept*.[36]

For Bill McSweeney, one of the critics of Barry Buzan who argued that security is an "essentially contested concept" (deriving from the article of W. B. Gallie entitled "Essentially Contested Concepts" in 1962) and "the nature of security defies pursuit of an agreed definition,"[37] the identification of security as such "has given rise to a widespread myth of the 'essentially contested concept' of security – repeated ritually in the literature – concerning the peculiar intractability of security, and implying that other concepts of the social order are different."[38] In a similar vein, Wyn Jones argues that Buzan "offers no theoretical grounds for judging rival accounts of security nor for deciding on the relative importance of security as compared with other values."[39] In other words, for Buzan, given the contested nature of security, it is not possible to provide for a definition relating to the meaning of security, rendering security as *the* only concept that cannot be properly defined. Even though it is not possible to provide a *singular* definition, which all theorists can agree upon; nevertheless, it is still possible to distract a basic definition

[35] Ibid., "Critical Explorations," p. 21.

[36] Ibid.; see also ibid., *Theory of World Security*, pp. 109-110 and 149-160.

[37] Buzan, *People*, *States and Fear*, p. 16.

[38] McSweeney, *Security*, *Identity and Interests*, p. 83.

[39] Richard Wyn Jones, *Security*, *Strategy and Critical Theory* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1999), p. 92.

of security with some identifiable core elements,[40] yet what is in question here is how these core elements of security have acquired meaning or the ways in which they are "conceptualized and operationalized in the contingent contexts of world politics."[41] In this respect, Booth asserts that "the problem of security is not in the meaning of the concept, but in the politics of the meaning."[42]

Bilgin further stresses that "failure to recognize this point [security as a derivative concept] and practices shaped by ostensibly universal conceptions of security have rendered the world less secure," directing attention to the 'political' process of the emergence of different perceptions of threat that derive from different conceptions of security, and thereby to the 'instrumental value' of security, which should be conceived not as an end-point, but rather as "synonymous with opening up space in people's lives."[43] Such conceptualization of security, argues Booth, "allows for individual and collective human becoming – the capacity to have some choice about living differently – consistent with the same but different search by others."[44] In other words, security as an instrumental value "frees its possessors to a greater or lesser extent from life-determining constraints and so allows different life possibilities to be explored," as security is "more than mere

[40] For Booth, the basic definition of security is 'the absence of threats'. Following this definition, he identifies the core elements of security, which he claimed are not essentially contested, as: 'the existence of a referent object, 'impending or actual danger' and 'a desire to escape harmful possibilities'. See Booth, *Theory of World Security*, p. 100.

[41] Ibid., p. 101.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Pınar Bilgin, "Critical Theory," in Paul D. Williams, ed., *Security Studies: An Introduction* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), p. 90; Booth, "Critical Explorations," p. 22.

[44] Ibid.

animal survival," but in fact "an important dimension of the process by which the human species can reinvent itself beyond the merely biological."[45]

Such an understanding of security has actually formed the reflexive basis of critical security studies[46] that ardently calls for a rethinking of security, with a clinch on the possibility of social change aiming at human emancipation, offering progressive paths way beyond the boundaries and parameters of the traditional thinking, which accounts for the attainment of 'objective' facts and renders the theoretical purpose merely as one of reaching to "determinate, transhistorical and generalizable causal claims" instead of "contextual understanding and practical knowledge."[47] Nevertheless, such a rethinking has also obliged questioning the very basic assumptions of the traditional thinking – in this respect, neorealism – which not only failed to account for the end of the Cold War, but also proved to be analytically incapable of capturing the emerging security predicaments of the global world through its state-centrism and predominantly military agenda. Consequentially, building on the premises of the idea of security as a derivative concept, critical security studies has argued for deepening and broadening the conceptualization of security.

Even though the issue relating to broadening has long occupied the agendas of some studies within the discipline of International Relations, i.e. peace studies, it did not come to maintain a central place within the security studies until the end of the Cold War. An initial attempt came by the theorists of what

[45] Ibid.

[46] Specifically the Welsh School for our purposes.

[47] Keith Krause and Michael Williams, "Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods," *Mershon International Studies Review*, Vol. 40 (1996), p. 243.

has come to be known as the Copenhagen School when they introduced a multi-sectoral approach to security studies encapsulating military, political, economic, societal and environmental securities.[48] However, this multi-sectoral approach does not provide the broadening that the Welsh School has sought for, but rather with its selective significance put on 'societal security', it exemplifies "yet another variant of statism and the neorealist structuralism."[49] Booth contends that "new thinking about security is not simply a matter of broadening the subject matters (widening the agenda of issues beyond the merely military). It is possible – as Barry Buzan has shown above all – to expand 'international security studies' and still remain within an asserted neorealist framework and approach."[50] He goes on to stress that the perspective of the critical security studies fundamentally differs as it is based "on deeper understandings of the meaning of the political" rather than "on discontents with the presumptions of positivism."[51] In terms of the critical security studies, then, the broadening of security *derive*s from the deepening of security, which itself *derive*s from the understanding of security as a *derivative* concept.

For Booth, the broadening of the concept of security is the "inevitable consequence of the (primary) aim of critical security studies to deepen our understandings of security."[52] Deepening our understanding of security, in Bilgin's words, "reveals the politics behind scholarly concepts and policy

[48] Buzan, *People, States and Fear*; Ole Waever, Barry Buzan, Morten Kelstrup and Pierre Lemaitre, *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993); Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1998).

[49] Krause and Williams, "Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies," p. 244.

[50] Booth, "Security and Self," p. 106.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid., p. 111.

agendas, which allows analysts to de-centre states and consider other referent objects above and below the state level,"[53] not reifying certain sectors, i.e. the society as a state-like objectified entity, or perceiving the referent objects other than the state as merely determined by these sectors, as the case made by the Copenhagen School.[54] In this sense, Bilgin stresses that:

> Such a fixed conceptualization is a problem because the main contribution of societal security as an alternative approach to thinking about security results from the attention paid to the ways in which society constitutes itself in an attempt to secure its identity. To deal with this problem, the concept of societal security needs to allow for a more fluid notion of society – as a process of negotiation, affirmation and reproduction – instead of an objective reality or independent variable.[55]

Therefore, conceptualization of security as a derivative concept enables deepening of security as such, which, "by uniting security with political theory . . . also provides a basis for a synthesis of critique and reconstruction – the process of creating a politics of emancipation."[56] Derivatively, from deepening comes the broadening, which "involves expanding the agenda of

[53] Bilgin, "Critical Theory," p. 98.

[54] Booth, "Critical Explorations," p. 271; Mutimer, "Critical Security Ctudies: A Schismatic History," p. 91. For a critique of the multi-sectoral approach as an objectivist account, see also McSweeney, *Security, Identity and Interests*, pp. 59-72.

[55] Pınar Bilgin, "Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 5 (2003), p. 213.

[56] Booth, *Theory of World Politics*, p. 149. Booth describes emancipation as "the freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constraints which stop them carrying out what they would freely choose to do. War and the threat of war is one of those constraints, together with poverty, poor education, political oppression and so on. Security and emancipation are two sides of the same coin. Emancipation, not power or order, produces true security. Emancipation, theoretically, is security." See Booth, "Security and Emancipation," p. 319. Hence, Booth's idea on emancipation, laying its intellectual foundations on the Frankfurt School's Critical Theory, is guided by the "possibility of change" and "in effecting that change to global (security) practices, politics must be governed by emancipatory values." See Mutimer, "Critical Security Studies: A Schismatic History," pp. 93-94.

security studies beyond that of the hitherto militarized and statist orthodoxy"[57] and considers "a range of insecurities faced by an array of referent objects."[58]

In such an understanding of broadening, however, the aim should be directed towards 'politicizing' security, rather than 'de-securitizing' it;[59] the latter being a conceptualization of the Copenhagen School and is mainly criticized by the critical security studies around the premises that the 'securitization'[60] framework keeps security strictly under the hegemony of state elites, whose statist agendas of security may be proven to be zero-sum, militarized and confrontational.[61] 'Politicizing' security, on the contrary, aims to "turn every security issue into a question of political theory,"[62] and to re-theorize security with a view to "opening up space to include other issues identified by myriad actors, and to de-centre the statist concerns of some by highlighting human insecurities."[63] Hansen, focusing on the gender-based security problems, also emphasizes the need to politicize security, and,

[57] Booth, "Critical Explorations," p. 14.

[58] Bilgin, "Critical Theory," p. 98.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ole Waever, who introduced the concept, identifies the logic of securitization as follows: "In naming a certain development a security problem, the 'state' can claim a special right, one that will, in the final instance, always be defined by the state and its elites… power holders can always try to use the instrument of *securitization* of an issue to gain control over it. By definition, something is a security problem when the elites declare it to be so…" See Ole Waever, "Securitization and Desecuritization," in Ronnie D. Lipschutz, *On Security* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), p. 54; "In the case of security, textual analysis suggests that something is designtated as an international security issue because it can be argued that this issue is more important than other issues and should take absolute priority. This is the reason we link the issue to what might seem a fairly demanding criterion: that the issue is presented as an existential threat." See Buzan *et. al.*, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, p. 24.

[61] Bilgin, "Critical Theory," p. 99; Booth, *Theory of World Politics*, pp. 164-165; Wyn Jones, *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory*, p. 109.

[62] Booth, "Critical Explorations," p. 14.

[63] Bilgin, "Critical Theory," p. 99.

through the analogy of Little Mermaid, problematizes the connection between the absence of 'speech act' and the subjective construction of threats. She argues:

> 'Security' is not only a speech act, but embedded in the production of particular subjectivities which then form the basis for what can be articulated as threat and threatened. It has to be acknowledged that if security is a speech act, then it is simultaneously deeply implicated in the production of silence: all speech involves an attempt to fix meaning, to define a particular situation and the subjects within it, and any successful speech act implies as a consequence the exclusion of other possible constructions of meaning. Silence is a powerful political strategy that internalises and individualises threats thereby making resistance and political mobilisation difficult. The turn to security as a practice rather than as a concept facilitates a *political* analysis of the way in which security discourses come to gain the authority necessary to define threats and strategies to counter them.[64]

In this respect, Wyn Jones posits that "this means placing the experience of those men and women and communities for whom the present world order is a cause of insecurity rather than security at the centre of the agenda and making suffering humanity rather than raison d'état the prism through which problems are viewed."[65] Building on Robert Cox's assumption about the different views in relation to purposes of political inquiry, Wyn Jones further adds that "if 'all theory is *for* someone and *for* some purpose,' then critical security studies is for 'the voiceless, the unrepresented, the powerless,' and its purpose is their emancipation."[66]

---

[64] Lene Hansen, "The Little Mermaid's Silent Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in the Copenhagen School," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (2000), p. 306.

[65] Wyn Jones, *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory*, p. 123.

[66] Ibid., p. 92.

The Dilemma

Can the idea of security as an 'essentially derivative concept', as outlined above, be thereby applied to the concept of security dilemma as well?

Under the dominance of positivist assumptions of neorealism, security dilemma has come to acquire an uncontested, yet problematic meaning through the dogmatic basics and the paradigmatic dynamics of the Cold War and its nuclear determinism. Booth and Wheeler call it the 'fatalist logic' of the security dilemma (the classical security dilemma revolving around the theories of realism and neorealism), in clear distinction to 'mitigator' (revolving around the theories of regimes, the English school and structural constructivism) and 'transcender' (revolving around critical theories directed towards enabling radical change) logics that altogether form the 'three logics of insecurity' around which the security dilemma is organized.[67] These logics of insecurity do actually inform us, albeit in some cases indirectly, about the essentially derivative character of the concept of security dilemma.

Booth and Wheeler define the fatalist logic as "the idea that security competition can never be escaped in international politics. Human nature and the condition of international anarchy determine that humans will live in an essentially conflictual world."[68] Hence, Butterfield claims exactly in the voice of fatalism to which Booth and Wheeler refer:

> If you imagine yourself locked in a room with another person with whom you have often been on the most bitterly hostile terms in the

[67] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 10.

[68] Ibid., "Uncertainty," p. 139.

> past, and suppose that each of you has a pistol, you may find yourself in a predicament in which both of you would like to throw the pistols out of the window, yet it defeats the intelligence to find a way of doing it. [69]

Butterfield's illustration is strikingly reminiscent of the overarching classical realist themes of 'stag hunt'[70] and 'prisoners' dilemma',[71] which are widely used in exemplifying the logic of relations between rational actors who are deprived, in nature, of cooperative and communicative tools. This kind of fatalist logic, therefore, dictates that when an actor faces insecurity in relation to another under the conditions of uncertainty, it should prepare itself for the worst by adopting policies with the sole objective of increasing its own security. In explaining the condition which such illustrations represent, Donnelly concludes that:

> Anarchy and egoism greatly impede cooperation . . . In an environment of anarchy, even those capable of mastering their own desires for gain and glory are pushed by fear towards treating everyone else as an enemy. Anarchy can defeat even our best intentions.[72]

---

[69] Herbert Butterfiled, *Christianity and History* (London, 1949), pp. 89-90 quoted in Jack Donnelly, "Realism," in Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, Richard Devetak, Jack Donnelly, Matthew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smith and Jacqui True, *Theories of International Relations*, 3rd edition (New York and London: Palgrave, 2005), pp. 37-38.

[70] A parable of Rousseau, stag hunt describes a situation where each hunter has to cooperate if they want to catch a deer, but if a hare comes along, a hunter may defect and pursue to catch the hare, instead of staying in the post and waiting to catch a deer collectively. This parable was used by Kenneth Waltz in illustrating the conditions of conflict and cooperation under anarchy.

[71] Prisoners' dilemma depicts a situation where two prisoners, in lack of communication with each other, are interrogated and given some choices. If one confesses and the other does not, the confessor wil get a short sentence and the other is sentenced to a longer period; if both confesses, both will get short sentences; if neither confesses, both will go free. This game illustrated the dilemma in which if both cooperates, they will go free, but as they cannot trust the other, the best optimal outcome is to confess not to get a longer sentence.

[72] Donnelly, "Realism," p. 37.

As such, anarchy, seen as a constant and stable feature of the international system, is assumed to be significantly informing and reinforcing the egoism inherent in human nature, or vice versa, as the case made by Butterfield when he argued that given the innate psychological conditions – the inability to enter into the counter-fear of others and the 'Hobbesian fear' that aggravate mutual suspicion – "the interstate condition [also] becomes one of *tragedy*."[73] Depending on the level of analysis, both the actor and the system is, nevertheless, treated as naturalized entities, existing prior to social interaction and devoid of any historical process. In this kind of regressive conceptualization, the possibility that actors may engage into cooperation under the guidance of certain norms and principles is highly limited, thereby rendering the security dilemma doomed to exist eternally. Hence, a quick examination of the security dilemma theorizing within the Cold War system also suggests that the security dilemma between states can never be escaped, nor even alleviated.

Herz wrote as early as 1951:

> Wherever such anarchic society has existed – and it has existed in most periods of known history on some level – there has arisen what may be called the "security dilemma" of men, or groups, or their leaders. Groups or individuals living in such a constellation must be, and usually are, concerned about their security from being attacked, subjected, dominated, or annihilated by other groups and individuals. Striving to attain security from such attack, they are driven to acquire more and more power in order to escape the impact of the power of others. This, in turn, renders the others more insecure and compels them to prepare for the worst. Since none can ever feel entirely secure in such a world of competing units, power competition ensues, and the vicious circle of security and power accumulation is on.[74]

[73] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 27. Emphasis added.

[74] Herz, "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma," p. 157.

For Herz, this anarchic society necessitates "the dilemma of 'kill or perish', of attacking first or running the risk of being destroyed."[75] In the case of Butterfield, it is 'man's universal sin' that exacerbates the 'Hobbesian fear' and makes up the 'nature of the predicament', characterized by himself as a 'tragedy', and the 'irreducible dilemma':

> It is the peculiar characteristic of the situation I am describing – the situation of what I should call Hobbesian fear – that you yourself may vividly feel the terrible fear that you have of the other party, but you cannot enter into the other man's counter-fear, or even understand why he should be particularly nervous.[76]

Without undermining the particular differences between the conceptualizations of Herz and Butterfield, it will not be an overgeneralization to argue that both shared a pessimism in relation to an ultimate escape from the 'security' or the 'irreducible' dilemma. Herz maintained that "ultimately, somewhere, conflicts caused by the security dilemma are bound to emerge among political units of power."[77] Likewise Butterfield stressed that "the predicament would not exist . . . if all the world were like St Francis of Assisi, and if human nature in general were not streaked with cupidities."[78] Nevertheless, even when Butterfield emphasized 'man's universal sin' or 'cupidities', Herz and Butterfield's arguments did not imply that both regarded the human nature as evil, or that security dilemma appeared as a result of malign intent, but rather that both referred to a combination of psychological and structural factors that animated fear,

[75] Ibid., *Political Realism and Political Idealism*, p. 3.

[76] Butterfield, *History and Human Relations*, p. 21 quoted in Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 28.

[77] Herz, "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma," p. 158.

[78] Butterfield, *History and Human Relations*, p. 22 quoted in Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 30.

mainly driven by mutual suspicion and mistrust, which resulted in the vicious cycle of 'security' or 'irreducible' dilemma.[79]

Robert Jervis, one of the early theorists of the security dilemma, writing during the Cold War about the material (offence-defence balance) and psychological (perception/misperception) dimensions of the security dilemma,[80] posits in an emblematic way of the period:

> The lack of an international sovereign not only permits wars to occur, but also makes it difficult for states that are satisfied with the status quo to arrive at goals that they recognize as being in their common interest. Because there are no institutions or authorities that can make and enforce international laws, the policies of cooperation that will bring mutual rewards if others cooperate may bring disaster if they do not. Because states are aware of this, anarchy encourages behavior that leaves all concerned worse off than they could be, even in the extreme case in which all states would like to freeze the status quo.[81]

Hence, he defines the security dilemma as "many of the means by which a state tries to increase its security decrease the security of others."[82] He further stresses that "in domestic society, there are several ways to increase the safety of one's person and property without endangering others… In international politics, however, one state's gain in security often inadvertently threatens other."[83]

---

[79] Ibid., pp. 21-30.

[80] In his book, *Perception and Misperception*, Jervis also distinguished between 'spiral' and 'deterrence' models; in the spiral model, although the states are not aggressive and are non-expansionist, misperception and ambiguities inherent in the weaponry involved drive them towards a spiralling mutual mistrust. However, in the deterrence model, there is an aggressive and expansionist state, through its hostile actions drive the other state to deter against the aggressive one by arming.

[81] Jervis, "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma," p. 167.

[82] Ibid., 169.

[83] Ibid, pp. 169-170.

Jack Snyder, another theorist conceptualizing the security dilemma during the Cold War, argues with peculiar similarities that:

> The term [security dilemma] is generally used to denote the self-defeating aspect of the quest for security in an anarchic system. The theory says that even when no state has any desire to attack others, none can be sure that others' intentions are peaceful, or will remain so; hence each must accumulate power for defense. Since no state can know that the power accumulation of others is defensively motivated only, each must assume that it might be intended for attack. Consequently, each party's power increments are matched by the others, and all wind up with no more security than when the vicious cycle began, along with the costs incurred in having acquired and having to maintain their power.[84]

Instead of relying on the adversarial relations between states, however, Snyder focuses on the security dilemma between allies before and after the formation of alliances comparatively in multipolar and bipolar systems.

What is common in all these interpretations of the security dilemma is the 'unresolvable uncertainty', which is described by Booth and Wheeler as an 'existential condition' that can never be escaped. In fact, for Booth and Wheeler, security dilemma is a foundational concept, "because, above all, it engages with the existential condition of uncertainty that characterizes all human relations, not least those interactions on the biggest and most violent stage of all – international politics"[85] and "it alone captures the existential condition of the future environment in which political groups frame their thinking."[86] What makes the unresolvable uncertainty (defined in footnote

[84] Glenn H. Snyder, "The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics," p. 461.

[85] Booth and Wheeler, "Uncertainty," p. 134.

[86] Ibid., p. 136

28) an existential condition, according to Booth and Wheeler, is that uncertainty is "not an occasional and passing phenomenon, but rather an everyday part of the existence of individuals and groups."[87] However, they make it clear from the beginning that uncertainty does not mean insecurity and they cannot be used synonymously, "since uncertainty is a house in which there are many rooms, and in some life is much less insecure than in others… When states practice cooperation, or when societies embed trust in security communities, significant degrees of security are attained, even within the house of uncertainty."[88]

For Booth and Wheeler, there are two main drivers of the unresolvable uncertainty, which has been central in the theorizing of the security dilemma ever since Herz and Butterfield: the 'ambiguous symbolism of weapons' (an idea mainly developed by Jervis through offence-defence balance), which refers to the difficulty of safely distinguishing between offensive and defensive weapons, and the 'other minds problem' (described in footnote 28). What is central to both, and without necessarily in exception to the unresolvable uncertainty, is the notion of 'fear' that makes up the problem of future uncertainty and that put the actors into a dilemma of choosing between the choices for policy and action. In this respect, and in a similar vein with Booth and Wheeler, Jervis points to the "potent fear that even if the other state now supports the status quo, it may become dissatisfied later. No matter how much decision makers are committed to the status quo, they cannot bind themselves and their successors to the same path. Minds can be

[87] Ibid., p. 134.

[88] Ibid.

changed, new leaders can come to power, values can shift, new opportunities and dangers can arise."[89] Booth and Wheeler contend in this respect that:

> Future uncertainty appears therefore to construct international politics as an inescapable insecurity trap. Even if, today, the government of State A considers the leadership group in State B peacefully inclined, can it afford to rely indefinitely on 'best-case' thinking in a situation where bad judgments of interpretation and response can have such negative consequences for one's own state? The conclusion drawn so often through history has been that those charged with responsibility for a state's or people's security must never rely on best-case forecasting when assessing potential threats to their well-being.[90]

Although Jervis on the one hand, and Booth and Wheeler on the other hand, point to this 'problem of future uncertainty', they nevertheless differ extensively in terms of their conceptions of security and the political world within which they theorize that in turn mainly inform their approaches for the possibility of whether the security dilemma can be transformed or not. For instance, while Jervis, commonly acknowledged as a defensive realist, argues that uncertainty reinforces misperceptions that overlay the security dilemma,[91] Mearsheimer, an offensive realist, posits that because of uncertainty, there is no escape from the security dilemma that makes war inevitable and rational.[92] For Booth and Wheeler, on the contrary, "embracing the assumption of uncertainty must be the basis for building and sustaining trust between peoples":

[89] Jervis, "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma," p. 168.

[90] Booth and Wheeler, "Uncertainty," p. 138.

[91] Jervis, *Perception and Misperception*, p. 75.

[92] John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: Norton, 2001), pp. 35–6.

> Respect must be given to uncertainty itself, but that must not be allowed to imprison the search for a less violent world politics… Recognition of this existential condition of uncertainty in world politics, but confidence in the potentiality for overcoming any other uncertainty opens the door to human agency and hence to the possibility of cooperation and trust-building.[93]

Whereas the notions of rational egoism, uncertainty, fear and anarchy are key to the fatalist logic; then, the notions of 'security regime'[94] and 'international society'[95] are key in the mitigator logic, as inspired mainly by the regime theory and the English school. Booth and Wheeler define the mitigator logic as "the idea that security competition can be ameliorated or dampened down for a time, but never eliminated."[96]

> If conflict between powerful states, and the domination of the powerless by the powerful, are the story of international history from the fatalist perspective, mitigator voices have looked towards dialogue (primarily the institution of diplomacy) or the construction of norms (embodied in international regimes) as ways of dampening the dynamics of insecurity. Mitigator logic accepts that human nature may be flawed, and that the anarchical international system cannot be escaped, but the most dangerous features of the struggle between nations and states – such as arms racing, crises and war – can be ameliorated.[97]

---

[93] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 80.

[94] Mainly conceptualized by defensive realist theorists, who sought cooperation under anarchy, yet only when it is in the interest of actors to do so. Among those defensive realist conceptualizations of cooperation under anarchy, see Robert Jervis (regime theory: security regimes are those principles, rules and norms that permit nations to be restrained in their behaviour in the belief that others will reciprocate), Charles Glaser (signal type: how states may signal their type, whether they are defensive, status quo or peaceful) and Charles Osgood (Graduated Reciprocation in Tension Reduction (GRIT), Andrew Kydd (Reassurance Game or 'costly signalling').

[95] Among the leading theorists of 'international society', see Hedley Bull, Martin Wight and Charles Manning.

[96] Booth and Wheeler, "Uncertainty," p. 139.

[97] Ibid., *The Security Dilemma*, p. 15.

The mitigator logic argues, in essence, that the security dilemma can be ameliorated, *if* actors, as a result of their interests, choose to engage in the context of international society or regimes through the politics of reassurance and cooperation, thereby breaking the vicious cycle of security competition and war. That is to say, actors may alleviate their perceptions of insecurity through the construction of certain principles and norms, which in turn lessen the uncertainty about the motives and intentions that drive the security dilemma. However, even though cooperation can be achieved through the establishment of some kind of 'order', the structure of the international system is ever unchanging. States, still rational actors, may not have to expect for the worse and indeed can look for areas of cooperation within the anarchic system to mitigate the security dilemma; yet, as such, the world politics is perceived from the lenses of objectivist traditional thinking that hinders the prospects of any powerful transformation in relation to the security dilemma.

In that sense, Booth and Wheeler argue that:

> While, conceptually, it is possible to differentiate between the fatalist and mitigator logics, in practice there is much commonality. Few fatalists in the contemporary international system embrace the parsimonious logic of offensive realism when it comes to actual policy prescriptions; for the most part, it is a case of scratch a fatalist and find a mitigator. On the other hand, the mitigator disposition is strongly influenced by fatalist assumptions, and above all there is a widespread expectation that the competitive logic of anarchy will nevertheless overturn the aspirations of the institutions of international society. War will find a way.[98]

[98] Ibid., *The Security Dilemma*, p. 15.

What is peculiar in the approaches of the regime theory and international society, then, is their commonality on how security dilemmas can be alleviated and uncertainty lessened through cooperation under the condition of anarchy. An exception to this commonality to a varying degree within the mitigator logic is the structural constructivist work of Alexander Wendt, who questioned the very logic of anarchy as a given and immutable reality and its role to constitute self-help and power politics by itself. On the contrary, he argued that "there is no 'logic' of anarchy apart from the practices that create and instantiate one structure of identities and interests rather than another," and self-help and power politics are only institutions, which are socially constructed as a result of the process of intersubjective interaction and learning between states.[99] Although Wendt's analysis is an indirect contribution to the conceptualization of security dilemma, nevertheless its focus on the very nature of anarchy, self-help and power politics has indeed led him to come to the assumption that anarchy does not dictate states to necessarily face a security dilemma:[100]

> Competitive systems of interaction are prone to security 'dilemmas,' in which the efforts of actors to enhance their security unilaterally threaten the security of the others, perpetuating distrust and alienation. The forms of identity and interest that constitute such dilemmas, however, are themselves ongoing effects of, not exogenous to, the interaction; identities are produced in and through 'situated activity.' We do not begin our relationship with the aliens in a security dilemma; security dilemmas are not given by anarchy or nature . . . identities and interests are constituted by collective meanings that are always in process.[101]

---

[99] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 2 (1992), p. 395; Ibid., *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 308-309.

[100] Ibid., p. 402.

[101] Ibid., p. 407.

Notwithstanding the fact that both the regime theory and the English School have contributed to the security dilemma conceptualization in terms of opening up spaces for cooperation even under the condition of anarchy, Wendt's input plays a more pivotal role within the mitigator logic in the way that he showed how "there is nothing natural or inevitable about states practicing self-help and power politics; there is no single logic of anarchy, and the identities and interests that constitute relations of enmity are, in principle, alterable by new understandings of 'self' and 'other'."[102] However, as Wendt himself accepted, "once institutionalized such a dilemma may be hard to change."[103] Together with the fact that Wendt treats states as the main and 'monolithic' actors, as the other mitigator voices, Booth and Wheeler contend that the security competition cannot easily be mitigated from this standpoint of constructivism.[104]

Theorizing of the security dilemma during the Cold War had at its best reflected the positivism of problem-solving theories, treated security and identity as pre-given notions and remained strictly within the confines of the fatalist logic. However, with the end of the Cold War, the ensuing global conditions and predicaments necessitated a change well in the way the discipline of International Relations elaborated on world politics with more sophisticated tools that could help better grasp the emerging political trends and problems, and, in fact, that could become a panacea for the very familiar and enduring ones that resisted solution. Hence, in terms of the security studies, constructivist and critical accounts of security have contributed to

[102] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, pp. 93-94.

[103] Wendt, "Anarchy is what States Make of it," p. 407.

[104] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, 94.

the broadening and deepening of the security concept, as elaborated earlier, through challenging the very basics of the traditional accounts of security conceptualization.

Yet, against the emerging global order at the wake of the post-Cold War era, the security dilemma has continued to a greater degree to be conceptualized, just as Herz's alarming text in 2001 implicated, mainly within the fatalist logic, which did not foresee breaking away from the vicious circle of security competition and hence its transformation in the face of the emerging global world.[105] Notwithstanding the attempts made within the mitigator logic to break the vicious circle of security competition and replace it with a virtuous circle of reciprocal security, the key issue, which the mitigator voices raised, has continued to rely on "the extent to which the norms of international society can be strengthened, and so work to diminish the impact of those dynamics that exacerbate security dilemmas", or, more precisely, "whether cooperation between states can be sustained exclusively on the foundation of their mutual rational egoism."[106] Even though many other scholars have attempted to adapt the concept of the security dilemma to the emerging

[105] See John Mearsheimer, "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War," *International Security*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (1990); Charles L. Glaser, "The Security Dilemma Revisited,"; Alan Collins, *The Security Dilemma and the End of the Cold-War* (Keele: Keele University Press, 1997); Dale C. Copeland, *The Origins of Major War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000); Robert Jervis, "Was the Cold War a Security Dilemma?" *Journal of Cold War Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Winter 2001); John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*; Evan Braden Montgomery, "Breaking Out of the Security Dilemma: Realism, Reassurance and the Problem of Uncertainty," *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 2 (Autumn, 2006); Shiping Tang, "The Security Dilemma: A Conceptual Analysis," *Security Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (2009); Charles L. Glaser, *Rational Theory of International Politics: The Logic of Competition and Cooperation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010); Robert Jervis, "Dilemmas about Security Dilemmas," *Security Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (2011).

[106] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 83.

predicaments and changing contexts of the new era,[107] these accounts have also remained short of questioning the essentialist assumptions of the concept, its underlying processes and its standard outcomes. Bilgiç stresses in this respect that it was the introduction of the concept of 'societal security', which perceives the societal identity as a referent object, that mostly influenced the concept of security dilemma during this period.[108]

However, even such accounts,[109] which indisputably helped to enrich the conceptualization of the security dilemma in varying extents, have approached the security dilemma in positivist terms and could not go further than replacing the state with the society as an exogenous unit,[110] and the international anarchy with the intra-state anarchy as a consequence of the collapse of the multi-ethnic authority.[111] Hence, the common positivist basis upon which the security dilemma is conceptualized both from a state and society perspective was confirmed by well-known defensive realists, Snyder and Jervis, as they point to the fact that "the security dilemma, widely used to

[107] Philip G. Cerny, "The New Security Dilemma: Divisibility, Defection and Disorder in the Global Era," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (2000); Mikhail A. Alexseev and C. Richard Hofstetter, "Russia, China and the Immigration Security Dilemma," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 121, No. 1 (2006); J. J. Suh, "Producing Security Dilemma out of Uncertainty: The North Korea Nuclear Crisis," Mario Einaudi Center for International Studies, Working Paper Series No. 8 (2006); Frank P. Harvey, "The Homeland Security Dilemma: Imagination, Failure and the Escalating Costs Perfecting Security," *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (2007); Philip G. Cerny, "Terrorism and the New Security Dilemma," *Naval War College Review*, Vol. 58, No. 1 (Winter 2005).

[108] Ali Bilgiç, "Güvenlik İkilemini Yeniden Düşünmek: Güvenlik Çalışmalarında Yeni Bir Perspektif," *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, Cilt 8, Sayı 9 (Bahar 2011), p. 126.

[109] See Barry R. Posen, "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict," *Survival*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (1993); Stuart J. Kaufman, "An 'International' Theory of Inter-Ethnic War," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (1996); Paul Roe, "Former Yugoslavia: The Security Dilemma That Never Was?" *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (2000); William Rose, "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict: Some New Hypotheses," *Security Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (2000); Roe, *Ethnic Violence and the Societal Security Dilemma*.

[110] Ali Bilgiç, "Güvenlik İkilemini Yeniden Düşünmek," p. 128.

[111] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 73.

explain conflict between states in an anarchical international system, provides analytical insights into civil wars as well."[112] Furthermore, these scholars who have conceptualized the security dilemma from a societal perspective mainly used neorealist frameworks in furthering their assumptions. For instance, while Stuart Kaufman readapted Kenneth Waltz' three images of international conflict – the human nature, the nature of states and the nature of international system – to the domestic political context;[113] Barry Posen's approach was largely based on Jervis' distinction between offence-defence variables.[114] Yosef Lapid and Friedrich Kratochwil criticize such intra-state approaches for the security dilemma, especially drawing on Posen's arguments, on the grounds that:

> The 'national' was invoked primarily to buttress a beleaguered statecentric premise and to demonstrate the ability of neorealism to explain phenomena in traditionally untapped domains. It is then, of course, neither accidental nor insignificant that in these references the reengagement with the 'national' invariably ended as a stand-in for the same old (Waltzian) orthodoxy.[115]

Quite contrary, a critical rethinking of the security dilemma fundamentally necessitates conceptualizing the security dilemma beyond its fixed and routine parameters, with a view to enabling change and, more crucially, its transcendence. What appears highly significant at this point is the juxtaposition of critical accounts on security with the critical rethinking on

---

[112] Jack Snyder and Robert Jervis, "Civil Wars and the Security Dilemma," in B. Walter and J. Snyder (eds), *Civil Wars, Insecurity, and Intervention* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), p. 15.

[113] Kaufman, "An 'International' Theory of Inter-Ethnic War," p. 149.

[114] Posen, "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict," pp. 29-34.

[115] Yosef Lapid and Friedrich Kratochwil, "Revisiting the 'National': Toward an Identity Agenda in Neorealism," in Lapid and Kratochwil, eds., *The Return of Culture in IR Theory* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1996), pp. 116-117.

security dilemma. The conceptual and methodological toolkit of traditional approaches provides for an epistemologically positivist and ontologically objectivist conception of security as well as identity. As such, security, as a pre-given notion, emerges as a mere material interest and in a regressive manner whose attainment is basically a threat for others under the conditions of anarchy. Moreover, identity is also treated as a pre-given notion, which exogenously exists prior to social interaction and devoid of historical process. In terms of its relationship to security, identity is further conceptualized as 'negative' and as 'a source of insecurity'.[116] However, a critical conception of security and identity provides for analyzing and exploring both notions as socially constructed and co-constituting one another. This latter point is also helpful in terms of delineating the relationship between the security dilemma and identity. Hence, as the ensuing chapter shows, the rethinking on security dilemma enables to bring out this relationship, as Booth and Wheeler present through the transcender logic how the conception of identity as a social construct significantly influences the transcendence of the security dilemma. Through the transformation of exclusionary self-identification into an inclusive logic of community, or when two 'I's become a 'we', the security dilemma can no longer be perceived as an anachronistic concept, but as a social phenomenon that can be effectively transcended.

[116] Pınar Bilgin, "Identity/Security," in J. Peter Burgess, ed., *The Routledge Handbook of New Security Studies* (London and New York: Routledge, 2010), p. 81.

CHAPTER 3

THE SECURITY DILEMMA: TRUST AND TRANSCENDENCE

Booth and Wheeler aim to retheorize the security dilemma with a view to unleashing its traditional regressive conceptualization and, subsequently, breaking down its fatalism by reconstructing the ways in which the security dilemma is transcended, if not ultimately escaped. What is *critical* in this reconceptualization, however, is not only the approach that Booth and Wheeler embrace towards questioning its inherently naturalized assumptions by taking stock of critical theories and paving the path for its transcendence, but also their introduction of the concept of 'trust', to be built at the human society level both locally and globally, as a constitutive factor in shaping and sustaining that transcendence. Rethinking the security dilemma, therefore, enables to build a causal relationship between transcendence and 'trust' – a concept which has not been thoroughly considered within the discipline of International Relations and yet carrying far-reaching implications in terms of engaging with new ideas in the search for security in world politics.

Before attempting to analyze the logic of transcendence and, implicatively, the notion of trust, it is significant to dwell and elaborate on the very meaning of the security dilemma, as rethought by Booth and Wheeler:

> The security dilemma is a **two-level strategic predicament** in relations between states and other actors, with each level consisting of two related lemmas (or propositions that can be assumed to be valid) which force decision-makers to choose between them. The first and basic level consists of **a dilemma of interpretation** about the motives,

> intentions and capabilities of others; the second and derivative level consists of **a dilemma of response** about the most radical way of responding.[117]

In Booth and Wheeler's reconceptualization lies the assumption that security dilemma is not *a priori* and given reality of the world politics since it is a 'humanely constituted world' and primarily sought to be transformed; neither should it be treated as a reified and objectivist concept. Hence, the three logics of insecurity, as conceptualized by Booth and Wheeler, clearly inform about the essentially derivative and intersubjective character of the security dilemma, and also enable conceiving insecurities from a wide range of perspectives and moving towards broader and deeper interpretations of security. In this sense, there is no *singular* politics-free meaning of the security dilemma, as the case with the concept of security itself, but a theoretically informed one.

Deriving from this presupposition, and in contrast to the traditional conceptualization of the security dilemma, Booth and Wheeler are convinced that security dilemmas are not the result of a simple spiral of action-reaction dynamic that operates under constant anarchy. Even when Wendt gave the example of Gorbachev's new thinking ending the Cold War as illustrative of collective identity formation, Booth and Wheeler contended that "the story is more complex than this."[118] States, as rational egoists, may choose to cooperate, if it is in their interest, to mitigate the security dilemma under the conditions of anarchy; decision-makers may come to appreciate that fear and uncertainty rather than ambition motivate others and show an increased

[117] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 4.

[118] Ibid., p. 95.

sense of sensibility towards others' fears; routinized practices and patterns of habitual behaviour under the guidance of established norms and principles may help states and their decision-makers to lessen the degree of the uncertainty they feel and to start to gain confidence in the intentions of others; even state identities and interests can be changed as a result of social interaction between agents and structures; and so on. Yet, what is strikingly omitted from such mitigator considerations of the security dilemma is *the idea of cooperation between states or other actors deepening into embedded trust between their societies*. Apparently, this is the fundamental benchmark that lies at the heart of the reconceptualization of the security dilemma by Booth and Wheeler.

As Booth and Wheeler's definition of the security dilemma implies, rather than being merely driven into a security competition beyond their control, actors *do* have choices when they are confronted with a dilemma which they need to interpret and respond accordingly. Contrary to the traditional conceptualization in which one actor's pursuit of increased security automatically generates insecurity in the other; when actors have choices, these choices do not necessarily lead to negative outcomes and, therefore, insecurity in the others:

> A dilemma always involves a hard choice between two equally balanced alternatives. Some theorists of the security dilemma have argued that the nature of this dilemma is such that negative outcomes are unavoidable . . . To be sure, there are always hard choices between contending propositions in any security dilemma, but the choice is not necessarily between negative possibilities, nor must the outcome necessarily be grim . . . We claim that unpleasant choices and negative outcomes are not *essential* to the definition of a security dilemma.[119]

[119] Ibid., 6.

Booth and Wheeler argue that what is defined in essence as a security dilemma in the traditional conceptualization is in fact a security paradox: "Security paradox is a situation in which two or more actors, seeking only to improve their own security, provoke through their words or actions an increase in mutual tension, resulting in less security all round."[120] In other words, security paradox occurs when actors resolve their dilemma of response, the final level of two-level predicament that makes up the security dilemma, "in a manner that creates a spiral of mutual hostility."[121]

For instance, Montgomery identifies the security dilemma as "the situation where one state's attempts to increase its security appear threatening to others and provoke an unnecessary conflict."[122] For Tang, from a parallel perspective, the security dilemma can best be described as:

> Under a condition of anarchy, two states are defensive realist states—that is, they do not intend to threaten each other's security. . . many of the measures adopted by one side for its own security can often threaten, or be perceived as threatening, the security of the other side even if both sides merely want to defend their security. Consequently, the other side is likely to take countermeasures against those defensive measures. The interaction of these measures and countermeasures tends to reinforce their fears and uncertainties about each other's intentions, leading to a vicious cycle in which each accumulates more power without necessarily making itself more secure, through a self-reinforcing or positive feedback mechanism. This vicious cycle can also lead to unnecessary thus tragic conflicts—threats of war or war.[123]

[120] Ibid., 9.

[121] Ibid., p. 5

[122] Montgomery, "Breaking Out of the Security Dilemma," p. 151.

[123] Tang, "The Security Dilemma: A Conceptual Analysis," p. 594.

Roe, from a societal security dilemma perspective, characterizes the security dilemma as "a situation whereby one actor – in its traditional manifestation, the state – in trying to increase its security, causes a reaction in the second, which, in the end, decreases the security of the first. As a result, a (spiral) process of action and reaction is manifest in which each side's behaviour is seen as threatening."[124] In a similar description, Posen outlines the security dilemma as "what one does to enhance one's own security causes reactions that, in the end, can make one less secure. Cooperation among states to mute these competitions can be difficult because someone else's 'cheating' may leave one in a militarily weakened position. All fear betrayal."[125] While Roe and Posen's analyses of the security dilemma derive from accounts of ethnic wars, Cerny, who conceptualized the security dilemma from the globalization viewpoint, also defines the concept not so different than the ones already cited:

> The Security Dilemma is the notion that in a context of uncertainty and bounded rationality (1) perceived external threats (real or imagined) generate feelings of insecurity in those states that believe themselves to be the targets of such threats, thereby (2) leading those states to adopt measures to increase their power and capability to counteract those threats (alliance creation, arms buildups, and so on). In other words, the very attempts of individual states to strengthen their own security in an anarchic world lead other states to try to ratchet up their own power, thus making the first state to start this process feel even less secure, not more so, by its efforts. These countermeasures in turn are (3) perceived (or misperceived) as threatening by yet other states, leading to further counter-countermeasures and more – potentially undermining existing power balances and creating a vicious and even tragic circle of ever-increasing insecurity.[126]

[124] Roe, *Ethnic Conflict and the Societal Security Dilemma*, p. 1.

[125] Posen, "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict," p. 28.

[126] Cerny, "The New Security Dilemma," p. 624.

Although Cerny attempted to provide a new and wider definition along the lines of the fundamental changes that globalization has necessitated, he ended up repeating the classical logic of the traditional security dilemma: "New Security Dilemma, like the old, also involves a potentially damaging logic of vicious spiralling – a logic rooted in the complexity and uncertainty of the postmodern world and the uneven and multilayered nature of globalization itself."[127]

There are some scholars who have challenged the very notion of security dilemma and proposed instead an 'insecurity dilemma', with the argument that with the end of the Cold War, the classical security dilemma has lost its relevance:

> The security dilemma is no longer the supreme issue on the international agenda. It has not been completely eradicated and it remains a core concern in some regions, such as South Asia, but it is unlikely that it will rise to global pre-eminence again. Unfortunately, the fading of the security dilemma has not led to a world dominated by peace and cooperation. That is because the insecurity dilemma – that is, the existence of weak states who are major threats to the security of their own populations – has emerged as a new core concern. The insecurity dilemma brings with it a related dilemma, the liberal value dilemma. Between them, they continue to define a world where fear and violent conflict play important roles, though it is a different kind of fear and a different kind of conflict from earlier.[128]

Brian Job, who coined the term 'insecurity dilemma', applied the concept to the Third World,[129] while Sorensen applied it to the weak states in relation to

---

[127] Ibid., p. 626.

[128] Georg Sorensen, "After the Security Dilemma: The Challenges of Insecurity in Weak States and the Dilemma of Liberal Values," Security Dialogue, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2007), p. 358.

[129] Brian Job, ed., *The Insecurity Dilemma: National Security of Third World States* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1992).

the 'liberal value dilemma', which is generated through the imposition of the liberal values by the powerful liberal states:

> It emerges from the paradoxical situation that weak states are relatively free from serious external threat while simultaneously the weak state itself poses a serious security threat to major parts of its own population. In a basic sense, anarchy is domesticated: there is an international system or relative order with fairly secure protection of the borders and territories of weak states, and there is a domestic realm with a high degree of insecurity and conflict. As seen from the perspective of the populations of weak states, this is an insecurity dilemma, because they cannot know what to expect from the state; furthermore, strategies of resistance and support may be counterproductive in terms of achieving security. The government's primary task ideally should be to provide security for its population, but instead it makes up the greatest potential threat to people within its boundaries.[130]

While these scholars reject the conceptualization of the classical security dilemma in the post-Cold War world, the very basic logic of their approach still carry epistemological commonalities with the former; domesticized anarchy taking place of the international one, and populations taking the place of states.

As the peculiar similarity that each definition of the security dilemma implies, Booth and Wheeler argue that almost all conceptualizations of the security dilemma confuse a paradox with a dilemma, which put 'an additional layer of difficulty' to the already 'bedevilled' theorizing of the concept.[131] The distinction between a security dilemma and a security paradox, nevertheless, is an important contribution in terms of opening the paths towards the

[130] Sorensen, "After the Security Dilemma," p. 365.

[131] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 8.

possibility of eliminating the structural constraints – a constantly spiralling vicious circle operating under anarchy – that inhibit the security dilemma from ever unchanging. Indeed, a security dilemma, which is informed by an actor's choices, does not necessarily end up with a security paradox as the latter depends on how the actor will respond to the choices she has.

Another important dimension of this reconceptualization of the security dilemma relates to Booth and Wheeler's perception of agency. First of all, their definition of the security makes it clear that their perception involves 'states and other actors'. At first sight, one can easily come to the conclusion that their reconceptualization has remained largely state-centric as the empirical analyses in the book rely to a greater degree on examples of security dilemma between states. They argue that:

> In today's world, students of security studies are charged with analysing a wider set of referents and issue areas than was the case on the traditional agenda – namely states and military power/force. This certainly does not mean in our view that states and military force are irrelevant: far from it. We would oppose any approach to security studies that eschewed the military dimension of world politics, or the referent of sovereign states. However, we do believe that the traditional agenda should be approached through the perspective of what Robert Cox called 'critical' rather than orthodox or 'problem-solving' theorizing. This means shifting the weight of the agenda from focusing on the problems *in* the status quo to the problems *of* the status quo. This means that insecurity should be understood first as the consequence of a wider range of threats (e.g. poverty, the environment, the global economy) than that of military violence, and second, contemplating a wider range of referents (e.g. individuals, regions, common humanity) than sovereign states.[132]

[132] Ibid., "Uncertainty," p. 147.

Indeed, what Booth and Wheeler try to accumulate, directly and indirectly, throughout the book is the idea that as long as states remain in the form of rational actors and do not develop a shared sense of identity at various individual, society and global levels, a transformation of the security dilemma can certainly not be expected. As their analysis deepens on the transcender logic of the security dilemma, which is conceived as the main framework that will stimulate the transformation, it becomes clear how human agency will play the decisive role as she lies at the heart of their reconceptualization of the security dilemma. Human agency is thus the main actor and the ultimate referent object in the plight for trust and transcendence. However, Booth and Wheeler's reconceptualization also implies and reinforces the interrelationship between the states on the one hand, and the human agency at the individual, societal and global levels on the other hand, with a view that they mutually implicate one another in the attainment of security.

Human agency has two fundamental roles in Booth and Wheeler's reconceptualization – the role of the leaders in showing 'security dilemma sensibility' and, on a wider level, the role of human society both locally and globally in walking the path towards the transcendence. It is the human society, not the state which is seen as the primary actor who will ultimately transform the security dilemma. As such, human society is also the primary referent object in the imbuement of the trust, which as a tool will open up the path towards transcendence. As human society is "self-constitutive, . . . as individuals and groups, she can seek to become what it chooses to be."[133]

[133] Ibid., p. 139.

The dimension of the self-constitutive character of the human society will be more articulate as the discussion on the transcender logic unfolds. However, before engaging in this discussion, it is crucial to dwell on the idea of the role of agency as central to the "key attitudinal variable on the part of individual and group actors" which Booth and Wheeler describe as 'security dilemma sensibility':

> **Security dilemma sensibility** is an actor's intention and capacity to perceive the motives behind, and to show responsiveness towards, the potential complexity of the military intentions of others. In particular, it refers to the ability to understand the role that fear might play in their attitudes and behaviour, including, crucially, the role that one's own actions may play in provoking that fear.[134]

For Booth and Wheeler, the security dilemma sensibility "seeks to do what Butterfield thought impossible; namely to overcome the challenge of successfully signalling peaceful intent, and so transcend the dilemmas of interpretation and trust – and thus the likelihood of relations spiralling into armed competition, and the trap of the security paradox."[135] This means that actors are not simply rational egoists, who "will always fail in their attempts to know and act upon another's fears."[136] Furthermore, "security dilemma sensibility offers human society globally some hope of coming through the dangerous decades ahead in more positive shape than currently seems conceivable if governments and societies remain wedded to the global politics of business as usual."[137] The concept also depicts the causal relationship between the role of decision-makers and the role of human

[134] Ibid., *The Security Dilemma*, p. 7 and ibid., "Uncertainty," p. 141.

[135] Ibid., p. 148.

[136] Ibid., *The Security Dilemma*, p. 7.

[137] Ibid.

society in building and embedding trust as a means of transcending the security dilemma. Because attaining certain degrees of trust between decision-makers is never enough if that trust does not expand to cover the relations of the political community at all levels. If trust is not reflected at the human society level, insecurities and the security dilemmas are bound to reappear.[138] This also implies that security dilemma sensibility does not only involve the decision-makers, but the human society as well. As a matter of fact, in their empirical study of the Oslo Peace Process, Booth and Wheeler clearly showed how peace processes may fail when trust is lacking at the human society level.[139]

The Transcender Logic

Transcender logic is the *critical* logic, as it epitomizes a critical perspective of the future uncertainty and the security dilemma, utilizing various strands of critical thinking about security and world politics.

A comprehensive analysis of the traditional conceptualization of the security dilemma, which encompasses both the fatalist and mitigator logics, has demonstrated that security dilemmas, in their conventional form, are hard to be alleviated, let alone easily escaped. From this standpoint, even though cooperation between states and their decision-makers can enhance security to a certain extent; nevertheless, the psychological and structural forces will continue to hinder the states to eventually devise security policies for action

[138] Bilgiç, "Güvenlik İkilemini Yeniden Düşünmek," p. 132.

[139] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, pp. 248-249.

without contemplating on the nature of the predicament they are in. Furthermore, even though cooperation between states and their decision-makers can lessen the fears and insecurities felt at the state level, the problem of future uncertainty will continue to prevail. For Booth and Wheeler, the problem of future uncertainty may never abolish from the scene of world politics; however, they also do not conceive of a world politics that is not open to an 'alternative logic of uncertainty' – i.e. one encompassing the idea of security communities. They argue: "Some uncertainty will always exist, but in conditions of what we call *embedded trust* – where the trust is not just between leaders but between societies – the character of that uncertainty can be such that actors do not need to think about it in a military sense."[140] Implicatively, for the transcender logic, the thrust of the problem remains when security dilemma is conceptualized within the narrow ontological foundations of the fatalist and mitigator logics; that is to say, whatever 'order' is achieved by the rational actors in the embodiment of the state, if fear and enmity continue to dominate at the human society level, then, any stirring of negative feelings at the state and/or the societal level can easily deteriorate cooperation, and the order achieved may become quickly fragile. Accordingly, there is a need for a more reflexive understanding of the security dilemma. Hence, the conceptualization of the transcender logic facilitates putting forward not a repetition of accustomed and exhausted ideas and policies, but rather a promise of new ideas and policies that pursue the attainment of a 'radically different world order', in which anarchy is blurred and trust is reinforced.

Booth and Wheeler define the transcender logic as:

[140] Ibid., p. 172.

> The transcender logic argues that systemic insecurity, including that deriving from the security dilemma, can be escaped if human society reforms or re-invents the structures and processes within which it lives, globally . . . The problem in the interstate condition is not seen to be a fixed and regressive 'human nature' or an anarchic states system, but rather the way in which human societies have internalized regressive ideas about human nature, human history and the human condition. Humans created a world politics of suspicion and division, but a more harmonious route was always an option. Humanity could have done much better in the past, and could do so in the future.[141]

In putting forward the underlying logic of the transcender voices as such that "human society on a global scale can construct a radically new world order, and in so doing escape the dangers of the past, such as the security dilemma,"[142] Booth and Wheeler are not naively promoting a utopian project, rather they are aware that it presents an ambitious project, as they point to the power of 'inherited structural constraints', which suggest at best that 'a global community of peace and trust' looks improbable at the moment.[143] However, and this is where the critical thinking comes forward:

> The insecurities with which we have become familiar through history are neither the natural nor necessary outcomes of human nature or the nature of international life, but rather are the unfortunate products of a 'yesterday… [that] deformed us'. Human society on a global scale, as well as locally, need not replicate the mistakes of history, and in this regard there is a long tradition of thinking about peace, international governance, religious tolerance, cosmopolitan solidarities, and so on. These point in a radically different direction to the conflictual logic of Hobbesian anarchy. What is more, transcender voices argue that there is empirical support for hope, evident in situations where historic enmities have been replaced by non-violent and friendly relationships. The future remains to be written according to transcender logic; it

[141] Ibid., p. 16.

[142] Ibid., p. 18.

[143] Ibid., "Uncertainty," p. 139.

> need not be the prisoner of its regressive inheritance, though that past is indeed a heavy shackle around our collective necks.[144]

Empirically, Booth and Wheeler point to the security community of Europe, in which "there are interactions between states and societies at multiple levels; states have stopped targeting each other in a military sense; and war has become unthinkable."[145] Hence, the idea of 'security community' occupies a central place, though not much discussed, in the reconceptualization of the security dilemma for Booth and Wheeler, as will be further elaborated in the course of this study.

Transcender logic covers those theories which critically account for the radical change of the status quo of world politics either through 'reformist' or 'transformer' ideas. As such, the transcender voices are not as united in their perceptions and interpretations of (in)security as are the fatalist and mitigator logics; nevertheless, they share two basic assumptions: "the spread of security is associated with the embedding of moral and political community," and "the project is universal if it is to succeed."[146]

As of the 'transformer' ideas, Booth and Wheeler took stock of those theories which argue for the transformation of the human society at the global level and support progressive change in world politics. Among these 'structural transformers', there are theories that ardently call for an end to the states system through promoting the idea of a centralized world government; to war through the disarmament theory; to history through a universal and

[144] Ibid., *The Security Dilemma*, pp. 16-17.

[145] Ibid., "Uncertainty," p. 142.

[146] Ibid., *The Security Dilemma*, p. 18.

homogenous ideological world (i.e. liberal democracy); to capitalism through a Marxian classless, stateless and post-national community of humanity; to the patriarchal dominance through feminism; and last but not the least, to the government (or the illegitimacy of the state) through anarchism.[147] By implication, each one of them reduces insecurity to "one cause and one related solution."[148] Although scattered over the very meaning of insecurity and the alternative order, they all nonetheless share "the belief that history rather than necessity has got us where we are, and that it is possible (if extremely difficult) to construct a radically different world order – including one in which dilemmas of interpretation and response are replaced by a successful politics of trust-building."[149] Among the reformist ideas, Booth and Wheeler referred to the notions of collective security;[150] functionalism[151] and neo-functionalism;[152] and of security community.[153] Although the idea of collective security, as the epitome of the world government, has contributed conceptually to the transcender logic in terms of transmitting key assumptions of 'organized common peace', it failed as a theory as it practically appeared to be unachievable and unworkable.[154] In terms of functionalist and neo-functionalist theories, Booth and Wheeler also highlight

[147] Ibid., pp. 201-227.

[148] Ibid., "Uncertainty," p. 141.

[149] Ibid.

[150] Inis L. Claude: A top-down approach with nearest conceivable idea to world government within a recognizable states system.

[151] David Mitrany: A bottom-up approach through integrating basic interests between states through the daily activities of people.

[152] Ernst Haas: A top-down approach with cooperation being achieved at the top will lead to cooperation at the bottom.

[153] Adler and Barnett: Dynamics are both top-down and bottom-up, with the shared aim of bringing about transnational behavioural changes through increasingly positive and dense communication at multiple levels.

[154] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, pp. 176-177.

their theoretical contribution, yet this time with empirical certainty of the European experience:

> Although functionalist and neo-functionalist theorizing has not directly addressed the security dilemma, as theories designed to promote peace they are important to the progress of our argument because peace through community-building seeks to transcend security dilemma dynamics. Furthermore, key ideas in such theorizing have proved to be central to much transcender thinking, because the practices they have sought to promote are critical in making the transition from sustained cooperation to embedded trust in relations between both states and societies. In other words, functional cooperation promises to turn the personal trust that may develop between state leaders into societally embedded trust, thereby transcending the contingent interplay of personality. Trust, in short, *functions* through daily social practices.[155]

As the evidence from the history of Europe has demonstrated, "the costs of breaking positive interdependence have risen considerably, and in seeking solutions to common problems governments have developed habits of cooperation, such that they have seen their futures, including military security issues, increasingly bound up with each other."[156] What makes the European case exemplary is the fact that once – encapsulating almost her modern history – the traditional linchpin of security competition that dynamited two world wars, the European relations have transformed to such a degree that the very idea of advancing institutional and operational security and defence mechanisms seems trivial. Yet what is more, and further utilized and enriched in the notion of 'security community', is the construction of the 'we' feeling that is acquired through social interaction and learning, and that runs through different levels of relationship and operates under different

[155] Ibid., p. 182.

[156] Ibid., pp. 181-182.

tracks, "from the promotion of security dilemma sensibility at either the diplomatic and NGO level, through to positive societal interactions that delegitimize force."[157]

Booth and Wheeler are convinced that the idea and experience of the security community, among all the transcender voices, have best suited to the reconceptualization of the security dilemma, both because of its implications for building trust at the state and the human society levels, and its ability in shifting the conditions for politics as such that the security dilemma has effectively been transcended.[158]

Building upon the normative work of Karl Deutsch and his associates,[159] Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett[160] re-thought and re-adapted the idea of security community from a constructivist perspective in an attempt to further the relationship between security and the construction of political communities with a shared sense of value and identity that radically re-shape and transform the perceptions and practices of security.
Deutsch defined the security community as:

> A group of people which has become integrated. By integration we mean the attainment, within a territory, of a sense of community and of institutions and practices strong enough and widespread enough to assure . . . dependable expectations of peaceful change among its population. By sense of community we mean a belief . . . that common

[157] Ibid., p. 186.

[158] Ibid., "Uncertainty," p. 143.

[159] Karl Deutsch et. al., *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957).

[160] Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, eds. *Security Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

> social problems must and can be resolved by processes of peaceful change.[161]

Adler and Barnett also sum up that "Deutsch observed a pluralistic security community whenever states become integrated to the point that they have a sense of community, which, in turn, creates the assurance that they will settle their differences short of war. In short, Deutsch claimed that those states that dwell in a security community had created not simply a stable order but, in fact, a stable peace."[162] In this sense, they point to a move from the 'logic of anarchy' to the 'logic of community'.[163] This particular assumption is emblematic in terms of the transcender thinking as such that the security dilemma is not an inevitable feature of world politics governed by anarchy; rather it can be transformed through "social construction that is specific to particular historical moments and particular forms of identity politics."[164] Booth and Wheeler define this condition as "two *I*s becoming a *we*" – a powerful point, implying the role of the social constructedness of identity in transcending the security dilemma.[165]

For Adler and Barnett, the security community is analytically organized around 'three tiers' of 'precipitating conditions' (referring to changes in technology, demography, economics, environment; development of new interpretations of social reality; and external threats); 'factors conducive to

---

[161] Deutsch et. al., *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*, p. 5 quoted in Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 183.

[162] Adler and Barnett, eds. *Security Communities*, p. 3.

[163] Ibid., p. 9.

[164] Matt McDonald, "Constructivism," in Paul D. Williams, ed., *Security Studies: An Introduction* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), p. 67.

[165] Bilgin, "Identity/Security," p. 85.

the development of mutual trust and collective identity' (referring to facilitating conditions of structure, involving power and knowledge; and process, involving transactions, organizations and social learning); and 'necessary conditions of dependable expectations of peaceful change' (referring to mutual trust and collective identity).[166] Hence, the relevance of the idea of security community to Booth and Wheeler's reconceptualization of the security dilemma derives from the building up of these three tiers that accumulate to form a security community, which, in its final stage before becoming a community, is acquired through 'mutual trust' that reciprocates and reinforces collective identity.[167] Therefore, 'trust' is implicated as one of the key variables in the formation of collective identity and the security community – the very idea that promises the prospects for transcending the security dilemma.

The idea of security community is not a new invention, as first theorized by Deutsch and his associates as early as in 1957, nor it has innovatively come up to occupy the current global agenda of security studies, as re-brought by Adler and Barnett almost a decade and a half earlier in 1998. Indeed, for the purposes of the reconceptualization of the security dilemma by Booth and Wheeler, Adler and Barnett hindsighted that "a significant way that a change in the practice of security will be felt is with the elimination of traditional security dilemmas."[168] They further add:

> Once traditional security threats have been eliminated, what security dilemmas remain are likely to derive from economic or environmental

[166] Adler and Barnett, eds. *Security Communities*, p. 38.

[167] Ibid., p. 45.

[168] Ibid. p. 433.

> sources of insecurity. This is because: once war between states becomes unimaginable, the system is 'inoculated' against the psychological anxieties that are characteristic of security dilemmas; these 'new' security issues are less amenable to military solutions.[169]

Although Booth and Wheeler argue that "what is being eliminated is the vicious circle of power and security competition and not the existential condition of uncertainty,"[170] Adler and Barnett's focus on trust as a decisive element in the formation and sustainability of collective identities and security communities primarily informs the formers' attempt to rethink the security dilemma:

> According to Barnett and Adler, 'unarguably the deepest expression of trust possible in international arena' is the expectation of peaceful change between states, and the confidence felt by governments and societies that disputes will be resolved without war… This is the defining characteristic of a security community. Trust is key, and the feeling of trust and the sense of community synergistically interact once the decision has been taken to place the relationship on a different plane.[171]

Trust

In Booth and Wheeler's understanding, 'trust' is the key both at the theoretical (in terms of retheorizing the security dilemma) and the practical (in terms of transcending the security dilemma) levels. Consequentially, they phrase trust as "*the ultimate transcender strategy*:"[172]

---

[169] Ibid.

[170] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 188.

[171] Ibid., pp. 252-253.

[172] Ibid., p. 171.

> Trust-building, which has been marginalized in the literature of IR, is at the heart of the politics that sometimes enables groups to transcend the security dilemma . . . Trust occurs when a relationship shifts from being solely based on rational egoism, which produces common interests that may or may not last, to becoming a relationship embedded in a sense of a changed and shared identity: this is what we earlier described as two parallel 'I's becoming a 'we'.[173]

Trust is an elusive concept, escaping an easy cognizance. Nevertheless, it acquires a meaning in the context of relations within which it is built and socially constituted. From the standpoint of transcender logic, the aim is achieving and fortifying maximalist and universal trust "in the context of relations between collective political units (nations, states, ethnic group, etc.) susceptible to the negative dynamics of security competition."[174] This idea of maximalist and universal trust is, not so unsurprisingly, in striking contrast to the fatalist and mitigator logics. In the fatalist logic, the idea of trust is simply lacking, or rather mistrust is prevailing, as states are in a constant struggle for power, and contemplating on trust is too risky and dangerous. In the case of the mitigator logic, trust is problematically reduced to a mere material condition, informed by rational choice, as cooperation is deemed possible only if it is in the self-interest of the states. One of the prominent thinkers of such rationalist accounts of trust is Andrew Kydd, who defines trust as "a belief that the other side prefers mutual cooperation to exploiting one's own cooperation, while mistrust is a belief that the other side prefers exploiting one's cooperation to

[173] Ibid., p. 172.

[174] Ibid., 229.

returning it."[175] Moreover, he draws attention to four main implications of trust as theorized under rationalist, mitigator thinking:

> First, cooperation requires a certain degree of trust between states. The threshold of trust required for cooperation depends on a set of variables including a state's relative power and costs of conflict. Second, though conflict between trustworthy states is possible, when we see conflict it is a sign that when one or both of the states are likely to be untrustworthy. Thus, we, as external observers, should become less trusting of the parties involved in a conflict, just as they themselves do. Third, in mutlilateral settings, hegemony – the presence of a very powerful state – can promote cooperation, only if the hegemon is relatively trustworthy. Untrustworthy hegemons will actually make cooperation less likely. Fourth, if two parties are genuinely trustworthy, they will usually be able to reassure each other of this fact and eventually cooperate with each other. The key mechanism that makes reassurance possible is "costly signalling," that is, making small but significant gestures that serve to prove that one is trustworthy.[176]

For Booth and Wheeler, due to the fact that unresolvable uncertainty is the existential condition of world politics and thereby the foundation upon which the security dilemma is constituted and reconstituted, "trust always develops under the conditions of uncertainty and never entirely escapes it;" in other words, "trust and uncertainty are mutually implicated."[177] In the same manner, Mistzal identifies trust as implicated by uncertainty:

> Trust always involves an element of risk resulting from our inability to monitor others' behaviour, from our inability to have complete

[175] Andrew H. Kydd, *Trust and Mistrust in International Relations* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005), p. 6.

[176] Ibid., p. 5.

[177] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 230.

> knowledge about other peoples' motivations and, generally, from the contingency of social reality. Consequently one's behaviour is influenced by one's beliefs about the likelihood of others behaving or not behaving in a certain way rather than solely by a cognitive understanding or by a firm and certain calculation.[178]

Having said that, Mistzal's understanding on the mutual implication between trust and uncertainty is different from Booth and Wheeler's understanding in the sense that the former's rational approach towards managing risks is criticized by the latter on the accounts that trust involves "an ongoing two-way *relationship*," not the likelihood of others behaving or not behaving in a certain way.[179] Drawing from Martin Hollis's account of trust, Booth and Wheeler contend that "when 'promises and agreements' are represented in 'consequential terms', in the manner of rational egoism, they 'lose their power to bind' . . . trust cannot emerge from rational egoism in Hollis's account, because it is contrary to the very idea of trusting."[180]

Adler and Barnett also argue that "trust can best be understood as believing despite uncertainty."[181] However, in contrast to rationalist accounts of trust, through further pointing to the notion of trust as a social phenomenon, they in a sense exemplify what Booth and Wheeler try to assert as the derivative meaning of trust through the logics of insecurity:

---

[178] Barbara Mistzal, *Trust in Modern Societies* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996), p. 19 quoted in Adler and Barnett, eds. *Security Communities*, p. 46.

[179] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, pp. 232.

[180] Martin Hollis, *Trust Within Reason* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 160 quoted in Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 233.

[181] Adler and Barnett, eds. *Security Communities*, p. 46.

> Trust is a social phenomenon and dependent on the assessment that another actor will behave in ways that are consistent with normative expectations . . . the social construction of trust shifts our attention to the beliefs that we have about others, beliefs that, in turn, are based on years of experiences and encounters. *When international relations theorists turn their attention to trust they generally elevate how anarchy makes trust highly elusive if not impossible*. *This is one reason why states establish organizations and other means to monitor the behaviour of others* [mitigator logic] *. . . But the development of a security community . . . suggests that states no longer rely on concrete international organizations to maintain trust but do so through knowledge and beliefs about the others* [transcender logic].[182]

Furthermore, in strengthening the case inadvertently for the transcender logic, Adler and Barnett define the identification of a fellow actor in world politics as the social basis of trust, whose judgment is attained through years of mutual interaction and reciprocity: "Uncertainty in such matters [whether a state is a friend or foe], is generated not by technological capabilities or its absence but by knowledge founded on mutual identification and trust."[183] Although Adler and Barnett's focus was not the security dilemma *per se*, their prioritization of trust via the notion of security community has nonetheless provided powerful insights in enhancing the transcender thinking. If transcending the security dilemma is conceptualized to be achieved through the construction of collective identity and thus security community, then trust as a social phenomenon implicates and reinforces both the construction of the security community and thereby the transcendence of the security dilemma. Nevertheless, while Booth and Wheeler conceptualize the 'embedded trust' as key *in* inter-societal relations, Adler and Barnett's pier of 'mutual trust' only

[182] Ibid. Emphasis and remarks in parantheses added.

[183] Ibid.

concerns the relations between states. This is however not to underestimate the role of security community, when achieved, to "diffuse reciprocity and engage in various interactions in myriad spheres."[184]

Booth and Wheeler's working definition is as follows:

> Trust exists when two or more actors, based on the mutual interpretation of each other's attitudes and behaviour, believe that the other(s) now and in the future, can be relied upon to desist from acting in ways that will be injurious to their interests and values. This minimalist conception of trust can be contrasted with a maximalist one where actors mutually attempt to promote each other's interests and values, including in circumstances that cannot be observed. For trust to become embedded between political units, it is necessary for positive relationships between decision-makers to be replicated at the intersocietal level, and vice versa, through a mutual learning process. Trusting relationships of either kind are made possible by the following linked pairs of properties: a leap in the darkness-uncertainty, empathy-bonding, dependence-vulnerability and integrity-reliability.[185]

Clearly, there are two important dimensions to trust as addressed by Booth and Wheeler. In trust, as a social learning process, the ultimate goal is retaining embedded trust at the intersocietal level and the agency of human actors plays political roles in achieving that embedded trust. These dimensions are also important in terms of understanding the relationship between trust and the socially constructed character of identities. The assumption is that relations between actors can indeed change from one of enmity to one of embedded trust; therefore, paving the way for relations that exist in a security dilemma to be transformed into relations that exist within

[184] Ibid., p. 3.

[185] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 230.

a security community. Although, from a critical perspective, there is no end-point in a social learning process, it is the strong sense of shared identities and in essence "the character of the 'we-feeling' – their presence or absence, their strength or weakness – that determine the prospects for security communities surviving, and it is not fatalistically inevitable that they will be trumped by hostile nationalist-rational egoism."[186]

In the same manner, Lewis and Weigert point to trust as a social fact rather than an unattainable goal:

> Trust is a quintessentially social reality that penetrates not only individual psyches but also the whole institutional fabric of society . . . trust which undergirds our everyday lives is a pure social construction which answers to our need for security by seeming to be a fact when it is always a projected assumption.[187]

Jonathan Mercer, a critic of rationalist accounts on trust, points to the neglect of the importance of emotions in conceptualizations of trust. In a similar vein as discussed above, he contends that:

> The concepts "identity" and "trust" have causal power only when analysts recognize their dependence on emotion. Identification without feeling implies a cold, neutral, bloodless observation; it inspires no action. Trust without emotion implies an expectation of trustworthiness based on incentives; trust adds nothing if incentives explain cooperation. Emotion makes identity, trust, and solutions to collective action problems possible.[188]

---

[186] Ibid., p. 198.

[187] J. David Lewis and Andrew Weigert, "Trust as a Social Reality," *Social Forces*, Vol. 63, No. 4 (June 1985), p. 982.

[188] Jonathan Mercer, "Rationality and Psychology in International Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 59 (Winter 2005), p. 99.

Moreover, for our purposes, he emphasizes that "recognizing emotion's role in trust and in identity may help analysts better understand how alliances might work and how security communities might form. Emotion in identity – or "we feeling" – may be key to explaining when security communities form." Having said that, however, Mercer also warns that while "emotion drives in-group cooperation, it also creates "out-group discrimination."[189] For Booth and Wheeler, this means "provoking [new] security dilemmas in relation with other entities" when trying to establish a 'we-ness' with a desire of transcending the security dilemma.[190] This very last point leads Booth and Wheeler to contend that "the promise of trust at the international level is therefore a puzzling promise. Trusters seek certainty, but must live in uncertainty."[191] Indeed, this is why, Booth and Wheeler posit to the importance of conceptualizing trust as a universal value.

To enable studying trust empirically, Booth and Wheeler identified four properties constituting trust, which are "linked and integral pairs of attributes between political collectives:" leap in the dark-uncertainty; empathy-bonding; dependence-vulnerability; integrity-reliability.[192] What Booth and Wheeler imply with a 'leap in the dark-uncertainty' is the 'first act' that needs to be taken by the people at the decision-making level, though not necessarily by the leadership, as the 'leap in the dark' in the case of the Oslo Accords came by two Israeli academicians in collaboration with Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister. Uncertainty is an

[189] Ibid., p. 97-98.

[190] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 233.

[191] Ibid., p. 234.

[192] Ibid., pp. 234-245.

important factor at this level of initiation; as a matter of fact, trust-building always develops under the conditions of uncertainty. As the second level of trust-building, 'empathy-bonding' involves an 'empathizer' who attempts to "internalize the hopes and fears of another by imaginatively taking on as far as possible their emotions/feelings and psychological realities."[193] Booth and Wheeler stress that such "a capacity to empathize with the fear and suffering of one's adversaries is a critical precondition for trust-building."[194] By implication, security dilemma sensibility plays a pivotal role at this level. The third level involves 'dependence-vulnerability', which Booth and Wheeler refer to the willingness of an actor delegating some values under the control of another actor, even though there exists the possibility that such delegation renders the former vulnerable to betrayal. As Aaron Hoffman confirms:

> Trusting relationships are behavioral manifestations of trust. They emerge when actors delegate control over their interests to others, in part because they believe in the dependability and rectitude of their counterparts. Both trusting attitudes and delegation are necessary for trusting relationships; neither is sufficient in itself, and the presence of one cannot explain the presence of the other.[195]

The final level in the trust-building is the 'integrity-reliability'. Booth and Wheeler describe this situation simply as: "mutual trust requires partners to behave with reliability, which then creates mutually predictable

[193] Ibid., p. 237.

[194] Ibid.

[195] Aaron Hoffman, "The Structural Causes of Trusting Relationships: Why Rivals Do Not Overcome Suspicion Step by Step," *Political Science Quanerly*, Vol. 122, No. 2 (2007), p. 288.

attitudes and actions."[196] In this sense, Adler and Barnett correlated reliability with trustworthiness:

> Dependable expectations of peaceful change, the confidence that disputes will be settled without war, is unarguably the deepest expression of trust possible in the international arena… Trust does not develop overnight but rather is accomplished after a lifetime of common experiences and through sustained interactions and reciprocal exchanges, leaps of faith that are braced by the verification offered by organizations, trial-and-error, and a historical legacy of actions and encounters that deposit an environment of certitude notwithstanding the uncertainty that accompanies social life.[197]

Critical and post-structuralist approaches to theory have vastly contributed to the formation of what Booth and Wheeler call as the transcender logic, for which security dilemma theorizing does not necessarily lead to a fatalist existence or a contingent remedy under the conditions of anarchy. In fact, in contrast to the rationalist approaches that treat structural strictures as given and immutable and that provide the political actors only with a room of manoeuvring for a fragile cooperation, it is informed by the very critical assumption of ever possible processes of transformation and change susceptible to human society, individually and collectively. In this sense, through the transcender logic come the prospects for breaking away with the fatalism as it appraises above all that there is nothing naturally inevitable about a security dilemma. On the contrary, a security dilemma can be deviated from its essentialized objects and subjects through its reconceptualization as a politically informed social phenomenon. Implicatively, the primary referent objects and agents of security dilemma

[196] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 244.

[197] Adler and Barnett, eds. *Security Communities*, p. 414.

are not only the states as exogenous entities, nor it necessitates a centrism on security as a mere state practice. Indeed, Booth and Wheeler direct attention to the role of the state as well as the human society both as a referent object and an agent in transcending the security dilemma through whose trust-building practices a logic of community can be attained. The very politics that has created a security dilemma can indeed be transformed to a politics that reinforces a political community based on shared identities and a mutual interest on a common future. The key is rethinking and challenging those political discourses that resist transcending it. In the following part, such a rethinking is attempted within the context of the Cyprus problem.

PART II

RETHINKING THE SECURITY DILEMMA WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE CYPRUS PROBLEM

CHAPTER 4

THE CYPRUS PROBLEM: A PARADOX FROZEN IN TIME?

In the early morning of 11 July 2011, Greek Cypriots woke up to a massive blast, when 98 containers of munitions that had been kept exposed directly to the sun for about two and a half years exploded at the Evangelos Florakis Naval Base on the south coast of Cyprus. The explosion killed 12 people, and severely damaged the houses in the nearby town of Zygi and the greatest power plant facility in the island that provided half its electricity.[198] The exploded containers were the cargo from a Cypriot-flagged, Russian-owned and Iranian-hired vessel, the Monchegorsk, which, while sailing from Iran to Syria, was stopped and searched by the US Navy twice in January 2009. Due to the UN sanctions on Iran, the United States administration pressurized the Christofias government to recall the vessel using Cypriot flag, which purported to be carrying the munitions to the West Bank with Hamas as the end-user.[199] Although reluctantly, as it would affect negatively its relations with Syria and Iran, the Greek Cypriot government did abide to the call and confiscated the containers that were later moved to the naval base until a final decision over what to do with the containers.

The explosion quickly topped the agendas of those governments involved as well as the international headline news, while the Greek Cypriot leader

[198] George Psyllides, "Evangelos Florakis Blast Kills 12," *Cyprus Mail*, 11 July 2011, http://www.cyprus-mail.com/cyprus/evangelos-florakis-blast-kills-12/20110711.

[199] Richard Spencer, "Iran Explosives at Centre of Cypriot Intrigue," *The Telegraph*, 11 July 2011, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/cyprus/8630190/Iran-explosives-at-centre-of-Cypriot-intrigue.html.

Demetris Christofias attracted much criticism at home for allowing the munitions to be deployed in Cyprus and due to the negligence of the Greek Cypriot authorities that led to the massive blast.[200] So far, the story has carried manifold implications in terms of the security environment surrounding the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East. However, there is one more side of the story that has manifold implications in terms of the Cyprus problem and its security discourse. These implications, however, do not relate to any military or strategic aspect of security in Cyprus, but rather to a broader socio-cultural aspect of security – the societal insecurities and fears prevailing in the island. A Greek Cypriot woman, named Alexandra Dimitrou, giving an interview to BBC on the day of the explosion, cried out that some elderly people had thought "the Turks had started an invasion!"[201]

Such manifestations of insecurity are not unfamiliar in the context of the Cyprus problem and do not only relate to Greek Cypriots, but Turkish Cypriots as well, whose most vivid manifestation of insecurity relay on the fear of being politically and economically dominated by Greek Cypriots and a renewed violence or repetition of 1963 events in case of a settlement.[202] A

[200] The exposion of the US State Department documents in the infamous Wikileaks, documenting the US pressure on the Greek Cypriot government and the indifferent attitude of the Greek Cypriot government officials in relation to the cargo, was the main source of criticism directed towards the Christofias government, resulting in resignation of two of his ministers. Moreover, nearly half of the country in dark, the Greek Cypriot authorities had to buy electricity from the north. This move was also criticized by the fatalist voices in the south and the polls demonstrated that 68% of the Greek Cypriots were against buying electricity from the north. Archbishop Chrisostomos called on the Greek Cypriots "not to use the electricity of the Turks" and instead "to use candle lights." The Head of the Parliament and EDEK leader, Yiannis Omirou made a similar call and directed attention to the fact that Turkish Cypriot authorities would capitalize on the matter to "upgrade their illegal status." See "Partiler ve Hrisostomos KKTC'den Elektrik Alan Rum Yönetimini Eleştirdi," *Türk Ajansı Kıbrıs*, 17 July 2011.

[201] "Limasol'da patlama: 'Türk işgali başladı sandık'," *BBC Türkçe*, 11 July 2011, http://www.bbc.co.uk/turkce/haberler/2011/07/110711_cyrpus_blast_update.shtml.

[202] *Next Steps in the Peace Talks: An Island-Wide Study of Public Opinion in Cyprus*, Cyprus 2015 Initiative, Interpeace (2010), p. 21; Derya Beyatlı, Katerina Papadopoulou and Erol Kaymak, *Solving the Cyprus Problem: Hopes and Fear*, A Report by the Cyprus 2015 Project, Interpeace (2011), p. 39.

simple example drawn from the anthropological work of Hadjipavlou suffices to reveal the extent of these insecurities felt by Turkish Cypriots, which has invariably resulted in the Turkish Cypriot rigidity (both at the state and societal levels) over the principle of clear bizonality and the continuation of the Turkish guarantees: "I don't want to live on the other side. I am afraid. I still remember when we were hiding under the bed for fear of being killed."[203] Likewise, the Greek Cypriot rigidity over the cessation of the guarantee system of 1960, which gives Turkey as well as Greece and the United Kingdom the right of intervention in case of a breach in the constitutional order of the Republic of Cyprus, stems from these societal insecurities largely shaped by the events unfolded in 1974.

In any case, these societal insecurities have the effect of informing the leaderships on both sides to construct 'red-lines' and adopt non-flexible approaches vis-à-vis the security chapter of negotiations,[204] hence naturalizing both the insecurities at the societal level and the security policies at the state level that further hinder the prospects for reaching compromises in the negotiations over the Cyprus problem. As will further be elaborated in the ensuing pages, these insecurities in Cyprus have become commonsense in the historical course of the socio-political developments of the Cyprus problem. Such established commonsense is highly problematic and feeds extensively the fatalism of theoretical and practical approaches to

[203] A Turkish Cypriot woman interviewed by the author in Maria Hadjipavlou, "Multiple Stories: The 'Crossings' as Part of Citizens' Reconciliation Efforts in Cyprus?" *Innovation*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (2007), p. 62.

[204] That is not to imply that the security policies at the state level do not have any impact on the construction of insecurities at the human society level. Indeed, it is a two-way relationship which co-constitute one another, as will further be elaborated in this chapter within the historical and practical frameworks of the evolution of security policies. See Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson and Raymond Duvall, eds. *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the Production of Danger* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), pp. 14-15 and McSweeney, *Security, Identity and Interests*, p. 73.

the problem. As a matter of fact, the political discourses on both sides have been largely dominated by a fatalism that resisted a solution under federation to such an extent that a federal settlement in the island is seen today as the least likely solution for both communities and the status quo is perceived as more preferable.[205] This is mainly due to the fact that, although it is federation that has been negotiated on the table since 1977, both leaderships have in essence pursued policies that prioritized their exclusionary visions in the name of federation. The Turkish Cypriot leaderships, with the brief exception of the period between 2004 and 2010, have negotiated for the *de facto* situation, i.e. the existence of two states, in the island, and the Greek Cypriot leaderships have negotiated for the protection of the unitary character of their existing state.[206]

The pessimism over the likelihood of a federal solution reached its peak, however, when the Annan Plan referendum had failed on the polls in the south. On the part of the Greek Cypriots, as indicated by the overwhelming negative vote (75%), the Annan Plan never raised a fevered aspiration for a solution, let alone inter-communal peace, and largely remained as a

[205] Ari Sitas, Dilek Latif and Natasa Loizou, *Prospects of Reconciliation, Co-Existence and Forgiveness in Cyprus in the Post-Referendum Period*. PRIO Cyprus Center Report No. 4 (2007), p. 63. For the pessimism in the public attitudes, see Alexandros Lordos, Erol Kaymak and Nathalie Tocci, *A People's Peace in Cyprus: Testing Public Opinion on the Options for a Comprehensive Settlement* (Brussels: CEPS, 2009), p. 4; *Next Steps in the Peace Talks*, p. 5; Beyatlı, Papadopoulou and Kaymak, *Solving the Cyprus Problem: Hopes and Fears*, p. 11.

[206] For the Turkish Cypriot policies, see Necati Ertekün, *The Cyprus Dispute and the Birth of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus* (Nicosia: Rustem and Brother, 1984); Zaim Nejatigil, *Our Republic in Perspective* (Nicosia: Tezel Offset and Printing, 1985); Ergün Olgun, "Cyprus: A New and Realistic Approach," *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (1999); ibid., *Cyprus: Myths, Objective Realities and the Way Forward* (Nicosia: TRNC Presidency, 2004). For the Greek Cypriot policies, see Glafcos Clerides, *Cyprus: My Disposition*, vols. 1 and 2 (Nicosia: Alithia Publishing, 1989); ibid., *Bir Dönemin Anıları 1993-2003*, Çeviren Ali Çakıroğlu (Lefkoşa: Galeri Kültür Yayınları, 2008); Joseph S. Joseph, *Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics: From Independence to the Threshold of the European Union* (London and New York: Macmillan Press, 1997); Kalypso Nicolaidis, "Exploring Second Best Solutions for Cyprus," *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 6 (November 2009).

contested issue in the south over the workability and implementation of the plan, with security considerations taking the lead.[207] On the part of the Turkish Cypriots, the underlying causes of the brief yet strong flirtation with federalism with the introduction of the plan in 2002, although not be undermined as it had effected a great socio-political impact on the Turkish Cypriot community during that period,[208] point to a different dimension of pro-solution efforts that cannot be equated with a readiness toward truly opening up the prospects for building a 'political community' with Greek Cypriots and transforming the relations long-characterized with mutual mistrust and suspicion to a one enriched with a shared identity and common future.[209] Hence, the aspiration for federalism was mainly pursued through the prospects for EU membership and as an exclusionary and homogenous practice in contradistinction to the Greek Cypriot bid. The quick shift in the public opinion among the Turkish Cypriots away from a federation, despite the pro-solution and pre-federation stance of the Turkish Cypriot leadership at the time, is a clear indicative that Turkish Cypriots were mainly driven more by socio-political and economic motivations rather than building a

[207] See Savvas Daniel Georgiades, "Public Attitudes Towards Peace: The Greek-Cypriot Position," *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 44, No. 5 (2007); Panicos Stavrinides, "A Psychological Analysis of the Greek Cypriot 'No'," in Andrekos Varnava and Hubert Faustmann, eds., *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond (*London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2009) and Hubert Faustmann, "The Role of Security: Perceptions of Advantage and Diasdvantage," in ibid.

[208] The introduction of the Annan Plan, coupled with the frustration over the socio-political and economic isolations and the high prospects of EU membership, which the Greek Cypriots were already heading towards, had driven the large masses of Turkish Cypriot community, with the pro-solution forces embodying the leftist parties, such as the Republican Turkish Party and the Peace and Democracy Movement and the leading civil society organizations, such as the Turkish Cypriot Chamber of Commerce, Businessmen Association, the teachers' unions and so on, to indulge on a substantive campaign for a solution that led to massive peace demonstrations in the north. See Hannes Lacher and Erol Kaymak, "Transforming Identities: Beyond the Politics of Non-Settlement in North Cyprus," *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (July 2005).

[209] See Fatma Guven-Lisaniler and Leopoldo Rodrigez, "The Social and Economic Impact of EU Membership on Northern Cyprus," in Thomas Diez, ed., *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002) and Erol Kaymak and Yucel Vural, "Intra-Communal Dynamics: European Union Discourses among Turkish-Cypriot Political Actors Before and After the Failed Referenda," in Thomas Diez and Nathalie Tocci, eds., *Cyprus: A Conflict at Crossroads* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2009).

common future with the Greek Cypriots.[210] Notwithstanding the seemingly strong peace dividend, monolithic efforts toward the reunification of Cyprus under a federal umbrella remained problematic in terms of inter-communal reconciliation and trust-building. That is to say, if also accepted by the Greek Cypriots, the Annan Plan would bring peace without reconciliation and short of trust-building.

Furthermore, ever since the failure of the Annan Plan, a wide variety of public opinion surveys have indicated that the Greek Cypriots primarily opt for a solution ensuring the unitary character of the state, whereas the Turkish Cypriots opt for a two-state solution (not a loose confederation), with the establishment of the federal state as the second best option for both communities.[211] Consequently, one might rationally, if not correctly, ask: If this is the case, then why is there such insistence on the settlement of the problem within a federal framework? Hence, even the current Greek Cypriot leader Demetris Christofias, who as the former General Secretary of AKEL (Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus) is coming from a long-tradition of supporting good relations with Turkish Cypriots and a federal solution, has reiterated many times publicly and in the context of the bicommunal negotiations that they see the Greek Cypriot official discourse on federation as the greatest concession being made to date on the part of the

[210] Alexandros Lordos, "Rational Agent or Unthinking Follower? A Survey-Based Profile Analysis of Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot Referenda Voters," in Diez and Tocci, eds., *Cyprus: A Conflict at Crossroads* (2009), p. 26.

[211] Lordos, Kaymak and Tocci, *A People's Peace in Cyprus*, p. 7; *Next Steps in the Peace Talks*, pp. 26-27; Beyatlı, Papadopoulou and Kaymak, *Solving the Cyprus Problem: Hopes and Fears*, p. 19.

Greek Cypriot community.[212] From the perspective of the Turkish Cypriot official discourse – until the leadership of Mehmet Ali Talat – federation was ironically demonized[213] and equated with yielding the equal status of Turkish Cypriots and becoming a minority under the Greek Cypriot unitary state.[214] Notwithstanding the fact that the mediating efforts of the UN and the overall framework drawn by the international community have necessitated a search *exclusively* for a federal solution, moving away from a federation in Cyprus means in essence surrendering to the fatalist logic, which do not foresee any future of peaceful co-existence for Turkish and Greek Cypriots and the transformation of the Cypriot communities into a pluralistic political community of Cyprus. In the Cypriot world of fatalism, mutual fear and mistrust have constantly kept the security paradox active, despite the lack of violence on the ground, and the societal insecurities alive to a degree that naturalization of the status quo has normalized the conflict on behalf of the communities in the island, rendering the alternatives for resolving the paradox unrealizable. Therefore, besides the fact that the federation is the only available form of solution from an international politics and law

[212] *Statement by H.E. Mr. Demetris Christofias, President of the Republic of Cyprus, At the 66th Session of the UN General Assembly*, New York, 24 September 2010. Also see Demetris Christofias, "We Have to Look Ahead for Cyprus," *Cyprus News Agency* (19 March 2008); ibid., "We Have Exhausted Our Limits," *Cyprus News Agency* (3 September 2008); Maria Koniotou, "Recognition of a Second State in Cyprus is Unacceptable, Says Christofias," *Cyprus News Agency* (30 September 2008); "Christofias Urges Turkish Cypriot Leader to Show Understanding," *Cypriot Weekly* (27 June 2011).

[213] Ironic in the sense that the idea of federation was first proposed and promoted by the Turkish Cypriot leadership in 1968 with the sole purpose of fortifying the equal partnership status of Turkish Cypriots, which the amendments of 1963 to the constitution of the Republic of Cyprus deprived them. However, the Turkish Cypriot official rejection of federation came in 1998, when the Turkish Cypriot side, under the leadership of Denktaş and with the backing of Turkey, had put forward its confederation thesis. As the UN framework only allow for negotiating a federation, Denktaş sat on the table in 1999 on the basis of the federal framework, however putting proposals implying a confederation. The demonization of federation by the Turkish Cypriot side was to such extent that in neither version of the Annan Plan, the word 'federation' did not appear on the entire blueprint.

[214] Rauf Raif Denktaş, "The Crux of the Cyprus Problem," *Perceptions: Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (September-November 1999), p. 8. Ergün Olgun, "Recognising Two States in Cyprus Would Facilitate Co-existence and Stability," *Survival*, Vol. 40, No. 3 (Autumn 1998), pp. 35-37.

perspective as mainly argued by the mitigator voices, it is also the only way for transforming the Cyprus problem from one of a security paradox to one of a pluralistic political community. Nevertheless, the difference between the mitigator and transcender logics in terms of perspectives on the federation will be later discussed in length.

This chapter attempts to illustrate below the empirical showdown of what has been theoretically advanced from the very beginning of this study. In this sense, it is informed by the assumption that the prevailing insecurities are the social products of the history of the Cyprus problem, which in turn led to the (re)construction and the perseverance of the security paradox in the island. Therefore, in order to comprehend the dynamics lying behind the existing paradox, it is imperative to cast light on the constitution and reconstitution of (in)security in Cyprus both from historical and practical perspectives.

The Paradox in Cyprus: A Historical (Re)Construction

As with most of the protracted conflicts in the world, the background of the Cyprus problem is "well-known, though much contested."[215] Ultimately, out of the nostalgic pre-national history of Cyprus illuminated in the myth of Aphrodite and the peaceful co-existence for centuries, there borne two competing histories blended with facts and myths. Despite the fact that the seeds of insecurity in Cyprus are planted before and with the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus, the inception of the Cyprus problem marks the

[215] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 70.

year 1963 for Turkish Cypriots and the year 1974 for Greek Cypriots. Therefore, the 'tragedy' in Cyprus, engraved in the collective memories of both communities and encapsulated in the form of inter-communal violence and the consequent displacement of people, has always been perceived from competing angles and with differentiated sources of trauma.

The period between 1963 and 1968, which terrorized Turkish Cypriots at the wake of the Greek Cypriot leadership's policy of amending the 1960 Constitution (which many Turkish Cypriots perceived as a systemic attempt to deprive them of their equal partnership rights) and the following violence directed at Turkish Cypriots (which forced them to form enclaves to protect for their security), is "a period of Cypriot history over which many Greek Cypriots would later display almost total amnesia."[216] However, in the collective memory of Turkish Cypriots, the period represents *the* tragedy in Cyprus in which many Turkish Cypriots were killed randomly or *en masse*, and lived in constant fear of being communally exterminated at the hands of the state forces.[217] On the other hand, *the* tragedy for Greek Cypriots occurred in 1974 when Turkey forcefully divided Cyprus and illegally

[216] Necati Polat, "Self-Determination, Violence and Modernity: The Case of the Turkish Cypriots," in Thomas Diez (ed.), *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 107. See also Costas M. Constantinou, "Dominant Discourses of the 'Cyprus Problem' and Practices of Resistance" in Ahmet Sözen (ed.), *The Cyprus Conflict: Looking Ahead*, Famagusta: Eastern Mediterranean University Printing-House (2008), p. 3. Upon the example of the former Greek Cypriot President Papadopoulos, who in an interview to the daily English language newpaper published in the UAE *Khaleej Times* on 4 September 2004, stressed that 'no single' Turkish Cypriot was killed between 1963-1974, Constantinou argues: "That Cypriot leaders can get away with such statements has a lot to do with the fact that racist language and denial discourse have succeeded in Cyprus to such an extent that they are no longer a public issue; they have succeeded because they are associated with and used as a counterweight for the 'unacceptable position' of the other side. . . What this means is that in practice racist language is subtly softened because of the 'Cyprus problem. And this is where the danger lies; in that it makes racism banal and an unproblematic feature of everyday life."

[217] For a well-documented account of the period between 1963-1968 and the scope of the inter-communal violence, see Richard A. Partick, *Political Geography and the Cyprus Conflict: 1963-1971* (Waterloo: University of Waterloo Press, 1975). Also see Halil I. Salih, *Cyprus: An Analysis of Cypriot Political Discord* (New York: Gaus' Sons, 1968).

occupied the 1/3 of the island following its invasion, which terrorized Greek Cypriots with the fear of communal extermination and resulted in their forceful displacement.[218] Hence, what the Greek Cypriots portray as the tragedy is a salvation from the perspective of Turkish Cypriots, when Turkey rightfully intervened to protect them from total annihilation and to restore the constitutional order, as necessitated by the Treaty of Guarantee, following the *coup d'etat* of the Greek junta in Cyprus.[219] Even though two exclusionary accounts of 1963 and 1974 emerged from the collective memories of both communities, this is not to suggest that there is uniformity in each community in interpreting these accounts.[220] Nevertheless, the construction of two ethnically separate and competing histories has eventually led to a fatalist uniformity in the official political discourses of both communities that keeps alive the traumas, fears and insecurities at the societal level with a power encompassing over generations.[221]

The generalized starting point in accounting the history of the Cyprus problem is 1571 when the island came under the rule of the Ottoman

[218] For an account of the 1974 events, characterized as a tragedy from the Greek Cypriot perspective, see Polivios G. Polyviou, *The Tragedy and the Challenge* (England: Swin and Son, 1975).

[219] See Ahmet Gazioğlu, *Enosis Çemberinde Türkler* (İstanbul: Cyrep, 1996); Sabahattin Ismail, *Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti'nin Doğuşu ve Çöküşü ve KKTC'nin Kuruluşu, 1960–1983* (İstanbul: Akdeniz Haber Ajansı Yayınları, 1992); ibid., *Kıbrıs'ta Yunan Sorunu, 1821–2000* (İstanbul: Akdeniz Haber Ajansı Yayınları, 2000).

[220] See Niyazi Kızılyürek, *Kıbrıs Sorununda İç ve Dış Etkenler* (Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi Yayınları, 1983); Costas M. Constantinou, "Cypriot In-dependence and the Problem of Sovereignty," *Cyprus Review*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Fall 2010).

[221] For an account of historical construction of ethnically separate histories, see Rebecca Bryant, *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus* (London and New York: I. B. Taurus, 2004), pp 129-155; Also see Costas M. Constantinou, "Aporias of Identity: Bicommunalism, Hybridity and the 'Cyprus Problem'," *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 42, No. 3 (2007) for the problematization of the official discourses.

Empire.[222] This generalization is due to the fact that it was during the Ottoman rule of Cyprus that the Turks had become the co-inhabitants of the island starting from 1572, along with the Greeks whose forefathers (Aachean Greeks) settled on the island in around 2000 B.C.[223] Between 1571 and 1878, the inhabitants of the island were ruled by the *millet* system of the Ottomans, who were classed according to their religious identities and were allowed to be administered by their religious leaderships in terms of fiscal, juridical and civic affairs.[224] The *millet* system, which also brought a unique Ottoman land system based on the land distribution and its taxation, when coupled with the religious-communal identity affiliations, led to the emergence of class structure in the island in general and the rise of Greek bourgeoisie in particular, which was later influenced by the Greek nationalism and its *megali idea*.[225] Nevertheless, the Ottoman period in Cyprus is mainly characterized by the peaceful co-existence of Muslims and Christians of the island, providing a uniform account of positive interaction and mutually involved everyday practices, despite the religious and social divisions institutionalized by the *millet* system.[226]

---

[222] Yiannis Papadakis, "History Education in Divided Cyprus: A Comparison of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot Schoolbooks on the 'History of Cyprus'," PRIO Cyprus Center Report No. 2 (2008), p. 13.

[223] William Mallinson, *Cyprus: A Modern History* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2005); Paul Sant Cassia, "Religion, Politics and Ethnicity in Cyprus during the Turkokratia," *Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (1986); Harry Luke, *Cyprus under the Turks, 1571-1878* (London: Hurst, 1969); Kızılyürek, *Kıbrıs Sorununda İç ve Dış Etkenler*.

[224] Irene Dietzel and Vasilios N. Markides, "Ethno-religious Coexistence and Plurality in Cyprus under British Rule (1878-1960), *Social Compass*, Vol. 56, No. 1 (2009), p. 73. See also Ahmet Gazioğlu, *The Turks in Cyprus: A Province of the Ottoman Empire, 1571-1878* (London: Rustem and Brother, 1990).

[225] Megali Idea implies the Greek irredentism that had come to the fore after the Greek war on independence, asserting the establishment of a greater Greek state that would also include the large Greek population still living under the Ottoman Empire. See Kızılyürek, *Kıbrıs Sorununda İç ve Dış Etkenler*, pp. 16-31 and ibid., *Milliyetçilik Kıskacında Kıbrıs* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), p. 49.

[226] Paschalis M. Kitromilides, "From Coexistence to Confrontation: The Dynamics of Ethnic Conflict in Cyprus," in Michael Attalides, ed., *Cyprus Reviewed* (Nicosia: Jus Crypti Association, 1977), pp. 36-41; Paul Sant Cassia, "Religion, Politics and Ethnicity in Cyprus during the Turkokratia," pp. 3-5.

It was during the British rule that the Greek nationalism gained dynamism as evidenced in the uprising of 21 October 1931 against the colonial power, when a Greek riot caused the death of civilians and the burning of the British Government House in Nicosia.[227] The rise of the Turkish nationalism in the island did also coincide with this period, as the Turks in Cyprus were greatly influenced by the Turkish war on independence ensuing the demise of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923.[228] Moreover, besides the strong influence of ethnic nationalisms of the two mainlands Turkey and Greece, the Orthodox Christians and the Muslims of Cyprus had come to transform their religious identities further through the policies of the British rule into ethnic identities of Greeks and Turks.[229] One of the starkest examples contributing to this transformation was the establishment of a legislative assembly, which proportioned the Greek and Turkish subjects of Cyprus according to their population ratios, who had formerly been subjected to administrative independence under the Ottoman system. Constantinou defines the establishment of this legislative body as an attempt by the British to "modernise" the religious division of the *millet* system to an ethnic division on which "modern governmentality could be exercised."[230] Such "segregation through democratisation" allowed the British to a greater extent to avow authority over the Greeks, whose anti-colonial fractions had already started to assert itself, with a majority vote by

[227] Paschalis M. Kitromilides, "Milestones in the Historiography of the Cyprus Question," *The Historical Review*, vol. 1 (2004), p. 288

[228] Dietzel and Markides, "Ethno-religious Coexistence and Plurality in Cyprus under British Rule (1878-1960)," p. 77.

[229] Bryant, *Imagining the Modern*, p. 3.

[230] Constantinou, "Aporias of Identity: Bicommunalism, Hybridity and the 'Cyprus Problem'," p. 257.

allying themselves with the Turks.[231] Consequently, the historical account of this period suggests that the British policy of 'divide and rule' "politicized the inter-communal differences . . . and reinforced the rise of the two antagonistic nationalisms and competing visions based on each group's 'primordial attachments' to their respective motherlands"[232] – a factor which further drifted the Greeks and Turks of Cyprus apart in the anti-colonial struggle especially in the aftermath of mid-1950s.

In 1955, with the help of Greece, EOKA (National Organisation of Cypriot Fighters) was established to pursue the anti-colonial struggle and the ideal for *enosis*, union with the 'motherland' Greece, which was also confirmed by the overwhelming majority of Greek Cypriots under a referendum called by the Greek Cypriot communal leader Archbishop Makarios in early 1950s.[233] Another stark example of the British policy of 'divide and rule' came during this period with the recruitment of the Turkish Cypriots as auxiliary policemen in disproportionate ratios against the Greek Cypriots and hence the formation of a 'special mobile reserve unit' composed exclusively of Turkish Cypriots to deter the EOKA attacks. Even though the main target of EOKA was initially the British authorities and civilians, it nevertheless turned to the Turkish Cypriot fraction as it fought *for* the British. From the perspective of the Turkish Cypriot leadership under Küçük, the alignment with the British was not due to the content over the colonial rule *per se*, but that they would be politically and economically dominated by the mainland

[231] Ibid.; Dietzel and Markides, "Ethno-religious Coexistence and Plurality in Cyprus under British Rule (1878-1960)," p. 77.

[232] Hadjipavlou, "Multiple Stories," p. 55.

[233] Kızılyürek, *Milliyetçilik Kıskacında Kıbrıs*, p. 102.

Greeks, if *enosis* was achieved, thereby perceived as a grave threat for the Turkish community of the island.[234]

While EOKA intensified its struggle against the British and for *enosis*, Turkish Cypriots had put forward its demand for *taksim* – partition or a union of part of the island with the 'motherland' Turkey.[235] This was followed by the establishment, with the help of Turkey, of the Turkish Cypriot version of EOKA, i.e. VOLKAN, which was later renamed as TMT (Türk Mukavemet Teşkilatı).[236] In fact, this development implies that the problem of British imperialism was being slightly bypassed and was turning into a struggle between the ethnic communities of the island over the fate of Cyprus and with growing implications for, and interest of, both mainlands. While Turkey started ardently to support the Turkish Cypriot demand for *taksim*, Greece was furthering the demand for *enosis*, which had already carried the matter to the UN and appealed on behalf of the Greek Cypriots for self-determination in 1954.[237] However, as the stakes were high with the two NATO members entering into conflict during the Cold War over the fate of Cyprus, the two motherlands with the urge of the US compromised instead on a new form of independence other than *enosis* and *taksim* – a partnership state of Greek and Turkish Cypriots with Turkey, Greece and Britain as its guarantors.[238] The Greek Cypriot struggle against the British in the name of independence (yet

[234] Denktaş, *The Cyprus Triangle* (Nicosia: Rustem and Brother, 1982), p. 34.

[235] Michalis Stavrou Michael, *Resolving the Cyprus Conflict: Negotiating History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), p. 269.

[236] Kızılyürek, *Milliyetçilik Kıskacında Kıbrıs*, p. 246.

[237] Oliver Richmond, *Mediating in Cyprus: The Cypriot Communities and the United Nations* (London and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 1998), pp. 71-73; Farid Mirbagheri, *Cyprus and International Peacemaking* (London: Hurst and Company, 1998), pp. 26-31.

[238] Ibid., pp. 32-35.

through *enosis*) ironically set up a chain of events that ended up with a more limited independence for both communities, which instead of pushing the British out of the island, brought also Turkey and Greece along with Britain into the island. For the Greek Cypriots, this meant that not only their ideal for *enosis* had failed, but further an approvingly fragile republic subject to constitutional limitations and a system of guarantorship was imposed on them. In this respect, Richmond emphasizes:

> Along with both communities' passionate attachment to Cyprus and their strong nationalism towards their own mother country, their political naiveté at such an early juncture in their independent history was a poor omen for full independence after 1960.[239]

The Republic of Cyprus came into being as a result of the agreements that were negotiated and signed in Zurich and London in 1959 between the motherlands. In essence, the Zurich-London Agreements reflected the compromise between the interests of Turkey and Greece, rather than one between the communities inhabiting the island. Having largely ignored the prevailing inter-communal societal and political dynamics, the "strange beginnings" of the so-called partnership state have come to represent a breakdown in the island's modern history.[240] Constantinou illustrates this condition as follows:

> Brought into being on an island that was rented by one empire to another, it was a state that was not supposed to be. None of the local communities demanded it and would simply not exist today if the locals got their way. At the time before independence, most Greek Cypriots wanted union with Greece (enosis), most Turkish Cypriots

[239] Richmond, *Mediating in Cyprus*, p. 73.

[240] Kitromilides, "From Coexistence to Confrontation: The Dynamics of Ethnic Conflict in Cyprus," p. 42; Constantinou, "Cypriot In-dependence and the Problem of Sovereignty," p. 17.

> partition (taksim), and most other Cypriots from the smaller minorities the continuation of colonial rule. This meant that the newly established Republic of Cyprus begot considerable ambivalence at independence. It was invariably described as a 'realpolitik compromise', a 'reluctant republic', a 'self-determination substitute', an 'unwanted child', a 'sham' and other more or less felicitous terms that turned into sound bites and historical clichés . . . The Cypriot postcolony was nominally a sovereign independent state, but in practice nothing less than a state of in-dependence.[241]

Indisputably, this development planted the seeds for the already evolving inter-communal strife in the island, leading up to the events of 1963 and 1974 that Turkish and Greek Cypriots characterize respectively as 'tragedy', and formed the basis of the societal insecurities and fears articulated today.

The peaceful co-existence of once the Muslims and Christians of Cyprus had been gradually transformed into a security paradox between the Turks and the Greeks of the island through the colonial policies of Britain and the strong ethnic and nationalist influences of the motherlands. In fact, when the republic was founded, the relationship between Turkish and Greek Cypriots had already been shaped and dominated by the conditions of the security dilemma. On behalf of the Greek Cypriot leadership, the dilemma was between learning to live with the terms of the imposition and continuing the struggle for their imagined independence in the form of *enosis*, for which Turkish Cypriots presented a clear obstacle. On behalf of the Turkish Cypriot leadership, the dilemma was again between learning to live with the terms of the imposition and furthering the policy of partition. Indeed, for the Turkish Cypriot leadership, as evidenced from the Greek Cypriot proposal for amending the constitution, the Greek Cypriot leadership would never accept

[241] Ibid.

the equal partnership status of Turkish Cypriots having a veto on the overall functioning of the state.

Moreover, nationalistic irredentism had continued hanging in the air with such fatalism that the inter-communal violence that started in 1963 culminated in spiralling effects to form a security paradox in 1974. When the island was tentatively divided along what has come to be known as 'the Green Line', even though the violence on the ground had stopped and the security paradox had militarily 'frozen' in the time, its continuous repercussions have dominated the relationship between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots to such an extent that their societal insecurities and fears deriving from that period have been the main obstacle in front of a solution ever since. As will be seen in the following section, out of this frozen security paradox, there borne two exclusionary political discourses vis-à-vis the Cyprus problem; this time constructing a paradox over the negotiating table that has been open, on and off, since 1968.

The Paradox in Cyprus: A Practical (Re)Construction

The fact that negotiations over the solution of the Cyprus problem have been continuing for more than four decades, leaving no single issue to date that was not thoroughly discussed, is an indicative that the approaches toward its resolution have been largely dominated by the strategic and tactical imperatives of the fatalist logic on both sides of Cyprus. Hence, the established commonsense vis-à-vis the Cyprus problem points to this fatalism in various ways; from the portrayal of the conflict as an essentially 'intractable' and 'protracted' one, to the sustained accounts of peaceful co-

existence as a pure nostalgia that cannot be achieved in today's *realpolitik*, and, last but not the least, to its general presentation as a 'deathbed' that have resisted the 'wit' of many 'gifted' international diplomats and politicians.

As this study's main departure point is to problematize the naturalization of social insecurities that inform the security paradox at various levels of relations between the two communities, before starting to account on the practical (re)construction of the security paradox, it is important to note on the impact of the discourses of recognition and sovereignty in Cyprus on the process of this naturalization that have defied moving towards a sound inter-communal dialogue and reconciliation since the division of the island.[242]

The problematic side of the recognition discourse stems in fact from the peculiar construction of the protagonists of the Cyprus problem. In the *de facto* sense, there exist two states in the island; the Republic of Cyprus, although internationally recognized, deemed by the Turkish Cypriot political discourse as illegal, and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC), which was deemed illegal both by the Greek Cypriot political discourse and the international community. Derivatively, as each side does not recognize and indeed questions the sovereignty of the other, the main protagonists who appear on the negotiation table under the auspices of the United Nations are

[242] For a detailed account on the official discourses of recognition and manipulation of cross-ethnic contacts of individuals, see Costas M. Constantinou and Yiannis Papadakis, "The Cypriot State(s) in situ: Cross-ethnic Contact and the Discourse of Recognition," in Thomas Diez, ed., *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict, Postmodern Union* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp.73-97. For an argument on sovereignty within the context of the Cyprus problem, see Thomas Diez, "Introduction: Cyprus and the European Union as a political and theoretical problem," in ibid., p. 10, in which he stresses that "The core of today's conflict, however, is about sovereignty… And since sovereignty in the international realm is first and foremost about simulation, both sides are engaging in symbolic politics with high stakes."

'the Greek Cypriot community' and 'the Turkish Cypriot community' in their singular state-like capacities.

During the course of the negotiations, especially after 1983 when TRNC was established, this peculiar construction of the protagonists on the table had not only negatively affected the ability of the sides to negotiate effectively, but had also reinforced an ability to persuade the societies on both sides that inter-communal interaction and dialogue with the 'other' present an "unpatriotic" and a "treacherous" act on behalf of the 'self' as it had the effect of legitimizing the illegal existence of the other side and validating its political claims through opening up breaches in the sovereignty of one's self.[243] Therefore, the "danger" of recognition had a two-fold effect on how the Cyprus problem was to be negotiated and how Cypriots, as groups and individuals, were to meet and communicate with each other.[244] This means that the discourse in fact had provided a problematic official framework both for the conduct of negotiations at the state-like level and of (non)interaction at the societal level.[245] Absent from inter-communal dialogue and interaction, both communities have nevertheless learned to internalize their fears and traumas from the period between 1963 and 1974 and to naturalize their societal insecurities which were continuously fed by the official fatalist discourses at all levels. Even so, when the official ban on the crossings was lifted after 28 years in 2003, the availability of everyday contacts will have to bear no positive impact on the inter-communal dialogue and

[243] Constantinou and Papadakis, "The Cypriot State(s) in situ," p. 73.

[244] Ibid., p. 75.

[245] Besides the official negotiations, the very rare inter-communal dialogue in the form of highly homogenous bi-communal events, which were subject to official permission from both sides took place until the opening of the borders at the Ledra Palace Hotel in the buffer-zone. As Constantinou and Papadakis put it, in ibid., p. 86, "borders, whether of a *de facto* or *de jure* nature, are places of division but also ones of contact."

reconciliation.[246] Not only the crossings have been limited, they have also showed a tendency towards decline each passing day.[247] Some public opinion studies even indicate that the opening of crossings has further alienated the two communities in different contexts and to varying degrees.[248]

Under the shadow of the recognition discourse, the negotiations over the Cyprus problem were mainly pursued on the edges of high semantics in relation to the nature of the problem, as well as its solution and its parameters. Each of these areas of semantics has indeed reflected what the two sides understood from a solution. Instead of a chronologically documented history of negotiations, this study will approach the historical practice of negotiations through 'the logics of insecurity'. By this way, it is aimed to understand and, more importantly, to question the underlying logics contributing and constituting the security paradox in the due course of negotiations.

Basically, the 'diagnosis' (or the nature) of the problem that Denktaş demanded all throughout his life as a necessary precondition for achieving a solution and to which various Greek Cypriot leaderships had indirectly adhered, proved to be a futile attempt with no prospect for yielding any

[246] A survey conducted by the UNFICYP indicated that 90% of Turkish Cypriots have no contact with the Greek Cypriots, only 7% have a personal contact and 3% have a professional contact. For Greek Cypriots, 87% have no contact with the Turkish Cypriots, 8% have personal contact and 5% have professional contact. See *The UN in Cyprus: An Inter-communal Survey of Public Opinion*, UNFICYP (2008), p. 40. Also see Laurie Johnson, "Reconciliation and Peace Education in Cyprus: What Will It Take?" *The Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No.1 (Spring 2007), p. 22.

[247] Erol Kaymak, Alexandros Lordos and Nathalie Tocci, *Building Confidence in Peace: Public Opinion and the Cyprus Peace Process* (Brussels: CEPS, 2008), p. 5.

[248] *The UN in Cyprus: An Inter-communal Survey of Public Opinion*, pp. 31-35; See also Alexandros Lordos, "The UN in Cyprus," in Ahmet Sözen, ed., *The Cyprus Conflict: Looking Ahead* (Famagusta: Eastern Mediterranean University Printing-House, 2008), pp. 258-259 and Erol Kaymak, "Does Cyprus Need a Truth and Reconciliation Commission?" *The Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No.1 (Spring 2007), p. 79.

result.[249] The demand for diagnosis always played a regressive role, instead of a progressive one. Because diagnosis meant a simulation of the subjective 'realities' of each side, although influenced by the changes in the historical course of the socio-political developments in the island, amounting to objectivist accounts of reality on both sides. The fatalist logic in that sense dictated that either each side accepted the 'truth' of the other side or the negotiations were doomed from the beginning. From the perspective of the Turkish Cypriot political discourse, the diagnosis lied in the acceptance of political domination attempts and physical atrocities committed by Greek Cypriots between 1963 and 1974, which forced Turkey to intervene to restore the constitutional order disrupted by the Greek coup d'état and to protect the Turkish Cypriot community from total annihilation.[250] Therefore, it could not be expected to return to the *status quo ante*[251] as first of all the equal partnership status of Turkish Cypriots had to be recognized and the physical separation of both communities to be accepted to ensure the security of Turkish Cypriots.[252] From the perspective of the Greek Cypriot political discourse, on the other hand, *status quo* could not be accepted as was a result of the forceful division and the illegal occupation of the 1/3 territory of the Republic of Cyprus by Turkey.[253] The problem of diagnosis clearly reflects the exclusionary and objectivist political discourses of both sides that are mainly informed by the respective perceptions of 'tragedy' of

[249] Denktaş, "The Crux of the Cyprus Problem," p. 8; ibid., *The Cyprus Triangle*, p. 4; "Talking Points of the Greek Cypriot Side," in Glafcos Klerides, *Bir Dönemin Anıları*, p. 397.

[250] Denktaş, "The Crux of the Cyprus Problem," p. 6; ibid., *The Cyprus Triangle*, p. 13.

[251] In the political jargon of the Cyprus problem, 'status quo' refers to the division of the island as a consequence of 1974 intervention of Turkey. See *Report of the Secretary-General in Connection with the Security Council's Comprehensive Reassessment of the United Nations Operation in Cyprus*, S/26777 (22 November 1993), p. 24.

[252] Nejatigil, *Our Republic in Perspective*, pp. 46-49; Denktaş, *The Cyprus Triangle*, p. 18.

[253] "Talking Points of the Greek Cypriot Side," in Glafcos Klerides, *Bir Dönemin Anıları*, p. 397.

each side, which have survived to shape and dominate the threat perceptions of the sides and the insecurities articulated at the societal level. The diagnosis problem has in fact determined the practices of the sides over the negotiating table, not only in relation to the security aspect, but to the overall framework for a solution and its parameters. That is to say, given these objectivist 'realities', the search for a solution and an agreement over its basic principles have been carried under the conditions of an ever undiagnosed problem.

Between 1968 and 1974, a search for a solution was sought under the premises of a constitutional arrangement within the framework of the Republic of Cyprus, as also acknowledged by the UN Security Council resolutions.[254] In line with the fatalist logic of the diagnosis problem, the Turkish Cypriot leadership under Denktaş, pointing to the plight of Turkish Cypriots during the period, insisted on the recognition of their equal status and on the creation of an autonomous area that would ensure their security.[255] The Greek Cypriot leadership under Makarios, on the other hand, pointing to the non-workability of the constitution as evidenced by the events during the period, demanded that the unitary character of the state, both in terms of constitutional and territorial arrangements, to be protected.[256] However, the initiation of the Greek coup and the subsequent Turkish intervention created a *status quo* that led to a structural change in the stance of the Turkish Cypriot leadership, when coupled with the unilateral formation of the 'Federated Turkish State', towards a solution under federation. By this time, the physical separation of the two

[254] *UN Security Council Resolutions* 353 (1974), 357 (1974), 367 (1975); *UN General Assembly Resolution* 3212 (1974).

[255] Nejatigil, *Our Republic in Perspective*, pp. 24-25.

[256] Polivios G. Polyviou, *Cyprus Conflict and Negotiation* 1960-1980 (London: Duckworth, 1980), pp. 105-115.

communities was realized through the population exchange agreement signed in Vienna in 1975.[257] Given the division of the island, the Greek Cypriot leadership had to abide, what Christofias has claimed as the biggest Greek Cypriot concession to date, to a federal solution, as was formally signed in the 1977 High-Level Agreement between Denktaş and Makarios. It was declared in the agreement that the sides were seeking a "bi-communal federal republic" in which each community would administer its own territory – a principle that would later be accepted as 'bizonality'.[258] In 1979, a further High-Level Agreement was signed between Denktaş and (following the death of Makarios) Kyprianou, which reconfirmed the federal framework.[259] However, what was still envisioned by the United Nations (and likewise by the Greek Cypriot leadership) was an 'evolution' of the Republic of Cyprus into a federal state, which was found unacceptable by the Turkish Cypriot leadership, arguing that it would imply the continuation of the Republic of Cyprus 'hijacked' by the Greek Cypriots in 1963 and demanding instead 'a federation by evolution' with "two equal political entities joining their resources in a federal administration on a basis of equality," – a demand that in essence gave birth to the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.[260] Ever since, the Turkish Cypriot stance has been premised on this demand,[261] which challenged the UN during drafting the Annan Plan as late as in 2002 to

[257] *Interim Report of the Secretary-General Pursuant to the Security Council Resolution 370 (1975)*, S/11789 (5 August 1975). Also see Michael, *Resolving the Cyprus Conflict: Negotiating History*, p. 52.

[258] For 4 Points High-Level Agreement in 1977, see *Report of the Secretary-General Pursuant to Paragraph 6 of Security Council Resolution 401*, S/12323 (30 April 1977), p. 2.

[259] For 10 Points High Level Agreement in 1979, see *Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus*, S/13369 (31 May 1979), p. 13.

[260] *Report of the Secretary-General Pursuant to Paragraph 6 of Security Council Resolution 401*, p. 3.

[261] With the exception of the period between 1998 and 2004, when the Turkish Cypriot leadership officially sought confederation – a proposal that had nevertheless fortified its idea of a new partnership state, short of the Republic of Cyprus.

flirt with the idea of a 'virgin birth' that would imply neither the continuation of the Republic of Cyprus, nor the establishment of a (con)federation by two equal states.[262]

The overall framework of a Cypriot solution was provided, however, with the Ghali Set of Ideas introduced in 1992,[263] which articulated the basic parameters of a solution that have ever since formed the basis of the UN good offices mission mandated to help the two sides in their search for a comprehensive settlement:

> A Cyprus settlement must be based on a State of Cyprus with a single sovereignty and international personality and a single citizenship, with its independence and territorial integrity safeguarded, and comprising two politically equal communities as described in the relevant Security Council resolutions, in a bi-communal and bi-zonal federation, and that such a settlement must exclude union in whole or in part with any other country or any form of partition or secession.[264]

Although rejected by the Turkish Cypriot leadership, the Ghali Set of Ideas was the first detailed account of a would-be settlement, which also for the first time defined what was meant by the principles of 'bicommunality', 'bizonality' and 'political equality'. However, it was evident from the very

[262] The idea of 'virgin birth' was rejected by the Greek Cypriot leadership. Nevertheless, the UN drafted the final version of the Annan Plan in such a way as to ensure a level of 'constructive ambiguity' for both sides to be able to interpret however they like in relation to the source of the new state of affairs. Although Talat accepted the notion of constructive ambiguity in the ensuing negotiating period, Christofias continued to insist on the evolution of a federation from the Republic of Cyprus, which has been the internationally recognized government of Cyprus since 1960 and a member of the EU since 2004. See *Report of the Secretary-General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus*, S/2003/398 (1 April 2003), p. 15.

[263] *Report of the Secretary General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus*, S/23780 (3 April 1992), pp. 5-8.

[264] *UN Security Council Resolution 750* (10 April 1992), which was reiterated in subsequent resolutions 774 (1992), 939 (1994), 1092 (1996), 1117 (1997), 1146 (1997), 1179 (1998), 1217 (1998), 1251 (1999). After 1999, every UN Security Council resolution referred to the resolution 1251 in terms of the overall framework of the settlement.

beginning that what the sides understood from these principles were different as black and white, and, not surprisingly, derived from the diagnosis problem, with its roots still to be found in their respective perceptions of 'tragedy'. Despite the continuous attempts on behalf of the UN to adapt the basic features and principles of a solution to the changing conditions and in line with the proposals of both sides, the uniformity of the political discourses vis-à-vis the basics of a solution remained intact. Hence, looking in retrospection, one can easily recognize the persisting philosophies and uniform discourses that have been naturalized in the historical course of negotiations, albeit with different jargons.

For the Turkish Cypriot side, physical separation had always been an essential feature of a solution that has evolved in time to encompass a separation in terms of political practices as well. In 1968, the Turkish Cypriot leadership proposed the creation of 'autonomous areas' within the constitutional framework of the Republic of Cyprus. The idea of 'autonomous areas' was later re-formulated with the acceptance of federation as 'territories under the administration of each community' in 1979 and as two zones, namely 'bizonality', in 1992. With the unilateral confederation proposal of the Turkish Cypriot side, however, these 'two zones' were envisaged as 'two states' in equal status. The principles of bicommunality and political equality had also been subjected to transformation in the like manner as bizonality. The Turkish Cypriot side had made proposals evolving the status of Turkish Cypriots from one of 'community' to a 'people', with implications over their ascending political rights within a settlement.[265]

[265] *Report of the Secretary-General on His Mission of Good Offices*, S/24830 (19 November 1992), p. 13; *Report of the Secretary-General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus*, S/2003/398 (1 April 2003), p. 5. See also Denktaş, "The Crux of the Cyprus Problem," p. 8.

For the Greek Cypriot side, on the other hand, the unitary character of the state, with single sovereignty and single citizenship, and through an emphasis on the workability of the constitution, has played the utmost role in terms of their policies vis-à-vis the negotiations.[266] For that matter, from the Greek Cypriot point of view, neither bizonality necessitated a clear majority (but rather a more fluid one) of each community over a territorial area, nor the principles of bicommunality and political equality necessitated the acknowledgment of two distinct identities reflected in a clear numerical balance between the two communities in the state organs.[267]

It will not be an over-generalization to contend, then, that as the basic philosophy and the underlying logic of the political discourses had not changed *per se*, the Cyprus problem resisted to sustained efforts towards a comprehensive settlement and to the detriment of inter-communal relations. That is to say, the official conduct of negotiations in the period between 1968 and 2004 had been largely dominated by the fatalist logic on both sides, leaving no room for the mitigator logic, let alone the transcender one. One way or another, every single aspect of the negotiations had come to be tied up to the security paradox frozen in time, and, consequentially, to the security aspect of the Cyprus problem. These basic philosophies and logics of fatalism have greatly contributed to the practical construction of the security paradox in various ways, yet most prominently in relation to the future of the guarantees, from where societal insecurities are mainly deriving from. As the Turkish Cypriot political discourse necessitated a solution that would not be

[266] *Report of the Secretary-General on His Mission of Good Offices*, S/24830, pp. 11-13; *Report of the Secretary-General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus*, S/2003/398, p. 5. See also Polivios G. Polyviou, *Cyprus Conflict and Negotiation 1960-1980* (London: Duckworth, 1980), pp. 25-30.

[267] Michael, *Resolving the Cyprus Conflict: Negotiating History*, pp. 59-60.

a repetition of 1963, the continuation of the guarantee system has become a *sine qua non* of any settlement. On the contrary, as the Greek Cypriot political discourse required a solution that would not be a repetition of 1974, the abolishment of these treaties has likewise become a *sine qua non* of any settlement. This fatalist tradition on exclusionary policies that has been henceforth built into the security considerations in Cyprus points to a perception of security as an 'absolute quality' or 'complete security', which blocks any flexibility on part of the sides for an effective compromise. [268] In practical terms, the security paradox over the future of guarantees had proven to be a continuous one.

Furthermore, the consequences of the fatalist logic on sustaining the societal insecurities during the period had been grave, as the first comprehensive settlement plan that was put to separate simultaneous referenda for the first time in the long history of the Cyprus problem failed due to the rejection of the Greek Cypriots with an overwhelming 'no'. The Greek Cypriot fatalist logic in the epitome of Papadopoulos had played a leading role in the rejection of the plan, yet the exit polls during the day of the referendum in the south showed that the 3/4 of those Greek Cypriots who voted 'no' cited security concerns as the most important reason for their rejection of the plan.[269] This was also acknowledged by the then UN Secretary General as that "fears regarding security and implementation appear to be the prominent

[268] For security as an 'absolute quality' rather than a 'relative quality', see McSweeney, *Security, Identity and Interests*, p. 3. For 'common security', see Jerry Sommer, "Security in Cyprus: Threat Perceptions, Possible Compromises and the Role of the EU." Bonn International Center for Conversion, Paper No. 44 (2005), p. 24 and Hubert Faustmann, "The Cyprus Question Still Unresolved: Security Concerns and the Failure of the Annan Plan," *Südosteuropa-Mitteilungen*, Issue 6 (2004), p. 46.

[269] For the poll which was conducted by the Greek Cypriot TV channel, Mega, see Hubert Faustmann, "The Role of Security: Perceptions of Advantage and Diasdvantage," in Varnava and Faustmann, eds., *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2009).

among Greek Cypriots based, to a significant extent, on historic distrust of Turkish intentions."[270] On the part of the Turkish Cypriots, the Annan Plan, which provided for the continuation of guarantees, was sufficient enough to make their 'leap' forward and was accepted by a vast majority (65%), despite a massive, yet unreceptive campaign of the fatalists against the plan. In fact, the episode of the Annan Plan has clearly shown that without addressing the societal insecurities, any future solution is unlikely to be realized. As the fatalism feeds both the political discourses and the societal insecurities, resolving the security paradox over the security concerns needs a 'leap' effective on both sides of the island. The next chapter indeed attempts to open up the doors for such a mutual 'leap', when the negotiations were reinitiated in 2008 with the presence for the first time in the history of the Cyprus negotiations of two left-wing and pro-federal solution leaders, who based their election campaigns on a clear mandate to solve the long-overdue Cyprus problem. These leaps, when coupled with the practice of security dilemma sensibility, enabled a rethinking of the Cyprus problem as the relationship had eased from essentially being a paradox into a dilemma.

[270] *Report of the Secretary-General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus*, S/2004/437 (28 May 2004), p. 21.

CHAPTER 5

THE CYPRUS PROBLEM: TRANSCENDING OR MITIGATING THE DILEMMA?

The year 2004 marked a series of fundamental transformations in relation to the socio-political life of the Turkish Cypriot community. Far-reaching implications of the introduction of the Annan Plan in 2002 carried Turkish Cypriots to an unprecedented social and political level where they effectively questioned the Turkish Cypriot political discourse, which, over the history of the Cyprus problem, shaped their polity and society and led to the construction of a Turkish Cypriot cultural and political identity characterized by an exclusionary nationalism and secessionism based on a mistrust of Greek Cypriots.

Weary of the traditional practices of the long incumbent regime in the north, the long-held isolation that depressingly reflected on every aspect of Turkish Cypriot life, economical hardships ensuing a banking crisis in 2000, latent social problems and the promise of the EU did all contribute to this dramatic shift in the political orientation of the Turkish Cypriots in various ways, but nevertheless it could not be reduced to any one of them. Hence, on a more upper layer, the leading drives that led Turkish Cypriots to embody such a shift essentially point to their "disenchantment" with the failing policies and practices of their state and the subsequent aspiration for "reintegrating with

the international community" at a time when their Greek Cypriot co-islanders were entering into the EU.[271]

In fact, this unique period was also emblematic in terms of the role played by the regional actors, including the motherlands Turkey and Greece, as well as the international actors, such as the US and the UK and, far more importantly, organizations such as the EU and the UN. Hence, along with other drivers, the EU membership, which came to the fore by the opening of the accession negotiations with the Greek Cypriot side in 1998 and through its infamous 'catalyst effect' vis-à-vis the prospects for the reunification of the island, had created such a socio-political environment that it had effectively put the mechanisms for the transformation of the Turkish Cypriot society into play.[272] When coupled with the introduction of the first version of the Annan Plan in 2002, the EU membership, by creating the channels for the UN to bring about a 'new state of affairs', provided Turkish Cypriots with a concrete tool in aspiring for a change of its regressive political structures, which was clearly seen to be realized simultaneously through a federal solution and the EU membership. Coincidentally, with the change of the political leadership in Turkey, which fundamentally shifted the Turkish foreign policy as regards the perception of Cyprus as a 'national cause' and adopted a very articulate stance in favour of a solution under federation, the Turkish Cypriot society had nevertheless forced upon its leadership that continued to blatantly resist

[271] Lacher and Kaymak, "Transforming Identities: Beyond the Politics of Non-Settlement in North Cyprus," p. 149; Erol Kaymak, "The Turkish Cypriot Views on Annan V" in Varnava and Faustmann, eds., *Reunifying Cyprus*, pp. 149-150.

[272] For a discussion on the 'catalyst effect' of EU membership, see Nathalie Tocci, "Towards Peace in Cyprus: Incentives and Disincentives," *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (2003) and Thomas Diez, "Last Exit to Paradise? The European Union, the Cyprus Conflict and the Problematic 'Catalytic Effect'," in ibid., ed., *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002).

the efforts for reunification a dramatic change in terms of the latter's fatalist policies. As a result of the occurrence of a series of popular demonstrations for a peaceful settlement of the Cyprus problem and the EU membership, the Denktaş leadership, as a first step, had to abandon its long-held position of 'no contact' between the two communities.[273] However, on the negotiating table, the fatalist policies of the Turkish Cypriot leadership were still in effect. Moreover, the Greek Cypriot leadership, despite the rift with a restless Greece vis-à-vis the Annan Plan, capitalizing on the EU membership to legitimize its own political claims, continued to rely on its fatalist discourses.[274]

As well as the drivers, the consequences of this transformation were nevertheless proved to be manifold for the Turkish Cypriot side. It not only resulted in problematizing the fatalist political discourses of nationalism and separatism, but it also effectively galvanized Turkish Cypriots in changing them. The results of the parliamentary elections of December 2003 were highly instrumental in this sense. Turkish Cypriots, who had exposed over

[273] Nevertheless, the discourse of recognition continued to prevail on both sides at the expense of the highly emotional environment. On briefing the press for the first time about the opening of the crossings, the then Turkish Cypriot President Rauf R. Denktaş said: "Each state takes the necessary decisions and arrangements as regards to its relations with its neighbours. This may change according to that day's conditions. It can be put to a test. If it's seen harmful or if it doesn't function properly, then the measures taken will be re-examined. Every state has such right and it is under its jurisdiction." See *Türk Ajansı Kıbrıs*, 22 April 2003. The 'state' emphasis of Denktaş had found a quick response. The then Greek Cypriot Presidential Spokesperson Kypros Chrisostomides said: "This decision is illegal, it is an attempt to divert the attention of the international community from the negative stance of the Turkish side with regard to the UN peace effort to find a negotiated settlement. It aims to impress... We have always advocated unhindered movement throughout Cyprus and any arrangements in place now are there because of the continuing illegal occupation... Any decisions made by the occupation regime are illegal, on the basis of international law, the United Nations Security Council resolutions and the international judiciary decisions, which underline that the administration in the occupied areas of Cyprus is only a local subordinate administration to the occupying power, Turkey, which continues to violate flagrantly the international norms through the continuing presence of the occupying troops in Cyprus." See *Cyprus News Agency*, 22 April 2003.

[274] Neill Nugent, "Cyprus and the European Union: The Significance of its Smallness, Both as an Applicant and a Member," *European Integration*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (2006), pp. 55-56.

decades a tradition of casting votes in favour of right-wing political parties with traditional pro-*taksim* policies, brought the Republican Turkish Party (hereafter will be referred to as CTP) to power, having almost half of the seats in the parliament.[275] The symbolic value of ascendancy of the CTP derives mainly from the fact that although firming its place in the political system of the TRNC as the leading left-wing opposition party throughout its electoral history, it had nevertheless been marginalized by the predominantly pro-separation Turkish Cypriot polity and society due to its long tradition of bringing an end to the division of the island and solving the Cyprus problem through a federation.[276] When the leader of CTP, Mehmet Ali Talat, became Prime Minister in January 2004, the pro-solution public attitude was so deterministic that Denktaş, who was highly agnostic about and openly campaigning against the Annan Plan, had to abandon his long-held status of the main Turkish Cypriot counterpart in front of various Greek Cypriot leaders on the negotiating table and to surrender his negotiating powers as the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community to the newly elected government under Talat.[277] Indeed, it was the Turkish Cypriot delegation led by Talat, which went to the Burgenstock Summit in Switzerland in March 2004 to finalize the negotiations over the Annan Plan leading up to the referenda in the island.[278] Despite the setback of the Annan Plan, the social shift continued to shape the polity in the north and ascended Talat to the

[275] For an analysis of December 2003 elections, see Ali Çarkoğlu and Ahmet Sözen, "The Turkish Cypriot General Elections of December 2003: Setting the Stage for Resolving the Cyprus Conflict?" *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.9, No.3 (Winter 2004).

[276] See "Table 1: Parties on the Conventional Left-Right Ideological Spectrum and the Turnout Rate, 1976-2003," in ibid., p. 128.

[277] "Cumhurbaşkanı Denktaş İsviçre'ye Gitmeyeceğini Açıkladı: Basın Toplantısı 1," *Türk Ajansı Kıbrıs*, 17 March 2004, "Denktaş Rusya'nın Vetosunu Değerlendirdi," *Türk Ajansı Kıbrıs*, 22 April 2004.

[278] "Activities of Secretary-General in Burgenstock, Switzerland," *UN Press Release*, SG/T/2402 (1 April 2004), http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2004/sgt2402.doc.htm.

Presidency in April 2005, following a retiring Denktaş. Talat, who had recieved 10% of the votes in the previous presidential elections of 2000, came to become the first pro-federal solution leader of the Turkish Cypriot community with having 55% of the votes in the first round.[279]

As a matter of fact, expectations were relatively high towards finding a solution based on federation when Talat became the President in the north.[280] However, his unilateral efforts did not bear fruit until the presidential elections in the south in February 2008, when Papadopoulos – infamously known as 'Mr. No' due to its stance on the Annan Plan – had lost the presidential elections to another pro-solution leader, Demetris Christofias, who came to power with the promise of ending the division of the island and bringing a federal solution.[281] The election of Christofias, as the General Secretary of AKEL, the leading left-wing political party in the south, which had for the first time put a presidential candidate into the elections, not only raised expectations in the north, but also showed a relative shift in the Greek Cypriot public attitude towards the promise of a solution.[282] Although AKEL had decided not to support the Annan Plan a few days before

[279] "KKTC'nin Seçim Sonuçları: 2. Cumhurbaşkanı Mehmet Ali Talat," *Türk Ajansı Kıbrıs*, 17 April 2005.

[280] Alexandros Lordos, *Options for Peace: Mapping the Possibilities for a Comprehensive Settlement in Cyprus*, Cyprus Polls (2005), p. 121.

[281] Talat, who was very much keen to start the negotiations on the basis of the Annan Plan, had articulated his frustration over Papadopoulos that he did not even agree to the idea of having a social coffee with him. See Murat Palavar, "Papadopulos'la Kahve Bile İçemiyoruz," *Yeni Şafak*, 9 December 2005, http://yenisafak.com.tr/arsiv/2005/aralik/09/p11.html.

[282] Although this shift on the part of the Greek Cypriot community could not be compared with the shift in the Turkish Cypriot community, it showed that the indifference of Papadopoulos to the solution of the Cyprus problem was found problematic by Greek Cypriots, especially in the face of a pressing international community. For a general analysis of the Greek Cypriot presidential elections in 2008, see Christophoros Christophorou, "A New Communist Surprise – What's Next? Presidential Elections in the Republic of Cyprus, February 2008," *South European Society & Politics*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (June 2008) and Hayriye Kahveci, "The 2008 Presidential Election in Cyprus," *West European Politics*, Vol. 31, No. 5 (September 2008).

the referendum, Christofias made explicitly clear during his campaign that he would continue negotiations based on the plan requiring only minor changes.[283] Both for the Greek and Turkish Cypriots, the time seemed ripe for the first time with the presence of two pro-solution leaders to make their leaps forward and open up the prospects for the reunification of the island through resolving the security paradox.

The Dilemma in Cyprus: Testing the Properties of Trust[284]

At 01:20 am in 19 February 2004, a bomb exploded in Kyrenia outside the house of the newly elected Prime Minister of TRNC, damaging the front façade of the house and injuring a neighbour. The Turkish Cypriot daily *Yenidüzen* carried the incident to its headline the following day as a "Bomb to the Communal Approach."[285] The incident, which occurred hours before the resumption of direct talks in Cyprus that were continuing, on and off, in and outside the island since 1999, was perceived as an attempt to intimidate Talat who would also be attending the negotiations that day for the first time with the Turkish Cypriot delegation headed by Denktaş. Although Talat called the attack as a 'pointless intimidation', it was nevertheless directed to the peace efforts that had been fundamentally challenging the fatalist Turkish Cypriot political discourse survived to that date.[286] Booth and Wheeler

[283] Christofias: "'We are seeking changes to the Annan plan that would not alter its philosophy nor would they affect the rights of the Turkish Cypriot community." See *Cyprus News Agency*, 15 November 2004.

[284] In writing this section, the author has made use of the official 'minutes' of the meetings of the negotiations which are available to her. Nevertheless, where they are made public or as articulated by the interviewees, necessary citation will be given.

[285] "Toplumsal Yaklaşıma Bomba,' *Yenidüzen*, 19 February 2004.

[286] "Başbakan Talat'ın Konutuna Bombalı Saldırı," *Kıbrıs Gazetesi*, 19 February 2004.

contend that "risky initiatives are sometimes highly dangerous to the people making them, as a result of potential domestic opposition; the threat of assassination to those who have tried to bring about benign change is far from unknown in international history."[287] For them, these 'risky initiatives' are a result of what they call 'a leap of trust'.

Talat's 'leap', however, became a 'leap in the uncertainty' when four years later in 2008, it was reciprocated by Christofias' 'leap'. Despite the confederation stance of the Turkish Cypriot leadership since 1998, when Talat came to power, he came with a clear mandate on finding a solution within a federal framework, which the Denktaş leadership had long demonized and had been instead embraced by various Greek Cypriot leaderships after Makarios. Indeed, Talat gave an assurance to the Greek Cypriot community in his messages that he would work for advancing the rapprochement between the two communities and, instead of institutionalizing the division through his policies, ending the division of the island with a perspective on the 'reunification' – a concept which was 'forbidden' in the official discourse of the Turkish Cypriot leadership as it implied of the Turkish intervention as a forceful division, yet a vision that the Greek Cypriot community was aspiring for decades.[288] In the same manner, Christofias, both during his campaign period and right after his election, gave direct messages to the Turkish Cypriot community in favour of establishing good relations between the communities and would not ask for a solution

[287] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 234.

[288] "Talat Barış Elini Rum Tarafına Uzattı," *Türk Ajansı Kıbrıs*, 17 April 2005; "Kıbrıs Rum Toplumuyla Aynı Gemideyiz," *Türk Ajansı Kıbrıs*, 24 April 2005.

that would be to the detriment of one community or the other.[289] Hence, what formed his 'leap' forward was his public declaration before even meeting with his counterpart that he would accept 'rotational presidency' between Turkish and Greek Cypriots and 'allow' a considerable number of Turkish settlers or those Turkish origin TRNC citizens coming after 1974 to stay in the island in case of a solution. These statements of Christofias were indeed critical in the sense that, although envisioned in the Annan Plan, both the 'rotational presidency' and the 'acceptance of the Turkish settlers' had strong implications for the endorsement of the political equality of Turkish Cypriots and the humanitarian dimension involving the plight of Turkish origin TRNC citizens by the Greek Cypriot political discourse, which had effectively marginalized these issues to that date. With some transcender ideas transmitted and the leaps taken forward, the two leaders met at the symbolic Nicosia International Airport in 21 March 2008.[290]

21 March Agreement has come to represent the foundations for trust over which the two leaders started to establish some bonding through a commitment towards resuming the full-fledged negotiations.[291] They agreed to the inception of six working groups that would take up the six main chapters of the Cyprus problem as well as seven technical committees that would deal with the practical matters to ease the obstacles in the daily lives

[289]" Christofias to Fight for Just Settlement of Cyprus Problem," *Cyprus News Agency*, 24 February 2008; "Christofias: Reunification of Cyprus the Top Priority," *Cyprus News Agency*, 6 March 2008.

[290] Nicosia International Airport has been a dysfunctional airport since 1974 situated at the buffer zone, where the main premises of the UN Force in Cyprus are located. Its symbolism lies in its capacity to be proposed as a part of the confidence building measures taken up by the UN to date, which were never realized.

[291] "Statement of the two leaders read by Michael Møller, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Chief of Mission of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus following the meeting on 21 March 2008," T*he Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus*, S/2008/353 (2 June 2008), annex ii, p. 13.

of Cypriots stemming from the division of the island.[292] Although the Turkish Cypriot side, believing that the Annan Plan had provided the necessary framework as was confirmed by Christofias and AKEL right after the referendum, saw no need in establishing the working groups that would consider the core issues pertaining to an eventual settlement plan. Christofias insisted instead on the establishment of these working groups with the argument that they would provide the necessary preparatory work needed for the resumption of negotiations.[293] This laid in essence the foundations of a would-be rift in terms of the basis of negotiations and signalled that Christofias was abandoning his idea of introducing minor changes to the Annan Plan, which he later declared 'null and void'.

Nevertheless, on 23 May 2008, the two leaders met again and reaffirmed their commitment to "a bizonal, bicommunal federation with political equality, as defined in relevant Security Council resolutions."[294] They further agreed that "the partnership would have a Federal Government with a single international personality, as well as a Turkish Cypriot Constituent State and a Greek Cypriot Constituent State, which would be of equal status." This latter part of the agreement constituted in fact a major breakthrough in such a way that for the first time in the history of Cyprus negotiations, the leaders were able to move beyond the 'forbidden jargons' in their established political

[292] The working groups were on governance and power-sharing, property, security, territory, economic matters and EU matters, and technical committees on crime and criminal matters, economic and trade matters, cultural heritage, crisis management, humanitarian matters, health and environmental issues. See ibid., p. 1.

[293] Demetra Nicolaou, "Cypriot President 'Cautiously Optimistic' on Cyprus," *Cyprus News Agency*, 28 March 2008.

[294] "Joint statement made by Greek Cypriot leader Demetris Christofias and Turkish Cypriot leader Mehmet Ali Talat on 23 May 2008," T*he Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus*, S/2008/353 (2 June 2008), annex iii, p. 14.

discourses and agree on concepts that had always been on the exclusionary possession of the political discourse of the other. This had articulated that a well enough bonding was established between the two leaders. While Talat accepted 'a federal government with single international personality', Christofias consented to the idea of 'a Turkish Cypriot Constituent State and a Greek Cypriot Constituent State (with capital Cs and Ss) of equal status. Although the idea of single international personality derivatively comes through the inception of federation, for a polity and society which had been driven and influenced so long by pro-*taksim* and separatist policies with an emphasis of two equal states, it was a huge leap forward politically and socially, if not from the perspective of international law. In a similar manner, Christofias' acceptance of 'two constituent states', as envisaged by the Annan Plan, presented a major breakaway with the fatalism of the Greek Cypriot political discourse, which had a long tradition of rejecting the idea of two equal, yet separate entities, let alone states. As a matter of fact, such security dilemma sensibility was needed on behalf of the leaders, not only in terms of furthering the empathy and bonding between them, but also in terms of giving the communities the right message that a high time was approaching in Cyprus with the ability of breaking the fatalism of established political discourses that had hindered the prospects for transcending the security dilemma until then.

Not surprisingly, such security dilemma sensibility by both leaders attracted the criticism of the fatalist voices on both sides on the grounds that each was yielding to the demands of the other.[295] However, as in the words of former UN Secretary General Hammarskjöld, "you can only hope to find a lasting

[295] "Cyprus Undersecretary Responds to Comments on May 23 Meeting," *Cyprus News Agency*, 25 May 2008; "Liderlerin Tek Egemenlik-Tek Vatandaşlık Açıklamasına Tepkiler," *Türk Ajansı Kıbrıs*, 2 July 2008.

solution to a conflict if you have learned to see the other objectively, but at the same time, to experience his difficulties subjectively."[296] Booth and Wheeler also argue that "holding different interpretations of the same situation is also essential to the exercise of security dilemma sensibility . . . [which] is a particular expression of the general concept of empathy, focused on an appreciation of how one's own actions can generate fear and mistrust in others."[297] Although the practices of security dilemma sensibility in the case of Cyprus had proven up until this point efficient enough to convince the leaders to take domestic risks and imagine beyond the established fatalist paradigms, the criticism that they attracted started to influence their ability of empathy and sensibility. Referring to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Booth and Wheeler also stress that "both sides have suffered traumas and an acute dislocation of reality through violence. The result of such experiences is always likely to threaten the prospects for moderate decision-making and cooperative diplomacy."[298]

When for the third time the leaders met in 1 July 2008, Christofias, as a precondition for giving his consent to the resumption of negotiations, called upon Talat to accept that the federation would have 'single sovereignty' and 'single citizenship'.[299] The two issues implied fundamentally uprooting the Turkish Cypriot political discourse as they referred to the unitary character of the state and brought the sides to the edge of failing the initiative before the negotiations had started. Christofias argued that in order to be able to

[296] Dag Hammarskjöld quoted in Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 237.

[297] Ibid.

[298] Ibid., p. 71.

[299] *Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus*, S/2008/744 (28 November 2008), p. 2.

explain to his community his acceptance of 'constituent states', he needed to declare that both sides agreed on these issues. Although Talat knew that this time he would attract much criticism, he accepted them 'in principle', with the clause that "the details of their implementation" would be discussed during the full-fledged negotiations,[300] in order to open the way for formal talks.

The 1 July meeting, right before the resumption of negotiations, nevertheless changed the whole atmosphere both on the negotiating table and in the Turkish Cypriot community. Talat was also in favour of 'single sovereignty' and 'single citizenship' and was very much aware of the fact that as with 'single international personality', a federation could not be based on having 'two sovereignties' and 'two citizenships', which would rather mean a confederation.[301] However, it was peculiarly for the reasons that the Turkish Cypriot society in line with its polity had a negative perception on these concepts, Annan Plan was drafted in such a way as to ensuring ambiguity over the concepts and also introduced the idea of 'internal citizenship' to counter the Turkish Cypriot fears.[302] Therefore, before presenting it as two single aspects, the Turkish Cypriot side preferred to put them into a package with their details of implementation resolved in the *due course* of negotiations in a manner soothing the Turkish Cypriot fears. Yet, forwarding the acceptance of the two issues as a precondition for the start of

[300] "Joint Statement by Greek Cypriot Leader Demetris Christofias and Turkish Cypriot Leader Mehmet Ali Talat," 1 July 2008, http://www.uncyprustalks.org/nqcontent.cfm?a_id=2575.

[301] "Talat: Birleşik Kıbrıs Olacaksa Tek Egemenlik ve Yurttaşlık Olacağı Kesindir," *Türk Ajansı Kıbrıs*, 3 July 2008.

[302] For the Turkish Cypriot negative views on the issues of single sovereignty and single citizenship, see *Investigating the Future: An In-depth Study of Public Opinion in Cyprus*, Cyprus 2015 Project, Interpeace (2009), p. 22.

negotiations, Christofias challenged in a way the bond with whom Talat had established. The security dilemma sensibility of Christofias over the 'constituent states' had culminated in such a domestic pressure on him that regressed the series of security dilemma sensibilities expressed by both leaders and transformed the practice of 'an integrative solution' to 'a mutually exclusive bargain'.[303]

Despite the challenges, the long-awaited negotiations after the failure of the Annan Plan resumed in 3 September 2008. In an effort to increase the level of empathy and build a bonding relationship, the leaders agreed on having tête-à-tête meetings where necessary before engaging into formal negotiations with the presence of delegations of both sides. However, those tête-à-tête meetings caused such a disparagement, especially from the Turkish Cypriot fatalists that the leaders had to abandon their channel of personally establishing empathy and return to formal negotiations in the form of business as usual.[304]

During the course of the negotiations, although the two sides were able to agree on various substantive issues, reflected in the form of 'convergence papers', their achievement did not suffice going beyond the initial security dilemma sensibilities, which eventually resulted in negotiations to be effectively characterized as deal-making rather than trust-building. Moreover, it was becoming evident that the looming ghosts of the fatalist

[303] Fierke describes empathy as "providing an opening 'for beginning to re-describe the conflict such that an integrative solution, rather than a mutually exclusive bargain, might be possible," in Karin M. Fierke, *Diplomatic Interventions: Conflict and Change in a Globalizing World* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2005), p. 148 quoted in Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 238.

[304] Ata Atun, "Tutanaksız Müzakereler," www.mailgazete.com/asp/devam_yazi.asp?idyazi=703; "Talat: Başbaşa Görüşme Yapmak Yeni Birşey Değil," *Kıbrıs Gazetesi*, 25 October 2008.

political discourses were still dominating the negotiating table to such an extent that the old debates on the semantics of the overall framework of a solution as well as of its parameters gained dynamism. When both leaders started to their 'blame-games' publicly, the negotiations had taken the form of traditional realism of the past. Within a year, Christofias started to accuse Talat putting forward proposals confederal in nature 'to upgrade the illegal regime in the north', while Talat accused Christofias putting proposals ensuring the unitary nature of the state 'to render the equal status of Turkish Cypriots meaningless'.

Nevertheless, both leaders continued to practice security dilemma sensibilities, yet by this time, the public perceptions on both sides were growing weary over the future of the negotiations as the blame-games intensified, and therefore the sensibility practices were capitalized by the fatalists on both sides so as to create suspicion over the *real* intentions of the leaders.[305] This was most illustrative in Talat's practice of security dilemma sensibility over the Greek Cypriot proposal relating to the 'cross-voting', which was initially rejected by the Turkish Cypriot side, but was later put forward as yet another precondition by Christofias for the acceptance of rotational presidency to which he declared his approval even before his election as the president.

Cross-voting, which was proposed for the first time by the Christofias leadership in the history of Cyprus negotiations, was based on the idea that "the election of the President and the Vice-President is not an election of the

[305] For a decreasing level of trust for the Turkish Cypriot leadership, see *Bridging the Gap in the Inter-communal Negotiations: An Island-wide Study of Public Opinion in Cyprus*, Cyprus 2015 Project, Interpeace (2011), p. 11; *Investigating the Future: An In-depth Study of Public Opinion in Cyprus*, p. 15. For a weary public opinion on negotiations, see Lordos, Kaymak and Tocci, *A People's Peace in Cyprus*, p. 4.

leaders of the two communities, and therefore, it cannot be done via the separate expression of the will of each community."[306] As "the election of President and Vice-President constitutes the election of the leadership of the Federal State," it will have to ensure that "it expresses the will of the citizens as a whole." For the Turkish Cypriot side, this proposal constituted a paradigmatic shift in terms of the election of the executive, which had always been based on the idea that the two communities would separately elect their representatives assuming the office of the federal executive. However, for those Turkish Cypriot fatalists, this was an unacceptable proposal, who put forward the argument that the cross voting would "fortify the unitary state" and "kill the two democracies."[307] Interestingly, the Greek Cypriot fatalists were also against the proposal, rejecting the idea that Turkish Cypriots would have a say on the election of the Greek Cypriot member of the executive.[308] In fact, as cross voting necessitated the politicians to devise policies conducive to the ideas of the other community, they were probably "more keenly aware of how their own political fortunes could be affected by cross-voting that would induce coalitions across the communities and impact their chances of getting elected at the margins."[309] In simple terms, cross-voting meant the impossibility of the election of Papadopouloses and Denktaşes as the nationalist politicians in one community would be marginalized through the vote of the other community. Although a precondition for the endorsement of rotational presidency, which the Turkish Cypriot side could not take the risk

[306] *Greek Cypriot Renewed Proposal on the Election of Federal Executive*, 17 September 2009.

[307] For the views of Serdar Denktaş on cross-voting, see "Tek Devleti Perçinler," *Kıbrıs Gazetesi*, 10 December 2009. Moreover, Eroğlu, who was the Prime Minister of TRNC at that time, appealed to and called on Turkey to convince Talat from accepting the proposal.

[308] For the views of DIKO Leader Karoyan and DISY Leader Anastasiades on cross-voting, see "Rum Basını: Hristofyas'ın Açıklamalarına Tepkiler Sürüyor," *Türk Ajansı Kıbrıs*, 20 March 2010.

[309] Beyatlı, Papadopoulou and Kaymak, *Solving the Cyprus Problem: Hopes and Fears*, p. 23.

of losing, Talat's practice of sensibility also came from his conviction that the cross voting mechanism would ensure that "the leaders aspiring for the presidency would have to take the sensitivities of the other community into consideration, which would indeed estrange them from fanaticism."[310] He furthermore stressed that "if cross voting was in place, the 1963 events might not have happened."[311]

In its capacity to ensure pro-peace policies and sustain a culture of peace at the federal level with leaders feeling obliged to address the sensitivities of both communities, cross voting suggests to be an ostensibly transcender mechanism. In fact, despite the harsh criticism of the Turkish Cypriot fatalists, the public opinion surveys showed that the Turkish Cypriot attitude towards having a cross voting system together with the rotational presidency was a positive one.[312] The Greek Cypriot attitude, on the other hand, was more ambivalent over the mechanism, mainly due to their relative rejection of the rotational presidency.[313]

Yet the debate over cross voting had been instrumental in two respects. Firstly, it showed that the negotiations between the two sides were highly conducted on the premises of a 'trade-off' logic, challenging to a greater extent the practices of security dilemma sensibility and more importantly the building up of the initial empathy and bonding between the two leaders to be carried to an upper level of trust-building process, which Booth and Wheeler identify as dependence and vulnerability. In case of Cyprus negotiations,

[310] Mehmet Ali Talat, "Çapraz oy olsaydı, 63 olayları olmayabilirdi," *Kıbrıs Postası*, 9 March 2012.

[311] See ibid.

[312] *Bridging the Gap in the Inter-communal Negotiations*, p. 17.

[313] Ibid., p. 16.

Talat's brief dependence on Christofias culminated in his sense of betrayal by the latter,[314] as the growing pessimism in Christofias over the prospects of finding a solution with Talat led to his rejection of the UN idea on publicly announcing the great deal of convergences achieved in the negotiations by the two leaders before the presidential election in the north in April 2010. Although Talat unilaterally announced the convergences via a wide press briefing, the fact that the Turkish Cypriot public attitude had already changed over the presidency of Talat in particular and the attainability of a federal solution in general led him to lose the elections to Derviş Eroğlu, whose policies vis-à-vis the Cyprus problem are mainly guided by the fatalism of the past (and indeed the present) Turkish Cypriot political discourse. In fact, as another factor, the debate of the cross voting mechanism had also affected a change in the electoral climate of the north, as Serdar Denktaş, the leader of Democratic Party, who was expected to support Talat in the elections, had changed his stance specifically due to the latter's acceptance of cross voting and instead supported Eroğlu.[315]

The transformation in the Turkish Cypriot community that was galvanized during the Annan Plan with a view to fundamentally changing the inherent problematic structures that had hitherto hindered Turkish Cypriot appeal for better governance and reintegration with the world, had come to a dramatic end with the return of old fatalism to the political discourses of the north in the conduct of negotiations. In the same manner, despite a brief period of optimism that brought Christofias to the presidency, the prevailing fatalism in the south led Christofias to announce that he would not run for the

[314] Mehmet Ali Talat, "Kıbrıs sorununda çözümsüzlüğün tek sorumlusu Hristofyas'dır," *Kıbrıs Postası*, 28 June 2011.

[315] "Serdar Denktaş: Talat, Dünü Unutun Diyor," *Türk Ajansı Kıbrıs*, 17 April 2010.

presidency for the second time as "the prospects over the solution of the Cyprus problem are dead."[316] As a matter of fact, the negotiations, which started with the transcender leaps of both communities and their leaders, have in effect collapsed. As Cyprus had failed the test once again, the next section attempts to analyze the reasons of this dramatic collapse through the mitigator logic of insecurity in the island.

The Dilemma in Cyprus: Why the Test Has Failed

Against the background of decades-long fatalism that resisted to a resolution of the conflict in Cyprus, the relatively brief period between 2004 and 2010 has contributed in various ways to comprehend that the established political and societal structures are not inherently fixed, but rather their transformation is possible. Although the failure of the peace efforts during the period has added another layer of pessimism as regards the 'intractability' of the Cyprus problem, the seemingly powerful ability of breaking away with the long-enduring fatalism through imagining leaps forward and practices of security dilemma sensibility has nonetheless shown that Cyprus is not doomed to fail eternally. There are strong grounds to believe that Cypriot communities can effectively be transformed to transcend their security dilemma in the form of Cyprus problem, if lessons are drawn from the collapse of mitigating efforts to successfully build upon the properties of trust and carry the two communities to a level where they can imagine a common future.

[316] Demetra Nicolaou, "President Christofias Says He will not Seek Re-election," *Cyprus News Agency*, 14 May 2012.

The period that was subject to transformations beyond comprehension before 2004 can at best be characterized as one which mitigated the security dilemma, but deliberately failed to transcend it. The mitigation came from both sides through a strong commitment for the reunification of the island under a federal system. However, before engaging into a critical analysis of the mitigating efforts, it is also necessary to briefly note on the problematic role played by the EU and the UN during that period. The EU's problematic role has emerged two-fold. On the one hand, in the period that led to the Annan Plan referenda, the state-centric approach of the EU in handling the Cyprus problem did further complicate the established political discourses of recognition and sovereignty through its inability to "imagine a legal or territorial status for the island other than that accorded its pre-existing member states."[317] Beyond that, EU's intervention on the problem had largely remained within the confines of its "imperialistic 'carrot and stick' policy whose governmentalising logic attempted at first to resolve the physical and statutory division of the island," rather than creating a conducive environment for the two communities to walk towards the path of reunification.[318] This assumption mainly derives from the EU's decision to unilaterally accept the Greek Cypriot side short of a political settlement in the island. As the incentives for the Greek Cypriot leadership in walking that path towards reunification were rendered meaningless, the entry of a divided country has created an 'anomaly' in the EU, which has further weakened its conflict resolution capacity as regards the inter-communal relations in

[317] Freerk J. Boedeltje, Olivier Thomas Kramsch, Henk Van Houtum and Roald Plug, "The Fallacious Imperial Geopolitics of EU Enlargement: The Case of Cyprus," *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, Vol. 98, No. 1 (2007), p. 134.

[318] Ibid.

Cyprus.[319] On the other hand, this anomaly has also negatively contributed in the post-2004 period not only in constraining the capacity of the EU to bring into effect sound policies that will work for strengthening the relations between the two sides as well as two communities, but it has also cemented the division as the EU has fallen prey of the problematic discourses of the island and further alienated the Turkish Cypriot community vis-à-vis its normative power and border transformation strategy.[320] Christou even argues:

> Ironically, in the case of Cyprus, the more reconciliatory climate has not emerged from EU action or policy, but through a domestic dynamic [election of a new GC leadership with Christofias] that has recaptured a spirit of cooperation between the two communities. The impact of the EU as a force for good has been ambiguous at best, with a limitation on what the EU can do, because of the differentiated interpretations and representations of the EU among the conflict parties in the Cyprus dispute.[321]

Richmond argues that the UN is also a 'victim' of this framework "despite the sentiments of its Charter, because it is the primary body in which recognition can be confirmed; it is also a state-centric body in which sovereignty is fiercely defended, often by referring to the Charter itself."[322] He further states: ". . . this has meant that it has had to deal with an asymmetric negotiating process blocked by conflicting claims to sovereignty over which it has clearly taken a stance in favour of current Greek Cypriot control of the

[319] Harry Anastasiou, "Cyprus as the EU Anomaly," *Global Society*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (2009), p. 129.

[320] Erol Kaymak, "Growing Apart, Cementing Division: Civil Society and Dearth of Ideas," in Ahmet Sözen, ed., *The Cyprus Conflict: Looking Ahead* (Famagusta: Eastern Mediterranean University Printing-House, 2008).

[321] George Christou, "The European Union, Borders and Conflict Transformation: The Case of Cyprus," *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 45, No. 1 (2010), p. 72.

[322] Oliver Richmond, "The Multiple Dimensions of International Peacekeeping: UN and EU Involvement in the Cyprus Conflict," in Thomas Diez, ed., *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict*, p. 119.

Republic of Cyprus."[323] However, what has proven more problematic in the case of the UN in Cyprus is its narrow peacekeeping capacity, rather than a full-fledged peacemaking capacity, despite the fact that apart from the existence of a peacekeeping force of the UN (UNFICYP), there is a 'good offices mission' of the UN Secretary General with a mandate to help the two sides to achieve a political settlement. Yet, through its state-centrism, the UN in Cyprus has also been unable to create and implement normative initiatives and mechanisms that will help the two sides as well as the two communities in questioning the established political discourses and addressing the societal problems generated by the division of the island. In simple terms, both the EU and the UN have been inefficient not only in de-naturalizing the division, but also in bringing forward 'norm-generating' and reconciliatory mechanisms. Their top-down approaches in fact have overlooked the value of those mechanisms in bringing closer the two communities. This is especially dramatic when one considers how the aspiration for EU membership has been transformed to a crisis of confidence on the part of the Turkish Cypriot community towards the EU.

The ensuing analysis of the post-2004 period from the perspective of the mitigator logic also reveals the challenges of peacemaking in Cyprus. To start with, the mitigator voices advance such logic of federalism that effectively problematizes the very foundations of the political discourses of fatalism, but which does not amount to successfully transform them. In the general sense, the mitigator voices perceive of the federation as a rational choice deriving from the fact that the international law, in the embodiment of the UN Security Council resolutions on Cyprus, strictly provides a federal framework for the

[323] Ibid., p. 126.

solution.[324] That is to say, searching for alternatives other than the federal solution would mean adopting policies that run contrary to the norms of the international law and questioning the 'realities' of the international community. Given these 'realities', it is believed by the Turkish Cypriot mitigators that the only option for Turkish Cypriots to acquire an equal partnership status in Cyprus and to become a part of the world community is through the establishment of a federation.[325] The Greek Cypriot mitigators, on the other hand, believe that as the advancement of a unitary state is not 'realistic', federalism, although seen as the biggest concession, is the most optimal solution, which will render both overturning the injustices (displacement and loss of use of property) made to them and putting an end to the abnormal and illegal division of the island caused by the events of 1974.[326] Hence, such mitigator voices, although crucial in terms of advancing the idea of cooperation and a common future between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots, have largely failed in addressing the societal insecurities and especially pursuing security policies that are conducive to building trust at the inter-communal level.

In this sense, the most illustrative policies of the mitigator logic appear in two respects, ironically in great resemblance to the fatalist logic on these aspects. Firstly, the mitigator voices on both sides pursue exclusionary policies in relation to the guarantee system, which its continuation for the Turkish Cypriots, while its abolishment for the Greek Cypriots have become perceived as an 'established fact' that will *naturally* derive from a future

[324] Aral Moral, "Talat: Birleşme Tanrı Kelamı Değil," *Kıbrıs Gazetesi*, 4 February 2008. Interviews with Mehmet Ali Talat and Ozdil Nami.

[325] Ibid.

[326] Anonymous Greek Cypriot interviewee.

settlement. This problematic established understanding had even led the two mitigator leaders *not* to enter into meaningful conversations, let alone negotiations, over the guarantees and to trivialize the security issues to such an extent that the chapter was only artificially handled by the two sides. The Turkish Cypriot mitigators argue that the Turkish guarantees should remain in effect also in the new state of affairs to be established by a federation.[327] In simple terms, this logic implies that while the societal security of Turkish Cypriots is provided (as the Annan Plan did), the societal insecurity of Greek Cypriots is undermined (the very reason that failed the Annan Plan). The Greek Cypriot mitigators, on the other hand, argue for the abolishment of the guarantee system, which they see their injustices stemming from. Not only they propose the abrogation of the Treaties of Alliance and Guarantee once and for all, they also demand guarantees from Turkey over the implementation of the new state of affairs if established.[328] Therefore, in the case of the guarantees, one community's security interest is expected to supersede over the interest of the other. When achieving a federation is perceived strictly from this rational perspective, then many future Annan Plans are likely to fail, as they will remain short of addressing the societal insecurities of both communities at the state policy level.

Secondly, the mitigators on both sides do not give credit to reconciliation efforts or rather treat them as of secondary importance.[329] This is not to suggest that their approach has a negative assessment of bi-communal relations or undermines the value of realizing inter-communal reconciliation,

[327] Interviews with Mehmet Ali Talat and Ozdil Nami.

[328] Anonymous Greek Cypriot interviewee.

[329] Interviews with Mehmet Ali Talat, Ozdil Nami and anonymous Greek Cypriot interviewee.

as was the case with the fatalist logic in the north that even banned the personal contact for decades, let alone a societal one. Hence, at a more personal and societal level, the mitigators give due importance to engaging in good relations with the other community and believe that a bonding that may be established between the communities at the social level will indeed contribute to the political discourses to a great extent.[330] Therefore, societal reconciliation will only have the effect of positively affecting the polities on both sides and making a settlement more liveable, not as a value in itself. Booth and Wheeler rightly asked: "Even if properties of trust can be realized at the level of the leaders, can they become embedded at the intersocietal level?"[331] In this respect, when attaining a level of trust between the leaders, as evidenced even in the case of Talat and Christofias with a long ideological history as the leaders of two 'brother' socialist parties, has proven to be such a tricky matter, how would the two communities, with a long history of mutual mistrust, be expected to build inter-societal bonding, short of any reconciliatory policies? For the mitigator leaders, the answer lies in tackling the hardest issues first and then the communities will follow. However, as shown by the case over the security chapter, the two leaders were relatively unable to take the security issues effectively with a view to attempting to understand the societal insecurities from the perspective of the other. With these insecurities untouched, it would be a naïveté to expect the mitigator voices to enter into a meaningful conversation over the future of guarantees. Even if the political leaders are able to agree upon a settlement plan, there is no guarantee that it will not be defeated in the referenda. Indeed, "the conclusion of political settlement . . . does not necessarily translate to

[330] Ibid.

[331] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 249.

effective results."[332] Following this, Diez and Pace questions 'the conclusion of a peace agreement' as a sufficient factor or not:

> The mere signing of an agreement is not sufficient . . . unless this agreement turns out to be a milestone towards lasting peace. To achieve lasting peace, however, the incompatibilities at the heart of a conflict need to be transformed, which requires broader societal changes in terms of the definition of identities and interests. We also, however, maintain that success does not have to be characterised by the disappearance of conflict. Rather, conflict will remain in any society – the crucial question is how conflict is dealt with, and how other conflict parties are seen within society.[333]

Moreover, in terms of addressing the security dilemma in a sensible way, the shortcomings of the mitigator perspectives have been evident on other crucial aspects of security; namely the ambiguous symbolism of weapons, or armies in the case of Cyprus. The ambiguous symbolism of armies in Cyprus has a tremendous effect to the societal insecurities. However, not only these considerations were largely omitted from the security agendas of the mitigator voices under the conditions of non-settlement, they have also shown a tendency towards disregarding the societal insecurities of the other community in case of a settlement.

From the Greek Cypriot perspective, this is most illustrative in the presence of the Turkish Army in the island. The controversy over the presence of the Turkish Army originates legally from the constitution of 1960, to which three annexes were attached, namely The Treaty of Establishment, the Treaty of Guarantee and the Treaty of Alliance, which had altogether come to establish

[332] Asaf Siniver, "Power, Impartiality and Timing: Three Hypotheses on Third Party Mediation in the Middle East," *Political Studies*, Vol. 54, No.4 (2006), p. 808.

[333] Thomas Diez and Michelle Pace, "Normative Power Europe and Conflict Transformation," Paper for Presentation at the 2007 EUSA Conference, Montreal (17-19 May 2007), p. 3

the (limited nature of) Republic of Cyprus. The Treaty of Alliance permits Turkey to station "650 Turkish officers, non-commissioned officers and men" and Greece to station "950 Greek officers, non-commissioned officers and men" in the island.[334] However, with the Turkish intervention in 1974, which was initiated to 'restore the constitutional order' deprived by the Greek coup, the Turkish Army had increased its presence over the years, instead of returning to the number necessitated by the Treaty of Alliance.[335] Although an exact number is not known to the public, it is estimated that the Turkish Army has roughly 40,000 troops in the island.[336] Drawing on this, the Greek Cypriot side argues that Turkey is in clear material breach of the Treaty of Alliance. As a matter of fact, numerous UN Security Council and General Assembly resolutions have condemned Turkey and requested "the withdrawal without further delay of all foreign armed forces and foreign military presence and personnel from the Republic of Cyprus and the cessation of all foreign interference in its affairs."[337] Besides, for the Greek Cypriot side, "the sheer scale" of Turkish military presence raises questions as to "its true rationale."[338] This argument mainly forms the ambiguous symbolism of the Turkish Army for the Greek Cypriots especially in relation to the numerical 'asymmetry' that it poses.[339]

---

[334] "Additional Protocol No. 1 of the Treaty of Alliance," in Nicholas Macris, ed., *The 1960 Treaties on Cyprus and Selected Subsequent Acts* (Mannheim und Mohnesee, 2003).

[335] Klearchos A. Kyriakides, "The 1960 Treaties and the search for security in Cyprus," *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (2009), p. 430.

[336] See *The Military Balance 2012*, International Institute for Strategic Studies (London, 2012), p. 103.

[337] *UN General Assembly Resolutions* 3212 (1974), 3395 (1975), 33/15 (1978), 34/30 (1979), 37/253 (1983) and *UN Security Council Resolutions* 353 (1974), 360 (1974), 889 (1993), 927 (1994), 969 (1994), 1000 (1995), 1032 (1995), 1062 (1996), 1092 (1996), 1117 (1997), 1146 (1997), 1178 (1998), 1217 (1998), 1251 (1999).

[338] Kyriakides, "The 1960 Treaties and the search for security in Cyprus," p. 431.

[339] *Letter by Glafcos Clerides, President of the Republic of Cyprus, to the UN Secretary-General Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali*, 17 December 1993 published in Glafcos Klerides, *Bir Dönemin Anıları*, p. 327.

As a means of reciprocating this asymmetry, the Greek Cypriot side has heavily relied on huge defence spending and pursued a policy of expanding, upgrading and modernizing its armed forces as well as its armaments, which were also condemned by the UN Security Council resolutions.[340] Indeed, the Greek Cypriot attempt to purchase sophisticated weaponry in 1997 culminated in a classical security dilemma in the island. Against the ambiguous symbolism of Turkish Army, the Greek Cypriot leadership under Clerides (a fatalist who has turned out to be a mitigator) decided to purchase S-300 anti-aircraft missiles from Russia. "The missiles had a 90-mile range able to reach southern Turkey and were to protect air and naval bases in southern Cyprus that would be used by Greece."[341] The Turkish side reciprocated through signing of a joint defence declaration between Turkey and TRNC, stating that "any attack on TRNC would be an attack on Turkey."[342] Although Clerides decided not to deploy the missiles a year later upon pressure from the international community, he defined the ambiguous symbolism of the presence of Turkish Army for the Greek Cypriot community earlier in 1993 as creating "serious anxieties and mistrust amongst the Greek Cypriot community regarding Turkish intentions."[343] He further stressed that "it also imposes on the Government of the Republic the need to increase the defensive capabilities of the country by purchasing arms" that came four years later in the form of S-300 anti-ballistic missiles.[344]

---

[340] *UN Security Council Resolutions* 1092 (1996), 1146 (1997) and 1178 (1998).

[341] Carol Migdalovitz, "Cyprus: Status of U.N. Negotiations and Related Issues," *CRS Report for Congress* (20 July 2007), p. 5; Aylin Güney, "The USA's Role in Mediating the Cyprus Conflict: A Story of Success or Failure?" *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35, No. 27 (2004), p. 35; Yannis A. Stivachtis, "Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean Region: Security Considerations, the Cyprus Imperative and the EU Option," in Thomas Diez, ed., *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union*, p. 43.

[342] Migdalovitz, "Cyprus: Status of U.N. Negotiations and Related Issues," p. 5.

[343] *Letter by Glafcos Clerides*, in ibid, *Bir Dönemin Anıları*, p. 327.

[344] Ibid.

The S-300 episode was the most serious, yet not the single episode that led the two sides to engage into classical security dilemmas in the military sense. The joint defence agreements between the Greek Cypriot side and Greece as well as between the Turkish Cypriot side and Turkey, and their respective joint military exercises that had been conducted in reciprocation throughout the years were instrumental in fortifying the security dilemmas in the military sense. Although when in 2008, Talat and Christofias suspended the conduct of military exercises in an effort to mitigate the military security dilemmas, the ambiguous symbolism of the armies continues to affect both communities in terms of societal insecurities. For the Turkish Cypriot side, not the presence of the Greek Cypriot National Guard with a total of 12,000 active armed forces, but the availability of 50,000 reserve units constitute the major ambiguous symbolism.[345] In the psyche of the Turkish Cypriots, the presence of these reserve units amount to the fatalist imagination that the Greek Cypriot men sleep with their guns hiding under their pillows, ready any time to attack.

As indicated in the subsequent UN Security Council resolutions since 1974, while "withdrawal of non-Cypriot forces" is regarded as a first step in restoring confidence between the two sides, "eventual demilitarization" is envisaged in the context of an overall comprehensive settlement. Indeed, starting from the 1979 High Level Agreement, all subsequent agreements and plans (i.e. 1986 Draft Framework Agreement and Ghali Set of Ideas) on Cyprus had foreseen the demilitarization of the island, although none was accepted by the Turkish Cypriot side with the exception of the 1979 High Level Agreement. As the culmination of the body of work that had been

[345] See *The Military Balance 2012*, International Institute for Strategic Studies (London 2012), p. 102.

constituted by the negotiations over the decades, the Annan Plan had envisaged a radical demilitarization, which called for dissolving all armed forces, including the reserve units. Yet, the plan did also include that as the Treaties of 1960 establishing the Republic of Cyprus "would apply *mutatis mutandis* to the new state of affairs," the symbolic number of Turkish and Greek contingent forces would remain in the island under the Treaty of Alliance.[346] Therefore, the ambiguous symbolism was not eliminated for the Greek Cypriots, who had indeed founded the plan unacceptable.

The failure of the mitigator leaders to even address these tantamount security concerns that fortify the societal insecurities has essentially implied the dominance of the naturalized and exclusionary character of the security policies under the fatalist political discourses on both sides. Therefore, in terms of the security considerations, it appears that the case in Cyprus is 'scratch a mitigator and find a fatalist'.

It is important at this point, however, to reflect on the Greek Cypriot political discourse that has hitherto envisaged the 'demilitarization' of the island, taking use of the various Security Council resolutions. When looked from the prism of a normative security approach, the Greek Cypriot vision of a military-free Cyprus and its subsequent security policies within the framework of negotiations – the demilitarization of the island and the removal of all foreign troops as well as an outdated guarantee system – can be claimed to have a transcender characteristic. However, the absolute justification that has been put forward amounts to rationally upholding the security interest of one community at the expense of the other. This is not to

[346] *The Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem*, 31 March 2004, Main Articles, Article 8. Paragraph 1b and Annex IV: Additional Protocol to the Treaty of Alliance.

suggest that this vision of military-free Cyprus should be undermined and disregarded. On the contrary, the promise of the two communities transforming into a pluralistic community of Cyprus is engraved in this very vision. Despite the seemingly great obstacles in front of realizing this vision due to the monopoly of the fatalist Greek Cypriot political discourse on the issue, it is a challenge that Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots should undertake together so as to break the fatalist monopoly over such a normative security approach. Not only the absolute justification of the Greek Cypriot political discourse through an invasion/occupation rhetoric, which highly alienates Turkish Cypriots, needs to be problematized; but it is also critical to open up the prospects for Turkish Cypriots to inherently internalize and embody this vision with a view to enabling both communities to aspire for a security community of Cyprus based on a common vision and a shared peaceful future. Indeed, the key to such an aspiration is, as Booth and Wheeler argue, building trust between the two communities and inducing into them an ability to imagine beyond their societal insecurities and embrace a common security vision for Cyprus that is purified from its military and strategic connotations. As Hadjipavlou rightly puts: "In the end, the best assurance of security is the 'disarmament of the minds', which is indeed a long-term process, but one that can lead to a new imaginary for the future."[347]

The near-dominance of the fatalist logic throughout the history of the Cyprus problem and the inability of the mitigator voices to break this fatalism, have articulated well up to this point why the security dilemma in Cyprus could not have been transcended. There is a need to learn looking from an

[347] Maria Hadjipavlou, "The Cyprus Conflict: Root Causes and Implications for Peacebuilding." *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 44, No. 3 (2007), p. 364.

alternative perspective on Cyprus; one that aspires to go beyond its essentially state-centric character and brings the societal insecurities to the fore with a view to challenging their reified nature and thus opening up the path for building mutual trust between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots. Despite the enormous fuss that the Annan Plan and the subsequent transformative period had created, their failure has clearly evidenced that without tackling with the deeper and broader aspects of the societal insecurities in the island, the search for a solution will not yield any result. Reconciling the societal insecurities is not "a natural process, but one that requires active efforts to overcome past obstacles."[348] In other words, the federal option will be an embraceable one only when mutual mistrust is de-naturalized and prospects for building trust are explored.

[348] Ibid., "Multiple Stories," p. 59.

PART III

TRANSCENDING THE SECURITY DILEMMA IN CYPRUS: TRUST THROUGH RECONCILIATION

CHAPTER 6

RECONCILIATION AND TRUST-BUILDING IN CYPRUS

In strictly general terms, practices of reconciliation at the state and societal levels are simply lacking in Cyprus. The political discourses of both sides have never formally engaged into such policies, even though an aspiration for reconciliation is evident at the societal level. Given the nature of societal insecurities, as ones constituting political agendas through which are reconstituted, reconciliatory approaches must be prioritized with an effect both on political discourses and inter-communal relations. Nevertheless, reconciliation is neither an easy subject, nor an easily attainable goal. A primary question then appears within the Cyprus context: Are reconciliation and trust-building between the two communities possible against a 'backdrop of uncertainty' and under the conditions of non-settlement?[349]

In an attempt to reflect on this complex question, this chapter aims to provide an account of (non)existing practices at the state and societal levels with a view not only to drawing from them the prospects for reconciliation, but also revealing any future possibilities for such 'therapeuthic' processes in soothing the societal insecurities and transcending the security dilemma in Cyprus. However, before attempting to do so, it is important to briefly note what is meant by 'reconciliation' as to be applied in the case of Cyprus.

[349] Nicos Trimikliniotis, "Introduction: Reconciliation and Citizenship in Cyprus: A Trans Communal Concept for Social Action," *The Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No.1 (Spring 2007), p. 13.

Reconciliation, in its simplest form, means "restoring friendship and harmony between the rival sides after conflict resolution, *or* transforming relations of hostility and resentment to friendly and harmonious ones."[350] Bar-Siman-Tov describes it as:

> Reconciliation may take place within divided societies or within one country after interethnic, interracial, or interreligious conflicts, which tend to be protracted, zero-sum conflicts, involve extensive violence, cost many casualties, and accumulate animosity and hatred . . . The reconciliation process should openly address painful questions of past conflict so as to build a foundation for normal peace relations. This may require a unilateral or mutual willingness to apologize for previous transgressions, unilateral or mutual forgiveness, an offer of appropriate compensation, a mutual perception of a just peace agreement (one that is responsive to the needs and fears of both sides), mutual satisfaction with the peace agreement and with the development of relations, mutual acceptance and respect for each other's national identity, internalization of the peace values, and a willingness to open a new chapter in the relationship.[351]

Bar-Tal and Bennink suggest that it is *the* process of reconciliation that "builds stable and lasting peace."[352] Therefore, reconciliation should not be approached as simply involving conflict resolution or signing of a mere agreement, but rather as one that goes beyond such formal agenda to "changing the motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes and emotions" of the conflicting parties as well as "the nature of their relationship" and "the parties themselves."[353] In a similar respect, Kelman points to reconciliation, not only as an outcome, but also as a process of conflict resolution outside the

---

[350] Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov, "Introduction: Why Reconciliation?" in ibid., ed., *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 4. Emphasis added.

[351] Ibid., p. 5.

[352] Daniel Bar-Tal and Gemma H. Bennink, "The Nature of Reconciliation as an Outcome and as a Process," in Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov, *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation*, p. 12.

[353] Ibid.

strictures of the rationalist thinking informed by interests.[354] As a dynamic and complex process, reconciliation first of all should attempt to "redesign" the relationship between the conflicting parties in a way that they move from "a divided past to a shared future."[355]

Moreover, Hadjipavlou argues that reconciliation is more than the "co-existence of formerly hostile groups living near each other" and also more than "formerly hostile groups interacting and working together," but it is rather "the capacity to reach to the other, feel empathy for their suffering and engage in shared social activities."[356] Desmond Tutu also contends that reconciliation is:

> A way to transform individuals, and the whole of society. It is a way to look at perpetrators of human rights and see brothers and sisters. A way to look at the victim in oneself and see a survivor. Through reconciliation, we can see the fluidity of everything in the universe: how the past influences the present and the future… how we are all victims, perpetrators, bystanders, everyone part of the same family of humanity. Reconciliation embodies the idea of the oneness of everything.[357]

It is the reconciling effort that helps the conflicting societies to see the 'humanity' of each other through which they may perceive the possibility of "constructing a new relationship" and move towards trust-building.[358] In this

[354] Herbert C. Kelman, "Reconciliation as Identity Change: A Social-Psychological Perspective," in Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov, *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation*, p. 112.

[355] David Bloomfield, "Reconciliation: An Introduction', in David Bloomfield et al., eds., *Reconciliation After Violent Conflict: A Handbook*, Stockholm, IDEA (2003), pp. 10-18.

[356] Hadjipavlou, "Multiple Stories," pp. 58-59.

[357] Archbishop Desmond Mpilo Tutu, "Forward," in Erin Daly and Jeremy Sarkin, *Reconciliation in Divided Societies: Finding Common Ground* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), pp. ix-x.

[358] Hadjipavlou, "Multiple Stories," p. 59.

sense, reconciliation has a normative and a moral aspect, and the process is very much implicated by the societal insecurities in terms of its exigent ability to address the fears and traumas inherent in one community so as to render it conducive to the idea of constructing a new relationship with the other. Having said that, reconciliation is an elusive concept and the process is not without its problems.

> The widespread commitment to the politics of reconciliation coupled with the lack of any agreement whatsoever as to what reconciliation means presents both conceptual and pragmatic challenges. People do not know what to expect from governmental programs promising reconciliation. Governments do not know what promises are reasonable to make, nor what steps are necessary to meet those promises. Social scientists do not know how to measure whether programs have worked. Donors do not know how long reconciliation will take. No one knows how to determine whether reconciliation has been accomplished.[359]

Daly and Sarkin further ask: "Is it national unity? Is it peace? Is it healing? Is it empathy? Is it stability? Is it harmony? Is it developing a democracy that ensures the fullest sense of inclusivity? . . . Is it all of these? Or none? Is it just moving on?"[360]

As suggested, reconciliation does not have an all-encompassing meaning and indeed it means different things for different people under different contexts. Therefore, the process of reconciliation acquires meaning within a contextual framework. And its potential tools to transform derive from this very context. In cases like Cyprus, where the societal insecurities are frozen in the time, the

[359] Erin Daly and Jeremy Sarkin, "Preface," in ibid., *Reconciliation in Divided Societies: Finding Common Ground* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), p. xiii.

[360] Ibid., "The Lay of the Land," in ibid., p. 5.

task of enabling the communities towards seeing such possibility of a new relationship is a much more challenging one. As the post-conflict moment had remained unchanged, it has further been complicated over the years by the political discourses in terms of sustaining the historic enmities at the societal level through exclusionary policies. Therefore, reconciliation in such protracted conflicts requires a multi-faceted task and a multi-dimensional approach, yet not without an institutionalized form.

By institutionalizing reconciliation, it is not suggested *per se* to put reconciliation efforts under the monopoly of the state. Retrospectively, even the mitigator voices see them as of secondary importance or rather prioritize the formal negotiations over the reconciliatory policies. However, peace-building does not only require conducting negotiations, but also necessitates an endorsement of pro-peace policies with a view to galvanize communities towards a culture of peace. As was formerly argued, a conflict does not end with a formal agreement; but without effectively creating a community enmeshed with a culture of peace, the conflict will nevertheless survive in the society with an adversarial effect in further complicating the relations. Hadjipavlou contends that this is why "the process of reconciliation needs to penetrate deep into the societal fabric" and include all the segments of communities "in order for trust and cooperation to begin by evolving as well as a consideration of each party's concerns, fears, grievances, needs and interests."[361] Thus, reconciliation is not only needed at the time of a formal agreement, but more critically in eliminating societal insecurities to prepare the grounds for a successful completion and survival of a future agreement. Nevertheless, for two communities whose strained relationship has stretched

[361] Hadjipavlou, "Multiple Stories," p. 70.

over the time, there appears a need to effectively socialize them so as to reinforce individual, group and private initiatives that had long subjected to the demonization of entering even into contacts with the other.[362] And it is where the two leaderships should play the role alike; in facilitating channels for both communities in various ways to render various segments of the society to see the possibility of a new relationship that can in return reinforce a culture of peace.

Reconciliation in Cyprus: An Overview of Existing Practices in Cyprus

The need for reconciliation in Cyprus is beyond doubt. Yet, as Trimikliniotis stresses:

> The content of reconciliation needs to be developed and articulated in order to define the terms of reference of the necessary dialogue in a new developed 'common public space' between and within the two communities and beyond. Such a dialogue has spasmodically taken place in the past; however, it requires a broadening of its basis and a deepening of its meaning. The social, political, economic, cultural, symbolic and moral dimensions of reconciliation in the particular context of Cyprus need to be elaborated to serve as the broad framework and reference point for potential citizens' actions and initiatives.[363]

In Cyprus, the only content for reconciliation that has been made available by the statist political discourses to date is the confidence building measures

[362] Ibid., "The Cyprus Conflict," p. 363.

[363] Trimikliniotis, "Introduction: Reconciliation and Citizenship in Cyprus: A Trans Communal Concept for Social Action," p. 14.

(CBMs). In the context of the Cyprus problem, the conduct of CBMs has nevertheless turned out to be synonymous with the formal negotiations and with the same negative connotation for both communities. This is mainly because, as a predominantly state practice, CBMs have been mainly employed by the UN when the formal negotiations collapsed. As the two sides have approached these measures in the same manner as they did to negotiations, the measures have fallen prey of the problematic discourses on recognition and sovereignty, and were never realized. As Nejatigil accepts: "As either side did not recognise the other, very little progress was made on these issues."[364] In fact, instead of building confidence between the two sides, the continuous failure of CBMs has built mistrust between the two communities.

The idea of CBMs was first introduced to Cyprus in 1979 High Level Agreement as "initial practical measures by both sides to promote goodwill, mutual confidence and the return to normal conditions."[365] These measures mainly involved to address some practical problems deriving from the immediate effects of the division of the island; such as travel restrictions back and forth, unfinished infra-structure projects relating to water and sewage master plans and economic embargoes on the Turkish Cypriots.[366] Nevertheless, the two sides could not reach to an agreement over the measures due to the problem of recognition by implication. The effort was reinitiated in 1993 when the Ghali Set of Ideas had collapsed, yet which lasted about a year. This time, apart from the practical matters, the package

[364] Nejatigil is the former Attorney-General of TRNC and a long time legal advisor of Denktaş. See Nejatigil, *Our Republic in Perspective*, p. 53.

[365] *Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus*, S/13369 (31 May 1979), p. 13.

[366] Nejatigil, *Our Republic in Perspective*, p. 51.

included providing for inter-communal cooperation, at the expert level, in fields like culture, education, sports, journalism, commerce, health and environment as well as for the opening of the fenced area of Varosha under the control of Turkish Army and the Nicosia Airport in the buffer zone.[367] As the leaders tackled more on the relatively 'hard' issues of and eventually could not agree on the opening of Varosha and Nicosia Airport, the CBM package failed once more and the aspects pertaining to inter-communal cooperation were not efficiently dealt with.

Until 2004, CBMs in similar nature as well as military ones (i.e. unmanning in areas close to settlements, demining and suspension of military exercises) were tried to be initialized, but none did yield any result. After 2004, CBMs were mainly introduced on the opening of more checkpoints, which also proved to be a difficult practice due to territorial disputes and military issues, yet with some historical achievement such as the opening of the symbolic Ledra Street in 2008 and the Yeşilırmak/Limnitis checkpoint in 2010 that crosses through a Turkish military area. Since 2008, military exercises have also been suspended, not as a part of CBMs, but through the mutual agreement of the two leaders. Furthermore, the inception of technical committees on matters relating to the practical and day-to-day issues, which were initiated with the 21 March Agreement in 2008, has been the most comprehensive form of cooperation between the two sides to date. Nevertheless, due to the fact that the committees were formed of the official representatives of each side, who attended the meeting not in their 'official' capacities, but as 'experts', no sound measures were achieved, especially in terms of inter-communal dialogue and reconciliation.

[367] *Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus*, S/26026 (1 July 1993), annex i, p. 15.

It was in 2006 that the establishment of a reconciliation commission was proposed as a part of a CBM package by the Turkish Cypriot side. This proposal was a first in the history of the Cyprus problem to date with a clear reflection on reconciliation.[368] The idea of a reconciliation commission, as proposed by the Turkish Cypriot side, was mainly based on the Reconciliation Commission foreseen in the Annan Plan. It was proposed "to promote understanding, tolerance and mutual respect between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots," but no further modalities were expressed other than that it would be composed of an equal number of Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots. As with most of the CBMs, this proposal was not taken up by the two leaders for further discussion.

Nevertheless, the idea of the establishment of a commission relating to a reconciliatory effort under the conditions of non-settlement is a one that needs serious and critical consideration by the two sides. As envisaged in the Annan Plan, the Reconciliation Commission was mandated "with the objective of promoting understanding, tolerance and mutual respect between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots:"

> to promote a dispassionate dialogue between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots regarding the past, by addressing, inter alia, historical perspectives, experiences, and memories; prepare a comprehensive report on the history of the Cyprus Problem as experienced and interpreted by Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots; make specific recommendations for action by the federal government and the constituent states aimed at promoting reconciliation, including guidelines for publications and school textbooks so as to promote mutual understanding of different perspectives on the past; make

[368] *Letter of Mehmet Ali Talat, President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus to the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan*, 6 July 2006. Also proposed in the *Turkish Cypriot Revised Package of Proposals on Confidence Building Measures*, 16 October 2008, presented to the UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon in a meeting held in the UN Headquarters, New York.

> recommendations for the implementation of the requirement in the Constitution for the teaching of the official languages to all secondary school students; and make recommendations on guidelines for the observance of secular public holidays by the constituent states.[369]

In contrast to the South African experience of Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the Reconciliation Commission in the Annan Plan did not foresee any 'truth' mechanism and thereby would have "no prosecutorial or other criminal legal function or powers."[370] Therefore, as Kaymak stresses, the commission would "serve the end of reconciliation better than a full blown truth and reconciliation commission."[371] In simple terms, the commission's mandate was highly limited to writing an official historical text and ran short of "embracing the wider challenge of contributing to the construction and maintenance of a viable society and polity."[372]

Interestingly, there is a wide-spread tendency in Cyprus against the establishment of truth or restitutive justice mechanisms, as even mainly argued in contra by some studies on reconciliation in Cyprus.[373] Their main argument is that as Cyprus is a small island, pinpointing individuals as the perpetrators of past crimes and subsequently effecting a punishment mechanism would be more harmful on inter-communal relations and would not serve the desired aim for addressing the societal traumas with a view to

---

[369] *The Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem*, 31 March 2004, Main Articles, Main Articles, Article 11 and Annex VIII: Reconciliation Commission, p. 134.

[370] Ibid., Annex VIII: Reconciliation Commission, Article 3, para. 6.

[371] Erol Kaymak, "Does Cyprus Need a Truth and Reconciliation Commission?" p. 71.

[372] Ibid.

[373] See ibid.; Virginie Ladisch, "The Challenge of Peacebuilding: Cypriot Views on Reconciliation," *The Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No.1 (Spring 2007); Djelal Kadir, "Truth and Reconciliation on Cyprus will be Possible, when …" *The Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No.1 (Spring 2007).

healing them.[374] Therefore, as the drafters of the plan had similar convictions, "the intent was to deal with a societal or inter-communal need for reconciliation rather than individual needs for truth on the fate of the missing or for restitutive justice."[375] In fact, the truth aspect of the process has been de-coupled from the reconciliation aspect in Cyprus through the establishment of a Committee on Missing Persons (CMP) as early as in 1981 by an agreement between the two sides and under the auspices of the United Nations.[376] It is one of the only institutionalized bi-communal committees in Cyprus as an investigatory body to tackle the humanitarian problem of the persons reported missing in the inter-communal fighting as well as in the events of July 1974 and afterwards.[377] The mandate of the CMP was made clear again that it does not attempt to "establish the cause of death or attribute responsibility for the death of missing", but to "establish the fate of missing persons."[378] It is argued that as "the revelation of truth would suggest that various versions of history prove to be erroneous or omitted . . . it is unlikely that these facts would help anyone adjudicate between the contending perspectives on sovereignty."[379]

In his analysis on the proposed commission in the Annan Plan, Kaymak comes to the conclusion that the "ontology of the new state of affairs," as based on constructive ambiguity on matters relating to the contested

[374] Interviews with Mehmet Ali Talat and Özdil Nami; See also the views of Katie Clerides, a Greek Cypriot member of the parliament, quoted in Ladisch, "The Challenge of Peacebuilding," p. 100.

[375] Kaymak, "Does Cyprus Need a Truth and Reconciliation Commission?" p. 73.

[376] Committee on Missing Persons Fact Sheet, April 2012, http://www.cmp-cyprus.org/media/attachments/CMP/CMP%20docs/CMP%20Fact%20Sheets/CMP_Fact_Sheet__April12.pdf

[377] Ibid.

[378] The Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus, *Terms of Reference*, Article 11.

[379] Kaymak, "Does Cyprus Need a Truth and Reconciliation Commission?", p. 77.

discourses of recognition and sovereignty, "the plan could be interpreted in substantially different ways."[380] Moreover, he contends that both communities have emphasized their "freedom defined ethnically" and those 'primordialist historiographies' and 'ethnic narratives', in turn, make truth very difficult to negotiate.[381]

Kadir posits in a similar manner that "reconciliation and truth commissions have proved apt for places such as South Africa, for example, precisely because those who shaped the facts and their truth approached obsolescence, or were marginalised from the national scene, or were obliged to relinquish control of fact-making and truth manufacturing by circumstances they could no longer determine or direct."[382] However, he further argues:

> Those who command the conditions and possibilities of facts and their truth, in other words, those who determine Realpolitik, especially in a circumscribed arena like the Island of Cyprus that approaches conditions of a laboratory control-group in a small terrain, tend to be rather nervous, not to say obsessive-compulsive in their diligent endeavours to manage circumstances and their Realpolitik. This is so because the size of their theatre of operation and the consistency of their modus operandi make them quite obvious and transparent to the scrutiny of anyone who would care to scrutinise or analyse them with any honest objectivity and historical insight . . . When speaking of truth and reconciliation it is imperative to be truthful. The truth of the matter is that 'Cyprus' is now multiple, de facto partitioned into two entities, and each only refers to the other and addresses the other in quotation marks.[383]

[380] Ibid. p. 76.

[381] Ibid.

[382] Kadir, "Truth and Reconciliation on Cyprus will be Possible, when …" p. 164.

[383] Ibid.

As put forward by the study of Ladisch on how Cypriots view reconciliation, the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriots do also share the view that "retributive justice is not one of the pressing concerns that surfaces in people's reflections on reconciliation."[384] She explains that:

> While there is disagreement over the origin of the Cyprus problem, there was a significant level of consensus about the term 'reconciliation'. Overall, the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot definitions of reconciliation were very similar, focusing primarily on understanding, dialogue, and acknowledgement . . . In this sense reconciliation, according to those interviewed, is understood in social/political terms rather than in spiritual terms. The emphasis was on creating dialogue and mutual understanding about the past, acknowledging the harm done on both sides, and moving forward.[385]

Therefore, in the Cypriot context, 'truth' is perceived to be in opposition to the very idea of reconciliation between the two communities. However, the mandate of the Reconciliation Commission as proposed in the Annan Plan and likewise in the Turkish Cypriot proposal is highly limited in the sense that reconciliation is interpreted as a mere account of the past. The vision of constructing a new relationship between the two communities will nonetheless require more than addressing the past – an interpretation of the past and the present with a power to transform the existing polity and society on both sides of the island into a pluralistic society of Cyprus. Although the establishment of a reconciliation commission is a promising idea that has to be pursued through the state policies, it needs to evolve as an 'inclusive' and a 'transparent' effort that will embody civil society initiatives, require significant input from the various segments of the communities and

[384] Ladisch, "The Challenge of Peacebuilding: Cypriot Views on Reconciliation," pp. 97-99.

[385] Ibid., pp. 97-98.

spirit up the individuals to question their ethnically defined identities, without trivializing their particularities.[386]

Ladisch's study also reveals that beyond a specific reconciliation commission as described in the Annan Plan, the two communities are in favour of utilizing other tools that could be even more effective in promoting reconciliation.[387] These tools include an official apology from representatives of both sides, training seminars in the workplace to prepare people to eventually work together in the federal government, informative media campaigns, and a true development of economic cooperation between the two sides that has remained too limited until now within the framework of the EU Green Line Regulation. However, Ladisch's study also demonstrates that "the most frequently cited tool for promoting reconciliation was education, and more specifically history education."[388]

History education has been one of the most problematic practices as it is mainly fed through exclusionary primordialist accounts of history and nationalist irredentism. For the Greek Cypriot textbooks, Makriyianni and Psaltis argue that:

> Unfortunately the ethnocentric grand narratives offered in the Greek-Cypriot history textbooks do not even fulfil the minimum requirements of decentration. A convincing analysis of these ideological orientations may be identified in all textbooks produced in Cyprus, where the history of the island is presented as part of Greek national history and terms such as 'Greek' and 'Cypriot' are used

[386] Ibid., pp. 87-88; Nicos Trimikliniotis, "Reconciliation and Social Action in Cyprus: Citizens' Inertia and the Protracted State of Limbo," *The Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No.1 (Spring 2007), p. 131-135.

[387] Ladisch, p. 101.

[388] Ibid.

> interchangeably or synonymously. An unbroken, Hellenic continuity is constructed from the twelfth century BCE until the present day with the multiethnic structure of the population being systematically ignored.[389]

Papadakis, on the other hand, gives a similar account of Turkish Cypriot history textbooks:

> The period that receives most emphasis in the books is 1963-1974, presented as a homogeneous barbaric onslaught of "Rums" against the "Turks" in Cyprus, all part of a plan (the Akritas Plan, a Greek Cypriot-inspired plan which aimed to bring about Union with Greece, by force if necessary, whose origins and implementation are still disputed) aiming to eradicate the "Turks," this being a period when the "Rums" displayed "such savagery and barbarism that the world has seldom seen." This period is presented in great detail, village by village and day by day when battles, killings, mass graves or displacements took place, illustrated with gruesome photographs and graphic descriptions. One photograph, for example, presents a Turkish Cypriot man kneeling in front of charred corpses unearthed from a mass grave.[390]

Johnson's study on education covering the both sides provides a more generalized overview of the simulation of 'historic enmities' in the classrooms and presents a problematic interpretation of the Cyprus problem with greater implications for the sustainment of societal insecurities:

> From a systemic perspective, mistrust toward 'the other' continues to be reinforced on the part of children, if not by deliberate design then as the outcome of the singular ethno-political worldview they are exposed to in their schools . . . I recall one teacher from a rural G/C elementary school who shared this account of an incident in her

[389] Chara Makriyianni and Charis Psaltis, "The Teaching of History and Reconciliation," *The Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No.1 (Spring 2007), p. 56.

[390] Papadakis, "History Education in Divided Cyprus," p. 14.

> classroom: following a student's class reading of a poem that focused on the beauty of trees, the school principal who was visiting in the class that afternoon followed the reading by launching into an unsettling account of how "the Turks took away all our trees". For these youngsters, the impact of this single event was to subtly reinforce the message of injustice and fear related to their counterparts in the north. Equally disturbing was the account shared by a T/C secondary student who said she was taught by one of her class teachers that all Greek Cypriots carry weapons, thus reinforcing in her young mind the notion that her Greek neighbours to the south were to be feared and defended against (which she admitted to still feeling). [391]

Drawing from her study, Johnson reflects on the overall education system on both sides as one that builds the societal insecurities into the psyches of individuals starting from early ages and that turns out to be an implicatively moral problem with negative consequences on internalizing a healthy inter-communal perspective:

> In divided societies where children are educated in ethnically segregated systems, mistrust and hostility toward the other can be reinforced in these ways, especially when there are no other systemic opportunities built in for students to develop tolerance of differences across the divide. When people continue to harbour feelings of injustice in relation to 'the other,' as is commonly the case in post-conflict zones where acts of previous violence have destroyed lives, property and dignity, it is very difficult to negotiate coexistence.[392]

The fatalist education system has indeed been problematized by the mitigator voices on both sides. With the change of the leadership in 2004, the first attempt came from the Turkish Cypriot side to unilaterally change the history textbooks taught in the classrooms in the north. A comparative study

[391] Laurie Johnson, "Reconciliation and Peace Education in Cyprus: What Will It Take?", pp. 22-23.

[392] Ibid.

conducted by Papadakis demonstrates that a more inclusionary account of history of Cyprus was provided with the new history textbooks, as one that is commonly shared by Turkish and Greek Cypriots with a stress on the 'Cypriotness' rather than ethnically divided communities:

> The most important difference lies in their approach to the concepts nation, nationalism and identity. The term "motherland" is now never used for Turkey, while the terms "our island" or "our country" are often used for Cyprus. The more generic identifiers "Cypriots" and "people," words that can include both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, are now also used. It is explained that Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots had many similarities and that what divided them were the forces of nationalism and the British "Divide and Rule" policies. Indeed, various caricatures showing "a Turkish Cypriot" and "a Greek Cypriot" often present them as exactly the same. The word "Turks" is now almost never used for Turkish Cypriots, employing instead "Turkish Cypriots" (Kıbrıslı Türkler) throughout, a term placing more semantic emphasis on the -Cypriot part. The problematic term "Rum" is still used for Greek Cypriots but in a different form, as Kıbrıslı Rumlar (Rumcypriots, is the closest translation), which is analogous to the term "Turkish Cypriots". These new terms of identity now share the designation "-Cypriots."[393]

A similar initiative was also instigated by the Greek Cypriot leadership in 2008 through a policy initiative under the Ministry of Education and Culture with the aim of developing 'a culture of peaceful coexistence' between the two communities.[394] Although the initiative remained short of changing the history textbooks, it maintained a general approach for peace education in the south. As these unilateral attempts did not evolve to become an established political discourse, they were nevertheless been challenged by

[393] Papadakis, "History Education in Divided Cyprus," p. 18.

[394] Michalinos Zembylas, "Ethnic Division in Cyprus and a Policy Initiative on Promoting Peaceful Coexistence: Toward an Agonistic Democracy for Citizenship Education," *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (2011), p. 53.

the fatalists on the grounds that students are taught to forget about their painful past and their overarching 'national' cause.[395] In fact, criticisms in the south never enabled the Christofias government to realize the desired change of the history textbooks in the south. A more dramatic change came in the north, when the Nationalist Union Party (UBP) came to power back in 2009, which replaced the new textbooks with the old ones.

An analysis of the policies of the mitigator voices with a reflection on reconciliation has shown that even limited attempts failed in the due course and were never amounted to initiate a breakaway from the fatalism dominating the political agendas. Furthermore, at a more societal level, the efforts of bi-communal groups, which were conducted prior to the opening of the checkpoints in the buffer zone under the auspices of third parties, such as the US, Britain, Germany and Sweden, as demonized by the fatalist political discourses, had remained narrow in content and context in terms of reaching to a wider public. After the opening of the crossings, although bi-communal groups have been more active due to the lifting of various restrictions on communication and favourable policies of the mitigator logic, their exclusive and homogenous character has restricted to a large extent the civic participation and thus the ability to reach out to a wider public. Trimikliniotis has stressed in that sense:

> A series of events since the referenda in spring 2004 have adversely affected not only the rapprochement movement but also the prospects

[395] For Turkish Cypriot views, see Ahmet Savaşan, DP representative, "Tarih Kitapları Değişecek," *Kıbrıs Gazetesi*, 1 April 2009; Derviş Eroğlu, the then leader of UBP, "Tarih Kitaplarını Değitireceğiz, Kolejleri Yeniden Açacağız," *Kıbrıs Gazetesi*, 3 April 2009; Rauf Denktaş, "Tarih Kitaplarının Gözden Geçirilmesi Lazım, *Kıbrıs Gazetesi*, 4 April 2009; For Greek Cypriot views, see Marios Karoyan, leader of DIKO, *Kıbrıs Gazetesi*, 21 November 2008; Archbishop Chrisostomos, *The Cyprus Mail*, 7 November 2008; Andreas Themistokleus, DISI representative, *Kıbrıs Gazetesi*, 11 August 2008; Vasos Lissaridis, EDEK representative, *Kıbrıs Gazetesi*, 29 September 2008.

> of a dialogue at citizen level. The result is that bi-communal activities are limited to symbolic gestures of friendship and common heritage, while the hot issues which today concern and affect the average person from both communities remain underdiscussed, unresolved and often fall prey to the politicians' televised discussions. As time goes by it is imperative to critically reflect the past and look to the future.[396]

Another public opinion survey has concluded, however, that "substantive dialogue is possible between members, institutions and associations of civil society," as there is an 'openness' to some form of co-existence, forgiving, convergence about social norms, more economic cooperation and a solution.[397] The study has also concluded that this 'openness' to various forms of inter-communal dialogue does however not allow the two communities to ask for a full-fledged reconciliation as "there are serious concerns about security; somehow, while the status quo does not seem to offer security, its abandonment is wracked by fears."[398]

Still the question of achieving a sustainable inter-communal dialogue looms over the prospects for reconciliation. Nevertheless, this 'backdrop of uncertainty' is an inescapable phenomenon, as theorized by Booth and Wheeler, and more so under the conditions of non-settlement in the island. The current plight of the inter-communal relations clearly demonstrates that 'rethinking' those fears at various levels is imperative in order to break the fatalism both in the minds and the policies. In order for societal energy be channelled into a force for reconciliation, mutual understanding and

---

[396] Trimikliniotis, "Introduction: Reconciliation and Citizenship in Cyprus: A Trans Communal Concept for Social Action," p. 13.

[397] Sitas, Latif and Loizou, *Prospects of Reconciliation, Co-Existence and Forgiveness in Cyprus in the Post-Referendum Period*, p. 63.

[398] Ibid.

reunification, the sources of insecurity that have become entrenched deeper by the day need to be problematized through and through.[399]

Reconciliation in Cyprus: Testing the Properties of Trust

Besides a vast array of anthropological studies in Cyprus, there has been a rise since 2004 on the study of polling data ('peace polls'), testing the public opinion in both communities pertaining to issues arising from the Cyprus problem. This polling data has also shown that despite the availability of a relative 'openness' for reconciliation; fear, suspicion and mistrust in varying degrees and under different contexts are ever present as the main obstacles in front of a healthy inter-communal dialogue and trust-building as well as a sustainable solution.[400] Through an analysis of this polling data, this study attempts at this point to reflect on elusive concepts such as fear, mistrust and trust as part of the relative focus on societal insecurities with a view to critically revealing their sources, dynamics and eventually the potential for building trust in Cyprus.

[399] Trimikliniotis, "Reconciliation and Social Action in Cyprus: Citizens' Inertia and the Protracted State of Limbo," p. 126.

[400] Alexandros Lordos, *Can the Cyprus Problem be Solved? Understanding the Greek Cypriot Response to the UN Peace Plan for Cyprus*, Cyprus Polls (2004); ibid., *Options for Peace*; ibid., *Civil Society Diplomacy: A New Approach for Cyprus?* Cyprus Polls (2005); ibid., "Rational Agent or Unthinking Follower? A Survey-Based Profile Analysis of Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot Referenda Voters,"; *The UN in Cyprus: An Inter-communal Survey of Public Opinion*, UNFICYP (2008); Kaymak, Lordos and Tocci, *Building Confidence in Peace: Public Opinion and the Cyprus Peace Process*; Lordos, Kaymak and Tocci, *A People's Peace in Cyprus*; *Investigating the Future: An In-depth Study of Public Opinion in Cyprus* (2009); *Next Steps in the Peace Talks*; *Public Opinion and the Property Issue*, Cyprus 2015 Project, Interpeace (2010); Beyatlı, Papadopoulou and Kaymak, *Solving the Cyprus Problem: Hopes and Fears*; *Bridging the Gap in the Inter-communal Negotiations: An Island-wide Study of Public Opinion in Cyprus*; *Negotiating the Core Issues: The Importance of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot Public Opinion*, Cyprus 2015 Project, Interpeace (2012).

The polling data is almost uniform in putting forward the issue of security and guarantees as the most prioritized issue for both communities vis-à-vis the solution of the Cyprus problem.[401] As a matter of fact, the two consecutive surveys, conducted by Cyprus Polls right after the failure of the Annan Plan in 2004, have clearly demonstrated that security considerations, in the form of the continuation of the Treaties of Guarantee and Alliance, the concerns over the implementation due to the former and the presence of 'settlers' that is seen as a strictly security issue, mainly constituted the 'no' of the Greek Cypriots.[402] In terms of the overall Greek Cypriot perceptions over the security chapter, the polls until 2012 have indicated that those security considerations have continued to prevail and that the Greek Cypriots reject the very idea of the continuation of the guarantee system with outstanding majorities.[403] Moreover, the poll conducted by UNFICYP posits to the very presence of the Turkish troops as the main source of insecurity for Greek Cypriots.[404] In a similar manner, the polls point attention to the underlying attitude of the Greek Cypriots that the abolishment of the Treaties of Guarantee and Alliance and the complete and immediate withdrawal of Turkish troops are the main sources of motivation for a future settlement.[405]

---

[401] *Negotiating the Core Issues*, p. 1; *The UN in Cyprus*, p. 7; Kaymak, Lordos and Tocci, *Building Confidence in Peace*, p. 43. Lordos, Kaymak and Tocci, *A People's Peace in Cyprus,* p. 9; *Investigating the Future*, p. 23; *Next Steps in the Peace Talks*, p. 12; Beyatlı, Papadopoulou and Kaymak, *Solving the Cyprus Problem: Hopes and Fears*, p. 83.

[402] Lordos, *Can the Cyprus Problem be Solved?* p. 40 and ibid, *Options for Peace*, p. 153.

[403] Lordos, *Options for Peace*, p. 56; Lordos, Kaymak and Tocci, *A People's Peace in Cyprus*, p. 32; *Investigating the Future*, p. 31; *Next Steps in the Peace Talks*, p. 27; Beyatlı, Papadopoulou and Kaymak, *Solving the Cyprus Problem: Hopes and Fears*, p. 91; *Bridging the Gap in the Inter-communal Negotiations*, p. 27.

[404] *The UN in Cyprus*, p. 7.

[405] *Next Steps in the Peace*, p. 12; Beyatlı, Papadopoulou and Kaymak, *Solving the Cyprus Problem*, p. 84.

Hence, the most restraining factor for Greek Cypriots in accepting a settlement is the fear of renewed violence in the island.[406]

In terms of Turkish Cypriot perception of security, a diametrically opposite condition exists as regards the motivating and constraining factors vis-à-vis a future settlement. As the majority of the Turkish Cypriots deem necessary the continuation of Treaties of Guarantee and Alliance, however, they show a slight trend towards some forms of compromise in terms of amending the treaties, yet to a limited extent (i.e. transition periods entailing the withdrawal of troops). The main source of motivation for Turkish Cypriots appear as the desire for reintegrating with the world, however they also greatly share the Greek Cypriot fear of renewed violence in the island.[407] The UNFICYP poll, in a similar manner, points to the presence of the Greek Cypriot National Guard as the main source of insecurity for the Turkish Cypriots.[408] Therefore, for both communities, the ambiguous symbolism of armies constitutes the main concern in their perceptions of security.

The analysis of the polls has also shown that trust emerges as a constraining factor in terms of a liveable solution and the prospects for future co-existence. Back in 2005, Lordos indicated that for most Greek Cypriots "Turkey is, quite simply, the enemy" and "Turks, in general, cannot be trusted"; deriving its roots from the events of 1974.[409] He asserted that when coupled with the ambiguous symbolism of the Turkish troops, this lack of trust "adds up to a profound sense of insecurity and a desire for Turkey to

[406] Ibid., p. 21; Ibid., p. 85.

[407] Ibid., pp. 12 and 21; Ibid.

[408] *The UN in Cyprus*, p. 7.

[409] Lordos, *Civil Society Diplomacy*,p. 11.

totally withdraw from Cyprus and stay away forever after."[410] For the Turkish Cypriots, he concluded that their main focus is not the 1974 events, but 1960s, and owing to these painful historical memories, "many Turkish Cypriots do not hesitate to agree with the statement 'Greek Cypriots are murderers' – in fact, only about 28% of Turkish Cypriots totally disagree with this statement, everyone else seems to find at least a kernel of truth in this assertion."[411] What is striking, however, this sense of mistrust continues to shape the perceptions of both communities, as demonstrated in the subsequent polls, in the form of fear of renewed violence in case of a settlement. Moreover, although the polls indicate that both communities are open to a low level of empathy, it never amounts to a desire of co-existence as a motivating factor for both communities, and mainly due to the respective lack of trust towards one another's institutions, leaders and ability of honouring the terms of a future settlement.[412] The UNFICYP poll has found out that to the direct question of whether the other community can be trusted to 'adhere to an agreement we might make with them' or not, both communities answered a 'complete no'.[413] Another poll has concluded that "Cypriots are fundamentally distrustful; Turkish Cypriots distrust Greek Cypriots, the EU and the international community, whereas Greek Cypriots distrust Turkey. Mistrust is also intra-communal, with general and diffuse mistrust of fellow citizens and institutions."[414] A poll conducted by the Cyprus 2015 Project in 2011 has asserted that:

[410] Ibid.

[411] Ibid., p. 12.

[412] *Next Steps in the Peace*, p. 19; Beyatlı, Papadopoulou and Kaymak, *Solving the Cyprus Problem*, p. 26; Kaymak, Lordos and Tocci, *Building Confidence in Peace*, p. 21.

[413] *The UN in Cyprus*, p. 47.

[414] Kaymak, Lordos and Tocci, *Building Confidence in Peace*, p. ii.

> Trust is an issue that emerges in almost all discussions on governance. Turkish Cypriots habitually refer to the period of 1960-1963 and express fear that they will face discrimination in a future federal government. Some Greek Cypriot stakeholders however, point to the other side of the coin and argue that Turkey and Turkish nationalists in Cyprus are unlikely to want to maintain the federation in the long-term future. Thus, they are wary of evolutionary models. This manifests itself in the form of the fear that the Turkish Cypriot state might secede from the federation, leaving the Greek Cypriot state undermined and in danger. They consider Turkish Cypriot attempts to make the Turkish Cypriot constituent state as independent and selfsustaining as possible paving the way to partition. These stakeholders fear that by signing a very loose federal agreement, Greek Cypriots might essentially be singing off their homeland to the Turkish Cypriots and forgoing any rights they have in it. Thus, it comes as little surprise that the actors involved in the negotiation process do not elicit much trust.[415]

The polling data does not also give an optimist account on the perceptions of both communities as regards a common sense of identity and a common future. It unanimously suggests that the main motivation of both communities is not the reintegration of the Cypriot society and co-existence *per se*, but rather other factors such as the abolishment of the guarantee system for the Greek Cypriots, and integration with the world for the Turkish Cypriots, as provided earlier. Indeed, in terms of sense of identity, it appears evident that both communities define themselves strictly within their ethnic identities, with only an attribute of 'Cypriotness' slightly around 5% for Turkish Cypriots and 20% for Greek Cypriots.[416] What the polls also indicate as regards the co-existence is that both communities is open to the idea of living together, however, its homogeneity is subject to contestations over the

[415] Beyatlı, Papadopoulou and Kaymak, *Solving the Cyprus Problem*, p. 26.

[416] Kaymak, Lordos and Tocci, *Building Confidence in Peace*, pp. 7-8; Beyatlı, Papadopoulou and Kaymak, *Solving the Cyprus Problem*, pp. 72-73; ; *Bridging the Gap in the Inter-communal Negotiations*, p. 6.

principle of bizonality. Whereas Greek Cypriots perceive of bizonality as a restrictive practice and demand more fluidity, Turkish Cypriots want to see a full-fledged bizonality in terms of having a clear majority of one community existing in its own territorial area or constituent state.[417]

In terms of reconciliation, as some polls have put it, "whereas there is a yearning for peace in both communities, seen as an opportunity to move the agenda on to other matters affecting the respective communities, empathy remains a relatively scarce commodity."[418] However, the same polls also indicate that both communities are favourable towards initiation of reconciliatory practices, such as the formation of a reconciliation commission with a view to putting an end to blame-games, addressing the past events, engaging into mutual apologies and initiating therapeuthic mechanisms that would bring together both communities in dealing with those past events.

Within the capacity of the polling data, one can easily depict the challenges and the prospects for reconciliation and trust-building. The polling data available to date has mainly tested communal perspectives on various aspects of the Cyprus problem and on inter-communal dialogue and co-existence. From these studies, trust emerges as a secondary issue. Therefore, this study also attempts to cast light on varying degrees of trust-building through testing the properties of trust at a more personal level with implications for trust at the societal level.

[417] Beyatlı, Papadopoulou and Kaymak, *Solving the Cyprus Problem*, pp. 30-31; ; *Bridging the Gap in the Inter-communal Negotiations*, pp. 21-22; *Investigating the Future*, pp. 21-22.

[418] *Next Steps in the Peace*, p. 17; Beyatlı, Papadopoulou and Kaymak, *Solving the Cyprus Problem*, p. 63.

For these purposes, answers were sought through three focus groups pertaining to test the properties of trust, as defined by Booth and Wheeler (i.e, leap in the dark-uncertainty, empathy-bonding, dependency-vulnerability, integrity-reliability).[419] At the outset, it is important to note a mutual tendency that the respondents from both communities were more reflective within their homogenous groups, yet more open to trust-building when in interaction with the other group.

As for the first property of trust, it is asked if the respondents have a personal relationship with a member of the other community and, if no, do they believe that they can establish one when such a condition occurs. Interestingly, out of twelve respondents, three confirmed that they have a personal relationship with a member of the other community. However, the other respondents who do not have a personal relationship showed ambivalence over establishing a relationship within their homogenous environment, while approached the idea in a seemingly positive way in the environment where the two groups of respondents were in interaction.[420] This clearly showed that as the level of interaction arises, the prospect for taking a leap forward increases.

[419] The first focus group was conducted in 23 June 2012, with the participation of six Turkish Cypriots. The second focus group was conducted in 7 July 2012 with the participation of six Greek Cypriots. The last focus group was conducted in 28 July 2012 with the participation of the same six Turkish Cypriots and the same six Greek Cypriots. Except than the Turkish Cypriot focus group, which was convened at the author's house, the subsequent focus groups were convened at a restaurant in the Ledra Palace area.

[420] While no respondent in both the Turkish Cypriot and the Greek Cypriot focus group opposed to the idea of establishing a personal relationship with the member of the other community, two respondents from the TC focus group and four respondents from the GC focus group gave answers pertaining to their indifference over establishing such a relationship. Only two respondents from TC group and one respondent from GC group said a direct 'yes' if such a condition arises. However, in the mixed focus groups, nearly all respondents (with the exception of two who still showed ambivalance) said they would enter into a personal relationship.

In understanding their level of empathy, as the second property of trust, it was asked to Greek Cypriot respondents what the period between 1963 and 1974 means from a Turkish Cypriot perspective, and to Turkish Cypriot respondents what the year of 1974 means from a Greek Cypriot perspective. The Greek Cypriot respondents, in their homogenous environment, were slightly more negative towards the suffering of Turkish Cypriots, as four out of six respondents pointed to the assumption that under the misguidance of the Turkish Cypriot leadership, they had withdrawn from the state organs and *chose* to live isolated from Greek Cypriots as a part of their ideal for *taksim* or partition. Although all of them articulated that Turkish Cypriots might have suffered from the inter-communal events during the period, their responses tended to prioritize the suffering of Turkish Cypriots as a consequence of their own choices. The same Greek Cypriot respondents, in the mutually interactive environment, reflected more on the human dimension of the suffering of the Turkish Cypriots, yet still believed that this was more as a result of their political acts rather than due to the policies of the Greek Cypriot leadership. Two respondents directly stated that Turkish Cypriots suffered under the period between 1963 and 1974.

Turkish Cypriot respondents showed a similar tendency as the Greek Cypriot respondents in answering to the same question, yet this time with a focus on 1974 from the Greek Cypriot perspective. While five Turkish Cypriot respondents articulated almost full empathy toward the suffering of Greek Cypriots as they were forced to leave their homes and being dislocated, one respondent directly stated that Greek Cypriots could not be empathized for the events of 1974 as they had prepared the ground for the Turkish intervention which took place to save Turkish Cypriots from being killed in mass graves. However, three out of those five respondents, who showed full

empathy, focused more on their suffering and in a way tended to believe that the suffering of Greek Cypriots came as a consequence of the suffering of Turkish Cypriots, who needed the intervention of Turkey in any case. One respondent stated that Turkey might have the right to intervene under the circumstances, but did not have the right to occupy and divide the island. The respondent, furthermore, stressed that Turkey capitalized on the events to divide the island for its strategic reasons. The Turkish Cypriot answers were also more reflective on the human suffering of Greek Cypriots in the mutual environment, however protected their stances in holding their suffering above the other community. The only respondent, who had not empathized with the Greek Cypriots vis-à-vis the events of 1974, continued the same attitude. The two respondents, who showed full empathy with the Greek Cypriots, articulated that both communities did suffer in each period and the existence of the Cyprus problem was a common tragedy for both communities.

The answers of the respondents from both communities reveal that there is an openness for empathy. However, their more positive responses again show that they are more articulate on the human dimension of communal suffering in mutual interaction.

On the third level of trust, a series of questions were asked to better grasp the potential for dependency. At this level, the results were more challenging in terms of the prospects for trust-building. The respondents were asked, firstly, how they feel about having a neighbour from the other community and whether they will socialize with her/him or not. All the Greek and Turkish respondents stated that they would not mind having a neighbour from the other community. However, to what extent they could socialize with the

neighbour seemed a challenging issue, also depending on the attitude of the neighbour. Both the Greek Cypriot and Turkish respondents, in their homogenous environment as well as in mutual interaction, stated that they would attempt to socialize with the neighbour if the latter was also willing to do so. Hence, the second question, whether they will talk with the neighbour their personal issues or not, attempted to test this level of socialization. In the Greek Cypriot focus group, three out of the six respondents were ambivalent over entering into a close relationship with a neighbour from the other community, depending on the social environment. The other three stated that if they accomplish a level of trust, then they could talk their positive issues with the neighbour. Their stance did not change in mutual interaction. Three Turkish Cypriot respondents, on the other hand, stated that they could talk their personal issues if a level of trust is attained, two respondents could not be sure if they can ever attain a level of trust, and one respondent rejected outright the idea of entering into a positive relationship with a neighbour from the other community. Although the two respondents who had shown ambivalence in their own group tended to think positively in mutual interaction, the respondent who rejected the idea in its entirety did not change stance.

On the third question of whether they will send their child(ren) to the other side for education or not, as the vulnerability level increased, the respondents mostly showed a tendency against dependency. One Turkish Cypriot respondent told her child was already attending a secondary school in the south, but made clear that the school was a private English-medium institution and she would not anyway send her child to a public school in the south. The other five respondents stated that they would never send their child(ren) to a school in the south. Their stance did not change in mutual

interaction as well. All of the Greek Cypriot respondents, on the other hand, stated in both groups that they would never send their child(ren) to the north for education. All respondents who rejected the idea emphasized for their children the importance of getting an education in their own social environments and to a lesser degree in their own languages. However, the most important factor for not doing so appeared as their concern over the physical security of their child(ren), which clearly indicated the fear of violence.

Indeed, the last question on dependency/vulnerability hinted the potential for the first question on the last property of trust – integrity/reliability. The respondents were asked if they will send their child(ren) to stay overnight in the neighbour's house if a personal bonding occurs. Almost all of the Turkish and Greek respondents stated, both in their own groups and in mutual interaction, that they saw such a possibility very unlikely, with two Turkish Cypriot and two Greek Cypriot respondents depending it on the level of trust, but with the exception of one Turkish Cypriot respondent, none rejected the idea out of principle. In the final question, it was asked whether they will marry a person from the other community or not. As in the former question, almost all respondents articulated that they did not foresee such a possibility, yet this time not depending it on the level of trust, but due to their conviction that under the ethno-cultural and political conditions of Cyprus, the liveability of marriage between Turkish and Greek Cypriots was seriously restricted. However, two young respondents, a Greek Cypriot male and a Turkish Cypriot female, although found it very unlikely, depended it on the level of trust rather than ethno-cultural restrictions.

The analyses on the results of the polling data and the focus groups have demonstrated that mistrust is more problematic than fear, and trust is a major, yet a very challenging issue that needs serious due consideration. However, as indicated by the studies, what is promising is that wink of trust as an ever demanding process whereby it can evolve through mutual interaction and understanding. Although the established fatalism of political and socio-cultural variables vis-à-vis the Cyprus problem restrain the transcender practices to take form, trust is indeed achievable.

However, trust needs more than human contact. What is critical at this point is providing the channels for the members of both community, individually and collectively, to see a degree of truth in trust-building through the policies of the state and an ever dynamic civil society. The security dilemma in Cyprus, despite its historic perseverance, can be transcended against the backdrop of uncertainty through the human agency. "When one group has victimized another or when there has been mutual victimization by two groups, if the groups continue to live near each other, reconciliation is essential to stop political violence and to facilitate healing."[421] The human agency plays the utmost part in the building of trust through reconciliation. Seeing the 'humanity' in each other is important and this cannot indeed be achieved both without the channelling of state practices and the civil society endeavours. Cypriots need to be socialized into mechanisms that enable them to explore and understand one another.

[421] Hadjipavlou, "Multiple Stories," p. 58.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

"The destiny of Cyprus is in the hands of its leaders. It is they who must act to reconcile their differences. Without their dedication and commitment to reunifying the island, the process cannot move forward," declared the UN Secretary General Ban at the wake of a collapsing process in 2011.[422] He further stressed that:

> I reiterate my belief that negative messaging makes it more difficult to reach an agreement. I made it clear again when I met Mr. Christofias and Mr. Eroğlu . . . that they cannot project strong doubts about the process and still expect their respective communities to trust and support them in their endeavours. Nor can they hope to create an environment in which the public on both sides will embrace reunification if public statements demonize or ascribe ulterior motives to the other side.[423]

In fact, the UN Secretary General has reiterated such calls in his latest reports on Cyprus and addressed the important role of the leaders in "creating an environment conducive to successful talks and to eventual support for a settlement by Cypriots on both sides" against "the growing public scepticism that a settlement would be reached."[424] In addressing the issue of (mis)trust,

[422] *Assessment Report of the Secretary-General on the Status of the Negotiations in Cyprus*, S/2011/112 (4 March 2011), p. 3.

[423] Ibid., p. 4.

[424] Ibid., p. 3; *Assessment Report of the Secretary-General on the Status of the Negotiations in Cyprus*, S/2011/498 (8 August 2011), p. 5; Report of the Secretary General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/2011/746 (30 November 2011), p. 7; *Assessment Report of the Secretary-General on the Status of the Negotiations in Cyprus*, S/2012/149 (12 March 2012), pp. 4-5.

he especially called on the leaders to engage civil society in the task of reaching a comprehensive settlement and to take into account the civil society efforts to contribute to the peace process.[425]

Its very own history has provided that there does not exist a magic formula for healing Cyprus. Despite the rather gloomy account of the fatalist political discourses that uphold the societal insecurities and mistrust at a level that are not problematized, there nevertheless lies a promise that the security paradox in Cyprus as a constructed phenomenon can be transcended through the human factor that has made it anyway. For the human factor to be successful, both the political discourses and societal insecurities, which mutually implicate one another, have to be put under critical scrutiny in an endless effort. Through constant problematization of these naturalized unnatural feelings and establishments, Cypriots can aspire for a better future. Indeed, Cyprus is home to unimaginable transformations in the past and these transformations had always come about as a result of the practices of the Cypriots themselves. Although marginalized in the Cypriot context, transcender voices can find ground through an aspiration for change. Trimikliniotis has once contended that "anything that captures the imagination of the people to enhance the struggle for a common reunited society and federal state cannot but be activated."[426]

To that end, Cypriots need sound reconciliatory policies that will speak directly to them about the problematic side of their 'inherent' fears and

[425] *Assessment Report of the Secretary-General on the Status of the Negotiations in Cyprus*, S/2011/498, p. 5; *Assessment Report of the Secretary-General on the Status of the Negotiations in Cyprus*, S/2012/149, pp. 4-5.

[426] Trimikliniotis, "Reconciliation and Social Action in Cyprus: Citizens' Inertia and the Protracted State of Limbo," p. 151.

insecurities. Ethno-nationalisms and the consequent divisive communalism that constantly buttress the security paradox in the island stand, in their fatalist entirety, as the most serious obstacle in front of bolstering a logic of community, or a 'we' feeling, in Cypriots. Those symbols and practices of divisive communalism are seemingly everywhere in the island; from enlightened flags on the mountains, ethno-cultural monuments of differentiated trauma, the ambiguous symbolism of the armies to the images of the ruptured brains and mass graves in history books taught at schools. These are felt and lived by Cypriots through and through. However, peacemaking necessitates, as Kaufman argues, not focusing on interests and institutions, but "addressing the emotional and symbolic processes that influence how tangible issues are perceived and played out politically."[427] The reconciliatory policies, therefore, should first of all aim at dwindling the other minds problem and the fear of a renewed violence that stay at the dead-end of these emotional and symbolic processes.

Reminiscent of the series of agreements that started with the process of 21 March 2008 in Cyprus, Nadler and Saguy argue in relation to the Oslo Accords that the agreements "deliberately avoided addressing issues of the parties' responsibility for past wrongdoings. These agreements were based on the assumption that after some years of gradual building of trust between the two parties they will be readier to address these thorny emotional issues."[428] They furthermore contend that this very assumption lies at the basis of eventual failure of such agreements, which remind us that "the end of

[427] Stuart Kaufman, "Escaping the Symbolic Politics Trap: Reconciliation Initiatives and Conflict Resoltion in Ethnic Wars," *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 43, No.2 (2006), p. 202.

[428] Arie Nadler and Tamay Saguy, "Reconciliation Between Nations: Overcoming Emotional Deterrents to Ending Conflicts Between Groups," in Harvey Langholtz and Chris E. Stout, eds., *The Psychology of Diplomacy* (New York: Praeger, 2004), p. 32.

conflict must be built on two pillars: Finding a solution to the actual problems that separate the parties (e.g., division of land) thorough processes of conflict resolution, and addressing the emotional barriers that separate them through processes of reconciliation."[429] In their analysis, the emotional barriers are two-fold and offer two routes. The first emotional barrier is "made up of feelings that originate from the parties' perceived victimization by their adversary and center on the parties' wish to avenge past wrongdoings done to them."[430] And this offers the route to 'socio-emotional reconciliation' that involves addressing the past wrongdoings through apology and forgiveness. The other barrier occurs when mistrust prevails in the relationship between the adversaries as a result of "years of conflict and animosity," and this requires the route to 'trust-building reconciliation', which is a "prolonged and gradual process."[431] For Nadler and Saguy, such reconciliation comes forward "when the adversaries learn to trust each other as a consequence of successfully cooperating on joint projects."[432] In terms of 'temporal focus', the former needs an address of the past and the latter needs a perspective on the present: "Thus, whereas socio-emotional reconciliation holds that confronting the painful past is the key to a reconciled future, trust-building reconciliation suggests that cooperation in the present is the key for such a future."[433]

The current stalemate in the island indicates that Cyprus needs both processes of reconciliation. As Hadjipavlou has correctly stressed that "there

[429] Ibid.

[430] Ibid., p. 33.

[431] Ibid.

[432] Ibid.

[433] Ibid., p. 34.

is a positive cyclical relationship between healing and reconciliation: as reconciliation begins it increases security and makes healing possible, which, in turn, supports further reconciliation."[434] And as a start, breaking the fatalist images and practices is the key, and this can only come from pressurizing the state discourses through these processes of reconciliation which the human society would also embody. Although, as discussed earlier, a 'truth' and 'healing' side of reconciliation is believed to be not suitable for Cyprus, a need for addressing the past traumas is nevertheless necessary. This may come in the form of political apologies and help initiating the mechanisms for people to interact and understand one another in relation to their lived traumas and fears. Moreover, in terms of establishing a link between the past and present, initiatives must take ground for people to start the gradual process of learning to trust one another. In all these, state practices play a crucial role. For trust to develop between two communities, it requires a trust between the political actors at the top as a factor informing the social atmosphere. For trust to develop between the political actors, it also requires the socialization of the two communities to these processes as a factor informing the political atmosphere. Therefore, two processes of reconciliation are very much interlinked and should be pursued in parallel. The political actors have choices, so do the societies. However, these have to be intermingled in a way so as to enable the former to affect the latter, or vice-versa.

Trimikliniotis and Kızılyürek's cure for such intermingling is the dissection of all nationalist projects and ideologies.[435] Hadjipavlou stresses on bringing out

[434] Hadjipavlou, "Multiple Stories," p. 58.

[435] Trimikliniotis, "Reconciliation and Social Action in Cyprus: Citizens' Inertia and the Protracted State of Limbo," p. 151. Kızılyürek, *Milliyetçilik Kıskacında Kıbrıs*, p. 249.

the 'humanistic infrastructure' through the state policies and civil society initiatives.[436] Papadakis contends that ethnocentric historical narratives have to be deconstructed.[437] Constantinou puts emphasis on the problematic political discourses and divisive 'bi-communal' identity constructions and the need to reframe them.[438] Lacher and Kaymak posit that a post-national form of identity formation must be embraced.[439] An argues that a consciousness of 'Cypriotism' needs to develop.[440] Lordos and Faustmann underline the importance of soothing the security concerns of the communities.[441] Yılmaz calls for the application of 'superordinate goals' for the two communities.[442] And the list goes on… In fact, at the basis of all these transcender assumptions lies the need to break the fatalism in the political and ideational structures in Cyprus. One way or another, this requires institutionalizing reconciliation as a state practice and creating the 'humanity infrastructure' for Cypriots to learn to embody a 'we-feeling' if the security paradox is ever to be resolved.

As Booth and Wheeler argue, ambiguous symbolism also plays a pivotal role in sustaining paradoxes both in the minds of people and in the established

[436] Hadjipavlou, "Multiple Stories," pp. 218-219.

[437] Yannis Papadakis, "Nation, Narrative and Commemoration: Political Ritual in Divided Cyprus," *History and Anthropology*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (2003), p. 258.

[438] Constantinou, "Dominant Discourses of the 'Cyprus Problem' and Practices of Resistance," p. 2; See also Constantinou, "Aporias of Identity: Bicommunalism, Hybridity and the 'Cyprus Problem'," p. 3.

[439] Lacher and Erol Kaymak, "Transforming Identities: Beyond the Politics of Non-Settlement in North Cyprus," p. 160.

[440] Ahmet An, "Cypriotism can pave the way to reunification," *The Cyprus Dossier: Towards Free/Thinking Cyprus*, issue 00 (January 2011), p. 6.

[441] Lordos, "The Security Aspect of the Cyprus Problem: Towards a Creative Solution," Unpublished Paper (May 2008), p. 1; Faustmann, "The Role of Security: Perceptions of Advantage and Diasdvantage," p. 224.

[442] Muzaffer Yılmaz, "Past Hurts and Relational Problems in the Cyprus Conflict," *International Journal on World Peace*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (June 2010), pp. 55-56.

social and political practices. As a conflict frozen in the time, Cyprus can truly transform into a military-free zone through the lifting of ambiguous symbolism of weapons and armies, and into a post-national society through challenging the divisiveness of ethno-nationalisms, its symbols and practices. For an aspiration of a logic of pluralistic community in Cyprus, reconciliation must be pursued at all levels to open up channels for multi-level social interaction and building trust. In short, "to trust is to risk, but the risks of embedding trust are path to peace and security."[443] In Booth and Wheeler's words:

> What marginalizes the culture of military competition, transcends security dilemmas, and ultimately erodes the power of the war system, is a shared and daily commitment to create the conditions globally for the politics of peaceful uncertainty . . . Choices are there to be made in world politics; that some choices lead in more hopeful directions for world security than others; and that fear and weapons can be replaced by cooperation and trust. We face these choices under the shadow of an increasingly common fate . . . it is this that leads us, despite all the pressures to think otherwise, to believe that it is not beyond human potential to construct the political conditions, regionally and even globally, to live together in the room of embedded trust in the house of uncertainty.[444]

As seen, Cyprus is not without its transcender voices that continuously challenge and politicize the sources of conflict from different angles. However, characterized by a security paradox, the Cyprus problem long awaits a critical rethinking on its security, which has come to take a fixed and regressive form through the discourses and practices of the fatalist logic. As Bleiker argues, "needed . . . is a politicization of security, rather than a

[443] Booth and Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma*, p. 297.

[444] Ibid., p. 298.

securitization of politics."[445] This study attempts to pursue such a politicization through problematizing the established political discourses and societal insecurities that are being historically and socially constructed, which, as such, can be transformed through the internalization of a security conception that is dynamic and progressive. In that sense, it is aimed to show that security needs not to be conceptualized as a complete phenomenon that blocks the prospects for imagining other than antagonistic identities and exclusive policies. In fact, the study clearly reveals that there is nothing inherent and natural about the prevalent discourses and insecurities. As the analysis of the post-2004 period demonstrates, the fatalist logic that dominated the politics in Cyprus to that date is not pre-given and unchangeable. Indeed, that specific period significantly posits that the security paradox can be eased into a security dilemma through sensible mitigating policies and practices. Nevertheless, that same analysis tests our potential and challenges our limits in acquiring a different understanding of security in Cyprus. Because the goal is not mitigating the security dilemma, but ultimately transcending it.

With that goal in mind, the study builds upon the conceptual and methodological rethinking of the security dilemma to effect a reimagining of the security predicament in the island and to identify and adapt the necessary tools for transforming the relations between the two communities. The main key to such transformation is presented by this study as the processes of reconciliation and trust-building. As it is shown, without these twin processes contextualized within the Cypriot polities and societies, security will continue to be conceptualized and practiced in its usual form. As

[445] Bleiker, *Divided Korea*, p. 78.

fear and mistrust provide the context for the prevailing fatalism, forgiveness and trust must provide the context for transcendence in Cyprus. Then, what lies at the core of reconciliation and trust-building is the potential for engagement and tolerance. And this potential is the one that will carry the Cypriot communities to build upon the properties of trust and be ascended to a level where they can imagine a common future. As it is argued, there is an immense scope for the human agency, be it the political actors, communities, civil society or individuals, in effecting that progressive conception of security and identity. Cyprus does not have to be equated with conflict, nor Cypriots with primordial nationalist identities. Although the challenge is burdensome, this study at its utmost unveils that there are strong grounds to believe that Cypriot communities can effectively be transformed to transcend their security dilemma through reconciling their differences via the subsequent properties of trust – empathy, dependency and reliability.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdurrazak, Gökçe Yükselen. "Kıbrıslı Türklerin Kimliğine Farklı Bir Yaklaşım". *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, Yıl: 12, Sayı: 34 (Kış 2008).

Adamson, Fiona B. "Democratisation in Turkey, EU Enlargement and the Regional Dynamics of the Cyprus Conflict: Past Lessons and Future Prospects." In Thomas Diez (ed.) *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Adler, Emanuel and Michael Barnett (eds.) *Security Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Akgün, Mensur, Ayla Gürel, Mete Hatay and Sylvia Tiryaki. "Quo vadis Cyprus?" A TESEV Working Paper (April 2005).

Alexseev Mikhail A. and C. Richard Hofstetter. "Russia, China and the Immigration Security Dilemma." *Political Science Quarterly,* Vol. 121, No. 1 (2006).

An, Ahmet. "Cypriotism Can Pave the Way to Reunification". *The Cyprus Dossier: Towards Free/Thinking Cyprus*, issue 00 (January 2011).

_____. *Kıbrıslılık Bilincinin Geliştirilmesi*. Lefkoşa: Galeri Kültür Yayınları, 1998.

Anastasakis, O., G. Bertrand and K. Nicolaidis. "Getting to Yes: Embellishment of the Annan Plan for Cyprus". South East European Studies Programme, European Studies Centre, University of Oxford (2004).

Anastasiou, Harry. *The Broken Olive Branch: Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict and the Quest for peace in Cyprus*. Vol. 1, *The Impasse of Ethnonationalism*. New York: Syracuse University Press, 2008.

_____. *The Broken Olive Branch: Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict and the Quest for Peace in Cyprus*. Vol. 2, *Nationalism versus Europeanization*. New York: Syracuse University Press, 2008.

_____. "Cyprus as the EU Anomaly". *Global Society*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (April 2009).

_____. "Nationalism as a Deterrent to Peace and Interethnic Democracy: The Failure of Nationalist Leadership from the Hague Talks to the Cyprus Referendum". *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 8 (2007).

Andreou, A. S., K. E. Parsopoulos, M. N. Vrahatis and G. A. Zombanakis. "Alliance between Cyprus and Greece: Assessing its Partners' Relative Security Contribution." *Defence and Peace Economics*, Vol. 15, No. 5 (October 2004).

Arslan, Kaya and Halil Güven. "International Law in Cyprus Problem." Paper Presented at the 38th International Congress of Asian and North African Studies, ICANAS 38, Ankara, Turkey (10-15 September, 2007).

Asmussen, Jan. *Cyprus At War: Diplomacy and Conflict During the 1974 Crisis*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2008.

Attalides, Michael. *Cyprus: Nationalism and International Politics*. Edinburgh: Q Press, 1979.

_____. "The Political Process in Cyprus and the Day after the Referendum." *Cyprus Review* 16 (2004).

Bahçeli, Tözün. *Greek-Turkish Relations since 1955*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1990.

_____. "Saying Yes to EU Accession: Explaining the Turkish Cypriot Referendum Outcome." *Cyprus Review* 16 (2004).

_____. "Turkey's Quest for EU Membership and the Cyprus Problem." In Joseph S. Joseph (ed.) *Turkey and the European Union: Internal Dynamics and External Challenges*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Baldwin, David. "The Concept of Security." *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (1997).

Balkır, Canan and Galip Yalman. "Economics and the Politicisation of Civil Society: The Turkish-Cypriot Case." In Diez, Thomas and Nathalie Tocci (eds.). *Cyprus: A Conflict at Crossroads*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2009.

Bamanie, Nuray. "Cyprus' Forgotten Turks". *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (2002).

Bar-Siman-Tov, Yaacov. *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

_____. "Introduction: Why Reconciliation?" In Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov (ed.) *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Bar-Tal, Daniel and Gemma H. Bennink, "The Nature of Reconciliation as an Outcome and as a Process." In Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov. *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Baylis, John. "International and Global Security in the Post-Cold War Era." In John Baylis and Steve Smith. *The Globalization of World Politics*: *An Introduction to International Relations*. 2nd edition. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Beyatlı, Derya, Katerina Papadopoulou and Erol Kaymak. *Solving the Cyprus Problem: Hopes and Fear*. Report by the Cyprus 2015 Project, Interpeace, 2011.

Bilgiç, Ali. "Güvenlik İkilemini Yeniden Düşünmek: Güvenlik Çalışmalarında Yeni Bir Perspektif." *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, Cilt 8, Sayı 9 (Bahar 2011).

Bilgin, Pınar. "Critical Theory." In Paul D. Williams (ed.) *Security Studies: An Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge, 2008.

_____. "Identity/Security." In J. Peter Burgess (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of New Security Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

_____. "Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security." *International Studies Review*, Vol. 5 (2003).

Bleiker, Roland. *Divided Korea: Toward a Culture of Reconciliation*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.

Bloomfield, David. "Reconciliation: An Introduction.' In David Bloomfield *et al.* (eds.) *Reconciliation After Violent Conflict: A Handbook*, Stockholm, IDEA, 2003.

Blumenwitz, Diete. "Cyprus: Political and Legal Realities". *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (1999).

Boedeltje, Freerk J., Olivier Thomas Kramsch, Henk Van Houtum and Roald Plug. "The Fallacious Imperial Geopolitics of EU Enlargement: The Case of Cyprus." *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, Vol. 98, No. 1 (2007).

_____, Roald Plug, Olivier Thomas Kramsch and Henk Van Houtum. "A Walk along the Line of Recollection: Geopolitics of the Green Line in Cyprus." *Final Case Study Report for Cyprus*, Nijmegen Centre for Border Research (NCBR), the Netherlands (2005).

Booth, Ken (ed.) *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005.

_____. "Security and Emancipation," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (1991).

_____. "Security and Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist." In Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams (eds.) *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. London: UCL Press, 1997.

_____. *Theory of World Security*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

_____ and Nicholas Wheeler. *The Security Dilemma: Fear, Cooperation and Trust in World Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

_____. "Uncertainty." In Paul D. Williams (ed.). *Security Studies: An Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge, 2008.

Bowman, Jim. "Seeing What's Missing in Memories of Cyprus". *Peace Review*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (2006).

Bölükbaşı, Süha. "Boutros-Ghali's Cyprus Initiative in 1992: Why Did It Fail?" *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 3 (July 1995).

Brewin, Christopher. *The European Union and Cyprus*. Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press, 2000.

Bryant, Rebecca. "A Dangerous Trend in Cyprus." *Middle East Report*, No. 235 (Summer 2005).

_____. *Imagining the Modern: Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2004.

_____. "Justice or Respect? A Comparative Perspective on Politics in Cyprus". *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 6 (November 2001).

_____. "Life Stories: Turkish Cypriot Community." In *Displacement in Cyprus: Consequences of Civil and Military Life*, PRIO Report No. 2 (2012).

_____. *The Past in Pieces: Belonging in the New Cyprus*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Bridging the Gap in the Inter-communal Negotiations: An Island-wide Study of Public Opinion in Cyprus, Cyprus 2015 Project, Interpeace, 2011.

Burchill, Scott, Richard Devetak, Andrew Linklater, Matthew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smith and Jacqui True. *Theories of International Relations*. 2nd edition. New York and London: Palgrave, 2001.

_____, Andrew Linklater, Richard Devetak, Jack Donnelly, Matthew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smith and Jacqui True. *Theories of International Relations*. 3rd edition. New York and London: Palgrave, 2005.

Burgess, Peter J. (ed.). *The Routledge Handbook of New Security Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Burgess, Michael. "What Is To Be Done? Bicommunalism, Federation and Confederation in Cyprus." In Michael Burgess and John Pinder (eds.) *Multinational Federations*, 2007.

Butterfield, Herbert. *History and Human Relations*. London: Collins, 1951.

Buzan, Barry. *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for Intenrational Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.

_____, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1998.

Byrne, Sean. "Power Politics as Usual in Cyprus". *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Spring 2000).

Cassia, Paul Sant. "Religion, Politics and Ethnicity in Cyprus during the Turkokratia." *Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (1986).

Cerny, Philip G. "The New Security Dilemma: Divisibility, Defection and Disorder in the Global Era." *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (2000).

_____. "Terrorism and the New Security Dilemma." *Naval War College Review*, Vol. 58, No. 1 (Winter 2005).

Christophorou, Christophoros. "A New Communist Surprise – What's Next? Presidential Elections in the Republic of Cyprus, February 2008." *South European Society & Politics*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (June 2008).

Christodoulides, Nicos. "Leaders, political behaviour and decision-making: the case of the former President of the Republic of Cyprus, George Vasiliou." *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol. 10, No 3 (December 2008).

Christophorou, Christophoros. "Party Change and Development in Cyprus (1995-2005)." *South European Society & Politics,* Vol. 11, No. 3 (September 2006).

_____, Sanem Şahin and Synthia Pavlou. *Media Narratives, Politics and the Cyprus Problem*. PRIO Cyprus Center Report No. 1 (2010).

Christou, George. "The European Union, Borders and Conflict Transformation: The Case of Cyprus". *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 45, No. 1 (2010).

Clerides, Glafkos. *Cyprus: My Disposition*. Vols. 1 and 2. Nicosia: Alithia Publishing, 1989.

_____. *Bir Dönemin Anıları 1993-2003*. Çeviren Ali Çakıroğlu. Lefkoşa: Galeri Kültür Yayınları, 2008.

Cole, Elizabeth A. (ed.). *Teaching the Violent Past: History Education and Reconciliation*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2007.

Collins, Alan. *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

_____. *The Security Dilemma and the End of the Cold-War*. Keele: Keele University Press, 1997.

The Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem, 31 March 2004.

Constantinou, Costas M. "Aporias of Identity and the 'Cyprus Problem'." Paper presented at the ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops (25-30 April 2006).

_____. "Cypriot In-dependence and the Problem of Sovereignty." *Cyprus Review*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Fall 2010).

_____. "A Cypriot's Problem or How Not to Deal with Existential Anxiety". *The Cyprus Dossier: Towards Free/Thinking Cyprus*, issue 00 (January 2011).

_____. "Dominant Discourses of the 'Cyprus Problem' and Practices of Resistance" in Ahmet Sözen (ed.), *The Cyprus Conflict: Looking Ahead*, Famagusta: Eastern Mediterranean University Printing-House (2008).

_____ and Mete Hatay. "Cyprus, Ethnic Conflict and Conflicted Heritage." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 9 (2010).

_____ and Oliver P. Richmond. "The Long Mile of Empire: Power, Legitimation and the UK Bases in Cyprus." *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (March 2005).

_____ and Yiannis Papadakis. "The Cypriot State(s) in situ: Cross-ethnic Contact and the Discourse of Recognition." *Global Society*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (2001).

Constantinou, Marios. "Reasons of State and the Constitutional Logic of Quasi-stateness: The Post-colonial Contradictions of Cyprus's Integration in the European Confederation." *Postcolonial Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (2006).

Copeland, Dale C. *The Origins of Major War.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Coufoudakis, Van. "Cyprus: The Referendum and Its Aftermath." *Cyprus Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (2004).

Cyprus after Accession: Getting past 'No'? South East European Studies at Oxford (SEESOX) Workshop Report and Responses (May 2007).

Cyprus Mail, Greek Cypriot Daily, 7 November 2008.

Cyprus News Agency, Official News Agency of Republic of Cyprus, 22 April 2003, 15 November 2004, 25 May 2005, 24 February 2008, 6 March 2008, 19 March 2008, 28 March 2008, 14 May 2012, 3 September 2008, 30 September 2008.

Çarkoğlu, Ali and Ahmet Sözen. "The Turkish Cypriot General Elections of December 2003: Setting the Stage for Resolving the Cyprus Conflict*?" South European Society and Politics*, Vol.9, No.3 (Winter 2004).

Çelenk, Ayşe Aslıhan. "The Restructuring of Turkey's Policy towards Cyprus: The Justice and Development Party's Struggle for Power." *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (September 2007).

Daly, Erin and Jeremy Sarkin. *Reconciliation in Divided Societies: Finding Common Ground.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Demetriou, Chares. "Big Structures, Social Boundaries, and Identity in Cyprus, 1400-1700." *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 51, No. 10 (June 2008).

Demetriou, Chares. "Political Violence and Legitimation: The Episode of Colonial Cyprus." *Qual Sociol* 30 (2007).

Demetriou, Olga. "After Mourning: 'Morning After' Literature on Cyprus." *South European Society & Politics,* Vol. 11, No. 2 (June 2006).

_____. "To Cross or to Cross? Subjectivization and the Absent State in Cyprus." *Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute*, Vol. 13 (2007).

_____. "Life Stories: Greek Cypriot Community." In *Displacement in Cyprus: Consequences of Civil and Military Life*, PRIO Report No. 1 (2012)

Denktaş, Rauf Raif. "The Crux of the Cyprus Problem." *Perceptions: Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (September-November 1999).

_____. *The Cyprus Triangle*. Nicosia: K. Rustem and Brother, 1982.

Deutsch, Karl *et. al*. *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Dietzel, Irene and Vasilios N. Markides. "Ethno-religious Coexistence and Plurality in Cyprus under British Rule (1878-1960). *Social Compass*, Vol. 56, No. 1 (2009).

Diez, Thomas. "Conclusion: Cyprus and the European Union – An Opening." In Thomas Diez (ed.) *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union.* Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

_____ (ed.). *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict, Postmodern Union*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

_____. "Introduction: Cyprus and the European Union as a Political and Theoretical Problem." In Thomas Diez (ed.) *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

_____. "Last Exit to Paradise? The European Union, the Cyprus Conflict and the Problematic 'Catalytic Effect'." In Thomas Diez (ed.) *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

_____ and Michelle Pace. "Normative Power Europe and Conflict Transformation." Paper for Presentation at the EUSA Conference, Montreal (17-19 May 2007).

_____ and Nathalie Tocci (eds.). *Cyprus: A Conflict at Crossroads*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2009

Dodd, Clement. "Constitutional Features of the UN Plan for Cyprus and its Antecedents." *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (March 2005).

_____. *Storm Clouds Over Cyprus: A Briefing*. Huntingdon: The Eothen Press, 2001.

Donnelly, Jack. "Realism." In Scott Burchill *et. al*.. *Theories of International Relations*. 3rd edition. New York and London: Palgrave, 2005.

Drath, Viola Herms. "The Cyprus Referendum: An Island Divided by Mutual Mistrust." *American Foreign Policy Interests*, 26 (2004).

_____. "New Thinking in Cyprus." *American Foreign Policy Interests*, 30 (2008).

Druşotis, Makarios. *Kıbrıs 1963-1964: İlk Bölünme*. Çeviren Ali Çakıroğlu. Lefkoşa: Galeri Kültür Yayınları, 2008.

_____. *Kıbrıs 1970-1974: EOKA B, Yunan Darbesi ve Türk İstilası*. Çeviren Ali Çakıroğlu. Lefkoşa: Galeri Kültür Yayınları, 2006.

Eralp, Atila. "The Last Chance in Cyprus Negotiations and the Turkey-EU Relationship." *Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy*, ELIAMEP Thesis 1 (February 2010).

_____. "Temporality, Cyprus problem and Turkey-EU Relationship." Centre *for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies*, EDAM Discussion Paper Series 02 (2009).

Erhürman, Tufan. *100 Soruda Kıbrıs'ta Federasyon*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitapevi, 2009.

Ertekün, Necati M. *The Cyprus Dispute and the Birth of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus*. London: Rüstem, 1984.

Evriviades, Euripides L. "Cyprus in the European Union: Prospects for Reunification, Peace with Turkey, and Regional Stability." *Mediterranean Quarterly* (Summer 2005).

Farr, Thomas. "Overcoming the Cyprus Tragedy: Let Cypriots Be Cypriot." *Mediterranean Quarterly* (Fall 1997).

Faustmann, Hubert. "The Cyprus Question Still Unsolved: Security Concerns and the Failure of the Annan Plan." *Suedosteuropa-Mitteilungen* (2004).

_____. "History in the Making? A New Drive for a Solution to the Cyprus Problem." *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (November 2008).

_____. "The Role of Security: Perceptions of Advantage and Diasdvantage." Varnava and Faustmann (eds.) *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond*, 2009.

_____ and Erol Kaymak. "Cyprus." *European Journal of Political Research* 46 (2007) – on the political developments in Cyprus in 2007.

_____. Cyprus." *European Journal of Political Research* 47 (2008).

Fierke, Karin M. *Critical Approaches to International Security*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.

_____. *Diplomatic Interventions: Conflict and Change in a Globalizing World*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2005.

Friis, Lykke. "Looming Shadows: The European Union's Eastern Enlargement and Cyprus." In Thomas Diez (ed.) *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Gazioğlu, Ahmet. *Enosis Çemberinde Türkler*. Istanbul: Cyrep (1996).

_____. *The Turks in Cyprus: A Province of the Ottoman Empire 1571-1878*. London: Rustem and Brother, 1990.

Georgiades, Savvas Daniel. "Public Attitudes Towards Peace: The Greek-Cypriot Position." *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 44, No. 5 (Sep., 2007).

Glaser, Charles L. *Rational Theory of International Politics: The Logic of Competition and Cooperation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

_____. "The Security Dilemma Revisited." *World Politics*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (1997).

Gobbi, Hugo. "Balkan and Cypriot Teachings". *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (December 1999—February 2000).

_____. *Rethinking Cyprus*. Tel Aviv: Ha'Dfus Hejadash, 1993.

"Governor Ronald Storr's Official Report: Disturbances in Cyprus, October 1931." *Journal of Cyprus Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 30 (2006).

Göktepe, Cihat. "The Cyprus Crisis of 1967 and its Effects on Turkey's Foreign Relations." *Middle Eastern Studies,* Vol. 41, No. 3 (May 2005).

Güney, Aylin. "The USA's Role in Mediating the Cyprus Conflict: A Story of Success or Failure?" *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35, No. 27 (2004).

Gürel, Ayla and Kudret Özersay. "Cyprus and the Politics of Property." *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (November 2006).

_____, Mete Hatay and Christalla Yakinthou. "An Overview of Events and Perceptions. In *Displacement in Cyprus: Consequences of Civil and Military Life*, PRIO Report No. 5 (2012).

Güven-Lisaniler, Fatma and Leopoldo Rodriguez. "The Social and Economic Impact of EU Membership on Northern Cyprus." In Thomas Diez (ed.) *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Hadjipavlou, Maria. "The Cyprus Conflict: Root Causes and Implications for Peacebuilding." *Journal of Peace Research,* Vol. 44, No. 3 (2007).

_____. "Developments in the Cyprus Conflict: A Conflict Resolution Perspective." *Interne Information zur Sicherheitspolitik*, No. 13 (May 2002).

_____. "Multiple Stories: The 'Crossings' as Part of Citizens' Reconciliation Efforts in Cyprus?" *Innovation*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (2007).

Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis, Maria and Lenos Trigeorgis. "Cyprus: An Evolutionary Approach to Conflict Resolution." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (June 1993).

Hannay, David. "Cyprus: The Costs of Failure." Center for European Reform Briefing Note (September 2009).

_____. "Cyprus: Lessons from the Debacle of 2004 and the Way Ahead." *The Round Table*, Vol. 95, No. 383 (January 2006).

_____. *Cyprus: The Search for a Solution*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2005.

Hansen, Lene. "The Little Mermaid's Silent Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in the Copenhagen School." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (2000).

Harbottle, Micheal. *The Impartial Soldier*. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Harvey, Frank P. "The Homeland Security Dilemma: Imagination, Failure and the Escalating Costs Perfecting Security." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (2007).

Hasgüler, Mehmet and Murat Tüzünkan. "Cyprus at a Crossroads." *Middle East Quarterly*, Vol. 16, Issue 4.

Hatzivassilou, Evanthis. *The Cyprus Question, 1878-1960: The Constitutional Aspect*. Minnesota Mediterranean and East European Monographs, No. 11, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota (2002).

_____. "The Red Line: Pressure and Persuasion in Greek Diplomatic Strategies on Cyprus, 1945 to 2004." *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Winter 2009).

Herz, John H. "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma." *World Politics*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (January 1950).

_____. *Political Realism and Political Idealism: A Study in Theories and Realities*. 2nd impression. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

_____. "The Security Dilemma in International Relations: Background and Present Problems." *International Relations*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (2003).

Hoffman, Aaron. "The Structural Causes of Trusting Relationships: Why Rivals Do Not Overcome Suspicion Step by Step." *Political Science Quanerly*, Vol. 122, No. 2 (2007).

Hollis, Martin. *Trust Within Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

_____ and Steve Smith. *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Hopmann, Philip Terrence. "Constituting a Reunified Cyprus: A View from the USA." *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (December 2009).

Investigating the Future: An In-depth Study of Public Opinion in Cyprus. Cyprus 2015 Project, Interpeace, 2009.

Ismail, Sabahattin. *Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti'nin Doğuşu ve Çöküşü ve KKTC'nin Kuruluşu (1960–1983).* İstanbul: Akdeniz Haber Ajansı Yayınları, 1992.

_____. *Kıbrıs'ta Yunan Sorunu (1821–2000).* İstanbul: Akdeniz Haber Ajansı Yayınları, 2000.

Jacobson, David, Bernard Musyck, Stelios Orphanides and Craig Webster. The Opening of Ledra Street/Lokmacı Gate in April 2008: Reactions from Citizens and Shopkeepers. PRIO Cyprus Center Report No. 2 (2009).

Jervis, Robert. "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma." *World Politics*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (1978).

_____. "Dilemmas about Security Dilemmas." *Security Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (2011).

_____. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

_____. "Was the Cold War a Security Dilemma?" *Journal of Cold War Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Winter 2001).

Job, Brian (ed.) *The Insecurity Dilemma: National Security of Third World States*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1992.

Joseph, Joseph S. "Cyprus: Domestic Ethnopolitical Conflict and International Politics." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 15 (2009).

_____. *Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics: From Independence to the Threshold of the European Union*. London and New York: Macmillan Press, 1997.

_____. "European Foreign and Security Policy: The Cyprus Connection." Paper Presented at the 44th Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Portland, Oregon (25 February-1 March 2003).

Kadir, Djelal. "Truth and Reconciliation on Cyprus will be Possible, When . . ." *Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 2007).

Kahveci, Hayriye. "The 2008 Presidential Election in Cyprus." *West European Politics*, Vol. 31, No. 5 (September 2008).

Kaliber, Alper. "Securing the Ground Through Securitized 'Foreign' Policy: The Cyprus Case." *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (2005).

_____. "Re-imagining Cyprus: The Rise of Regionalism in Turkey's Security Lexicon." In Diez, and Tocci (eds.). *Cyprus: A Conflict at Crossroads*, 2009.

Kanavou, Angeliki Andrea. "How Peace Agreements Are Derailed: The Evolution of Values in Cyprus, 1959-74." *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 43, No. 3 (May 2006).

Kaufmann, Chaim. "An Assessment of the Partition of Cyprus." *International Studies Perspectives*, No. 8 (2007).

Kaufman, Stuart J. "Escaping the Symbolic Politics Trap: Reconciliation Initiatives and Conflict Resoltion in Ethnic Wars." *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 43, No.2 (2006).

_____. "An 'International' Theory of Inter-Ethnic War." *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (1996).

Kaymak, Erol. "Does Cyprus Need a Truth and Reconciliation Commission?" *Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 2007).

_____. "Growing Apart, Cementing Division: Civil Society and the Dearth of Ideas." In Sözen (ed.) *The Cyprus Conflict: Looking Ahead*, 2008.

_____. "The Turkish Cypriot Views on Annan V." Varnava and Faustmann (eds.) *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond*, 2009.

_____, Alexandros Lordos and Nathalie Tocci. *Building Confidence in Peace: Public Opinion and the Cyprus Peace Process*. Brussels: CEPS, 2008.

_____ and Hubert Faustmann. "Cyprus." *European Journal of Political Research* 48 (2009).

_____ and Yucel Vural. "Intra-Communal Dynamics: European Union Discourses among Turkish-Cypriot Political Actors Before and After the Failed Referenda." In Diez and Tocci (eds.) *Cyprus: A Conflict at Crossroads*, 2009.

Kazan, Işıl. "Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean, Seen from Turkey." In Thomas Diez (ed.) *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union,* 2002.

Kedourie, Elie. "The Cyprus Problem and its Solution." *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 5 (September 2005).

Keim, Wiebke. “The Concept of ‘Ethic of Reconciliation’ and the Disciplines.” *Current Sociology*, Vol. 59, No. 5 (September 2011).

Kelman, Herbert C. “Reconciliation as Identity Change: A Social-Psychological Perspective.” In Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov, *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation.*

Ker-Lindsey, James. *EU Accession and UN Peacemaking in Cyprus*. Rethinking Peace and Conflict Studies (2008).

_____. “Europe’s Eastern Outpost: The Republic of Cyprus and the Middle East.” *The Round Table*, Vol. 97, No. 397 (August 2008).

_____. “A History of Cyprus Peace Proposals.” In Varnava and Faustmann (eds.) *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond*, 2009.

_____. “The Importance of Process in Peacemaking.” *Peace Review*, Vol. 22, No. 1 (2010).

_____. “From U Thant to Kofi Annan: UN Peacemaking in Cyprus, 1964-2004.” South East European Studies at Oxford (SEESOX) Occasional Paper No. 5/05 (October 2005).

_____. “The Policies of Greece and Cyprus towards Turkey’s EU Accession.” *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (March 2007).

_____. “Presidential Power and Authority in the Republic of Cyprus.” *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (March 2006).

_____. “A Second Referendum: The May 2006 Parliamentary Elections in Cyprus.” *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (November 2006).

_____. “The Security Dimensions of a Cyprus Solution.” Hellenic Observatory Papers on Greece and Southeast Europe, LSE, GreeSE Paper No 19 (October 2008).

_____. “The UN Force in Cyprus after the 2004 Reunification Referendum.” *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 13, No.3 (September 2006).

_____ and Keith Webb. “Cyprus.” *European Journal of Political Research* 45 (2006).

Kıbrıs Gazetesi, Turkish Cypriot Daily, 19 February 2004, 4 February 2008, 25 October 2008, 11 August 2008, 29 September 2008, 21 November 2008, 1 April 2009, 3 April 2009, 4 April 2009, 10 December 2009.

Kınacıoğlu, Müge and Emel Oktay. "The Domestic Dynamics of Turkey's Cyprus Policy: Implications for Turkey's Accession to the European Union." *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (June 2006).

Kızılyürek, Niyazi. *Cyprus Beyond Nation*. Nicosia: Cassoulides, 1993.

_____. "Historical Grounds of a Federal State in Cyprus." In Sözen (ed.), *The Cyprus Conflict: Looking Ahead*(2008).

_____. *Kıbrıs Sorununda İç ve Dış Etkenler*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi Yayınları, 1983.

_____. *Milliyetçilik Kıskacında Kıbrıs*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Koumoulides, John T. A. (ed.). *Cyprus in Transition 1960-1985*. London: Trigraph, 1986.

Kramer, Heinz. "The Cyprus Problem and European Security." *Survival*, Vol. 39, No. 3 (1997).

Krause, Keith and Michael C. Williams (eds.) *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. London: UCL Press, 1997.

_____. "Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods." *Mershon International Studies Review*, Vol. 40 (1996).

Kydd, Andrew H. *Trust and Mistrust in International Relations*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Kyriakides, Klearchos A. "The 1960 Treaties and the search for security in Cyprus." *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (2009).

Lacher, Hannes and Erol Kaymak. "Transforming Identities: Beyond the Politics of Non-Settlement in North Cyprus." *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (July 2005).

Ladisch, Virginie. "The Challenge of Peacebuilding: Cypriot Views on Reconciliation." *Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 2007).

Lapid, Yosef and Friedrich Kratochwil (eds.) *The Return of Culture in IR Theory*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1996.

Lewis, J. David and Andrew Weigert. "Trust as a Social Reality." *Social Forces*, Vol. 63, No. 4 (June 1985).

Lindley, Dan. "Historical, Tactical, and Strategic Lessons from the Partition of Cyprus." *International Studies Perspectives*, No. 8 (2007).

Lipschutz, Ronnie D. *On Security*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Loizides, Neophytos G. "Ethnic Nationalism and Adaptation in Cyprus." *International Studies Perspectives*, No. 8 (2007).

Lordos, Alexandros. *Can the Cyprus Problem be Solved? Understanding the Greek Cypriot Response to the UN Peace Plan for Cyprus*. Cyprus Polls, 2004.

_____. *Civil Society Diplomacy: A New Approach for Cyprus?* Cyprus Polls, 2005.

_____. "From Secret Diplomacy to Public Diplomacy: How the Annan Plan Referendum Failure Earned the Cypriot Public a Seat at the Negotiating Table." In Varnava and Faustmann (eds.) *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond*, 2009.

_____. *Options for Peace: Mapping the Possibilities for a Comprehensive Settlement in Cyprus*, Cyprus Polls, 2005.

_____. "Rational Agent or Unthinking Follower? A Survey-Based Profile Analysis of Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot Referenda Voters." In Diez and Tocci (eds.) *Cyprus: A Conflict at Crossroads*, 2009.

_____. "The Security Aspect of the Cyprus Problem: Towards a Creative Solution." Unpublished Paper (May 2008).

_____. "The UN in Cyprus." In Ahmet Sözen (ed.) *The Cyprus Conflict: Looking Ahead*. Famagusta: Eastern Mediterranean University Printing-House, 2008.

_____, Erol Kaymak and Nathalie Tocci. *A People's Peace in Cyprus: Testing Public Opinion on the Options for a Comprehensive Settlement.* Brussels: CEPS, 2009.

Luke, Harry. *Cyprus under the Turks, 1571-1878*. London: Hurst, 1969.

Macris, Nicholas (ed.). *The 1960 Treaties on Cyprus and Selected Subsequent Acts*. Mannheim und Mohnesee, 2003.

Makriyianni, Chara and Charis Psaltis. "The Teaching of History and Reconciliation." *Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 2007).

Mallinson, William. *Cyprus: A Modern History*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2005.

_____. *Cyprus: Diplomatic History and the Clash of Theory in International Relations*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2010.

_____. "US Interests, British Acquiescence and the Invasion of Cyprus." *BJPIR*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (2007).

Marchetti, Raffaele and Nathalie Tocci. "Conflict Society: Understanding the Role of Civil Society in Conflict." *Global Change, Peace & Security*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (June 2009).

Markides, Kyriacos C. *The Rise and Fall of the Cyprus Republic*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

McDonald, Matt. "Constructivism." In Paul D. Williams (ed.) *Security Studies: An Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge, 2008.

McSweeney, Bill. *Security, Identity and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Mearsheimer, John. "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War." *International Security*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (1990).

_____. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: Norton, 2001.

Mercer, Jonathan. "Rationality and Psychology in International Politics." *International Organization*, Vol. 59 (Winter 2005).

Michael, Michalis S. "The Cyprus Peace Talks: A Critical Appraisal." *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 44, No. 5, (2007).

_____. *Resolving the Cyprus Conflict: Negotiating History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Migdalovitz, Carol. "Cyprus: Status of U.N. Negotiations and Related Issues." CRS Report for Congress (20 July 2007).

The Military Balance 2009, International Institute for Strategic Studies, London, 2009.

Mirbagheri, Farid. *Cyprus and International Peacemaking*. London: Hurst, 1998.

Mistzal, Barbara. *Trust in Modern Societies*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.

Montgomery, Evan Braden. "Breaking Out of the Security Dilemma: Realism, Reassurance and the Problem of Uncertainty." *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 2 (Autumn, 2006).

Morag, Nadav. "Cyprus and the Clash of Greek and Turkish Nationalisms." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 10 (2004).

Moran, Michael. "Cyprus and the 1960 Accords: Nationalism and Internationalism". *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (2001).
_____ (ed.). *Rauf Denktash at the United Nations: Speeches on Cyprus*. Huntingdon: The Eothen Press, 1997.

Moulakis, Athanasios. Reviews of *Partition Through Foreign Aggression: The Case of Turkey in Cyprus*, by William Mallinson and *The History and the Politics of the Cyprus Conflict*, by Clement Dodd. *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 47, No. 1 (January 2011).

_____. "Power-Sharing and its Discontents: Dysfunctional Constitutional Arrangements and the Failure of the Annan Plan for a Reunified Cyprus." *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 43, No. 4 (July 2007).

Mutimer, David. "Critical Security Ctudies: A Schismatic History." In Alan Collins (ed.) *Contemporary Security Studies*. 2nd edition. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Müftüler-Baç, Meltem and Aylin Güney. "The European Union and the Cyprus Problem 1961-2003." *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (March 2005).

Nadler, Arie and Tamay Saguy. "Reconciliation Between Nations: Overcoming Emotional Deterrents to Ending Conflicts Between Groups." In Harvey Langholtz and Chris E. Stout (eds.), *The Psychology of Diplomacy*. New York: Praeger, 2004.

Nami, Ozdil. CTP Member of Paliament and Former Negotiator of the Turkish Cypriot Side and Special Representative of Mehmet Ali Talat. *A Personal Interview*, 22 May 2012.

Navaro-Yashin, Yael. "Affect in the civil service: a study of a modern state-system." *Postcolonial Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (2006).

Necatigil, Zaim M. *Our Republic in Perspective*. Nicosia: Tezel Offset and Printing, 1985.

_____. *The Cyprus Conflict: A Lawyer's View*. 2nd edition. Nicosia: K. Rustem and Brother, 1982.

Negotiating the Core Issues: The Importance of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot Public Opinion, Cyprus 2015 Project, Interpeace, 2012.

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

Next Steps in the Peace Talks: An Island-Wide Study of Public Opinion in Cyprus. Cyprus 2015 Initiative, Interpeace, 2010.

Nicolaidis, Kalypso. "Exploring Second Best Solutions for Cyprus." *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 6 (November 2009).

Nugent, Neill. "Cyprus and the European Union: The Significance of its Smallness, Both as an Applicant and a Member." *European Integration* Vol. 28, No. 1 (March 2006).

_____. "EU Enlargement and the 'Cyprus Problem'." *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 1 (March 2000).

Officer, David. "Northern Ireland – Peace without Reconciliation." *Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 2007).

Oğuzlu, Tarık. "The EU as an Actor in the Solution of the Cyprus Dispute: The Questions of 'How'?" Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe, Issue 2 (2002).

Olgun, Ergün. Former Negotiator of the Turkish Cypriot Side and Under-Secretary of TRNC Presidency. *A Personal Interview*, 5 August 2012.

_____. "Confederation, the Last Chance for Establishing Peace." *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (2001).

_____. *Cyprus: Myths, Objective Realities and the Way Forward*. Nicosia: TRNC Presidency, 2004.

_____. "Cyprus: A New and Realistic Approach." *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (1999).

_____. "Recognising Two States in Cyprus Would Facilitate Co-existence and Stability." *Survival*, Vol. 40, No. 3 (Autumn 1998).

Osgood, Charles E. *An Alternative to War or Surrender*. 2nd edition. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1970.

Özersay, Kudret. "The Excuse of State Necessity and Its Implications on Cyprus Conflict." *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Winter 2004).

_____. "Separate Simultaneous Referenda in Cyprus: Was it a 'Fact' or an 'Illusion'?" *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (September 2005).

_____ and Ayla Gürel. "The Cyprus Problem at the European Court of Human Rights." In Diez, and Tocci (eds.). *Cyprus: A Conflict at Crossroads*, 2009.

Palley, Claire. *An International Relations Debacle: The UN Secretary-General's Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus, 1999 – 2004*. Oxford, England and Portland, Oregon: Hart Publishing, 2005.

Panayiotou, Andreas. "Lenin in the coffee-shop: the communist alternative and forms of non-western modernity." *Postcolonial Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (2006).

Papadakis, Yiannis. *Echoes from the Dead Zone: Across the Cyprus Divide*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2005.

_____. "History Education in Divided Cyprus: A Comparison of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot Schoolbooks on the 'History of Cyprus'." PRIO Cyprus Center Report No. 2 (2008).

_____. "Introduction." Postcolonial Studies, Vol. 9, No. 3 (2006).

_____. "Is there 'Cypriot Coffee', or only Greek and Turkish Coffee?" The Cyprus Dossier: Towards Free/Thinking Cyprus, issue 00 (January 2011).

_____. "Nation, Narrative and Commemoration: Political Ritual in Divided Cyprus." *History and Anthropology*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (2003).

_____, Nicos Peristianis and Gisela Welz (eds.). *Divided Cyprus: Modernity, History and an Island in Conflict.* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2006.

Papastephanou, Marianna. "Religious Teaching and Political Context: The Case of Cyprus." *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (August 2005).

Patrick, Richard A. *Political Geography and the Cyprus Conflict: 1963-1971*. Department of Geography Publications Series No. 4, Ontario: University of Waterloo, 1976.

Pericleous, Chrysostomos. *The Cyprus Referendum: A Divided Island and the Challenge of the Annan Plan*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2009.

Philippou, Stavroula and Andrekos Varnava. "Constructions of Solution(s) to the Cyprus Problem: Exploring Formal Curricula in Greek Cypriot State Schools." In Varnava and Faustmann (eds.) *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond*, 2009.

Polat, Necati. "Self-Determination, Violence and Modernity: The Case of the Turkish Cypriots." In Thomas Diez (ed.) *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Polyviou, Polivios G. *Cyprus Conflict and Negotiation 1960-1980*. London: Duckworth, 1980.

_____. *The Tragedy and the Challenge*. England: Swin and Son, 1975.

Pope, Hugh. "Waiting for Miracles in Cyprus." *Current History* (March 2010).

Posen, Barry R. “The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict.” *Survival*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (1993).

Prodromou, Elizabeth H. “Reintegrating Cyprus: The Need for a New Approach.” *Survival*, Vol. 40, No. 3 (Autumn 1998).

Ramm, Christoph. “Assessing Transnational Renegotiation in the Post-1974 Turkish Cypriot Community: ‘Cyprus Donkeys’, ‘Black Beards’ and the ‘EU Carrot’.” *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies, Vol. 6, No. 4* (December 2006).

Ramming, Saskia. “Cyprus’s Accession Negotiations to the European Union: Conditional Carrots, Good Faith, and Miscalculations.” *International Negotiation* 13 (2008).

“Reconciliation and Citizenship in Cyprus: A Trans-Communal Concept for Social Action.” *Cyprus Review*, Special Edition, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 2007).

Reddaway, John. *Burdened with Cyprus: The British Connection*. Nicosia: K. Rustem and Brother, 1986.

Reflections on the Cyprus Problem: Compilation of Recent Academic Contributions. Famagusta: Eastern Mediterranean University Printing-House, 2006.

Report of the Secretary-General Pursuant to Paragraph 6 of Security Council Resolution 401, S/12323 (30 April 1977).

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/13369 (31 May 1979).

Report of the Secretary General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus, S/23780 (3 April 1992).

Report of the Secretary-General on His Mission of Good Offices, S/24830 (19 November 1992).

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/26026 (1 July 1993).

Report of the Secretary-General in Connection with the Security Council’s Comprehensive Reassessment of the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/26777 (22 November 1993).

Report of the Secretary-General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus, S/2003/398 (1 April 2003).

Report of the Secretary-General on His Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus, S/2004/437 (28 May 2004).

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/2008/353 (2 June 2008).

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/2008/744 (28 November 2008).

Assessment Report of the Secretary-General on the Status of the Negotiations in Cyprus, S/2011/112 (4 March 2011).

Assessment Report of the Secretary-General on the Status of the Negotiations in Cyprus, S/2011/498 (8 August 2011).

Report of the Secretary General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/2011/746 (30 November 2011).

Assessment Report of the Secretary-General on the Status of the Negotiations in Cyprus, S/2012/149 (12 March 2012), pp. 4-5.

Richmond, Oliver P. "Critical Research Agendas for Peace: The Missing Link in the Study of International Relations." *Alternatives* 32 (2007).

_____. The Dilemmas of Conflict Resolution: A Comparison of Sri Lanka and Cyprus." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 10 (2004).

_____. "The Globalisation of Approaches to Conflict." *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (2004).

_____. *Mediating in Cyprus: The Cypriot Communities and the United Nations.* London: Frank Cass, 1998.

_____. "The Multiple Dimensions of International Peacemaking: UN and EU Involvement in the Cyprus Conflict." In Thomas Diez (ed.) *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

_____. "Shared Sovereignty and the Politics of Peace: Evaluating the EU's 'Catalytic' Framework in the Eastern Mediterranean." *International Affairs*, Vol. 82, No. 1 (2005).

Roe, Paul. *Ethnic Violence and the Societal Security Dilemma*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.

_____. "Former Yugoslavia: The Security Dilemma That Never Was?" *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (2000).

Rose, William. "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict: Some New Hypotheses," *Security Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (2000).

Rothfield, Philipa, Cleo Fleming and Paula A. Komesaroff (eds.). *Pathways to Reconciliation: Between Theory and Practice.* Hampshire and Burlington: Ashgate, 2008.

Rotberg, Robert I. "Reunifying Cyprus: Essential Challenges." In Varnava and Faustmann (eds.) *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond*, 2009.

Ruzicka, Jan and Nicholas J. Wheeler. "The Puzzle of Trusting Relationships in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty." *International Affairs*, Vol. 86, Issue 1 (2010).

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

Siniver, Asaf. "Power, Impartiality and Timing: Three Hypotheses on Third Party Mediation in the Middle East." *Political Studies*, Vol. 54, No.4 (2006).

Sitas, Ari. "Beyond the Mandela Decade: The Ethic of Reconciliation." *Current Sociology*, Vol. 59, No. 5 (September 2011).

_____. "Reconciliation and Transformation: Lessons from South Africa?" *Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 2007).

_____, Dilek Latif and Natasa Loizou. "Prospects of Reconciliation, Co-Existence and Forgiveness in Cyprus in the Post-Referendum Period." PRIO Cyprus Center Report 4 (2007).

Schiff, Amira. "Pre-negotiation and its Limits in Ethno-National Conflicts: A Systematic Analysis of Process and Outcomes in the Cyprus Negotiations." *International Negotiation* 13 (2008).

Smith, Dennis. “Displacement and Reconciliation.” *Current Sociology*, Vol. 59, No. 5 (September 2011).

Smith, Steve. “The Contested Concept of Security.” In Ken Booth (ed.) *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005.

Snyder, Glen H. “The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics.” *World Politics*, Vol. 36, No. 4 (1984).

Snyder, Jack and Robert Jervis, “Civil Wars and the Security Dilemma.” in B. Walter and J. Snyder (eds). *Civil Wars, Insecurity, and Intervention*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Someritis, Richard S. “Cyprus: The Crisis Continues.” *Survival*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (1972).

Sommer, Jerry. “Security in Cyprus: Threat Perceptions, Possible Compromises and the Role of the EU.” Bonn International Center for Conversion, Paper No. 44 (2005).

Sonyel, Salahi R. *Cyprus, the Destruction of a Republic and its Aftermath: British Documents 1960-1974*. Nicosia: CYREP, 2003.

Sorensen, Georg. “After the Security Dilemma: The Challenges of Insecurity in Weak States and the Dilemma of Liberal Values.” Security Dialogue, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2007).

Sözen, Ahmet (ed.). *The Cyprus Conflict: Looking Ahead*. Famagusta: Eastern Mediterranean University Printing-House, 2008.

_____. “The Cyprus Impasse and Prospects for a Breakthrough.” In *Reflections on the Cyprus Problem: Compilation of Recent Academic Contributions.* Famagusta: Eastern Mediterranean University Printing-House, 2006.

_____. “The Cyprus Negotiations: From the 1963 Inter-Communal Negotiations to the Annan Plan.” In *Reflections on the Cyprus Problem: Compilation of Recent Academic Contributions.* Famagusta: Eastern Mediterranean University Printing-House, 2006.

_____. “A Model for Power-Sharing in Cyprus: From the 1959 London-Zurich Agreements to the Annan Plan.” *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (2004).

_____. "The Turkish Cypriot Legislative Election of February 2005; The Rise of CTP/BG." *South European Society and Politics*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (2005).

Stavrinides, Panicos. "A Psychological Analysis of the Greek Cypriot 'No'." In Varnava and Faustmann (eds.) *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond*, 2009 .

Stavrinides, Zenon. "*Dementia Cypria*: On the Social Psychological Environment of the Intercommunal Negotiations." *Cyprus Review*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (Spring 2009).

Stegenga, James A. *The United Nations Force in Cyprus*. Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1968.

Stephen, Michael. "How the International Community Made a Cyprus Settlement Impossible." *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (2001).

Stivachtis, Yannis A. "Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean Region: Security Considerations, the Cyprus Imperative and the EU Option." In Thomas Diez (ed.) *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict and Postmodern Union*, 2002.

Suh, J. J. "Producing Security Dilemma out of Uncertainty: The North Korea Nuclear Crisis." Mario Einaudi Center for International Studies, Working Paper Series No. 8 (2006).

Şahin, Sanem. "Open Borders, Closed Minds: The Discursive Construction of National Identity in North Cyprus." *Media, Culture and Society*, Vol. 33, No. 4 (2011).

Talat, Mehmet Ali. Former President of TRNC. *A Personal Interview*, 5 May 2012.

Taki, Yiouli. "The Plan, Public Discourse and the Role of Mass Media in Getting to 'No'." In Varnava and Faustmann (eds.) *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond*, 2009.

Tang, Shiping. "The Security Dilemma: A Conceptual Analysis." *Security Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (2009).

Tamçelik, Soyalp. *Kıbrıs'ta Güvenlik Stratejileri ve Kriz Yönetimi*. Ankara: ODTÜ Yayıncılık, 2009.

Tamkoç, Metin. *The Turkish Cypriot State: The Embodiment of the Right of Self-determination*. Nicosia and London: K. Rustem and Brother, 1988.

Tank, Pınar. "Cyprus: A Note on Security Guarantees and Threat Perceptions." *Turkish Yearbook*, Vol. 35 (2004).

Tannam, Etain. "The EU and the Conflict Settlement in Comparative Perspective: Northern Ireland and Cyprus." Paper Presented at the Conference of EU and the Promotion and Stabilisation of Conflict Settlements, University of Nottingham, UK (22-23 November 2007).

"T.C Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi'ndeki Belgelerde Kıbrıs 1923-1960." *Kıbrıs Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Cilt 14, Sayı 34 (2008).

Theophanous, Andreas. "The Cyprus Problem: Accession to the EU and Broader Implications." *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (Winter 2003).

Thompson, Spurgeon, Stavros St. Karayanni and Myria Vassiliadou. "Cyprus after History." *Interventions*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (2004).

Tocci, Nathalie. *EU Accession Dynamics and Conflict Resolution: Catalysing Peace or Consolidating Partition in Cyprus?* London: Ashgate, 2004.

_____. *The EU's Role in Conflict Resolution: Promoting Peace in the Backyard*. London: Routledge, 2007.

_____. "Incentives and Disincentives for Reunification and EU Accession in Cyprus." *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Spring 2003).

_____. "The Missed Opportunity to Promote Reunification in Cyprus." In Sözen (ed.) *The Cyprus Conflict: Looking Ahead*, 2008.

Trimikliniotis, Nicos. "For a Sociology of Reconciliation and Conflict: An Ascending Ethic of Reconciliation." *Current Sociology*, Vol. 59, No. 5 (September 2011).

_____. "Introduction: Reconciliaion and Citizenship in Cyprus: A Trans Communal Concept for Social Action." *Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 2007).

_____. "Reconciliation and Social Action in Cyprus: Citizens' Inertia and the Protracted State of Limbo." *Cyprus Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 2007).

Turk, Marco A. "Rethinking the Cyprus Problem: Are Frame-Breaking Changes Still Possible through Application of Intractable Conflict Intervention Approaches to This Hurting Stalemate." *Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Review*, Vol. 29, Issue 3 (2007).

Türk Ajansı Kıbrıs, Official News Agency of TRNC, 17 March 2004, 17 April 2004, 22 April 2004, 17 April 2005, 24 April 2005, 2 July 2008, 3 July 2008, 20 March 2010, 17 July 2011.

The UN in Cyprus: An Inter-communal Survey of Public Opinion. UNFICYP, 2008.

UN General Assembly Resolutions 3212 (1974), 3395 (1975), 33/15 (1978), 34/30 (1979), 37/253 (1983).

UN Security Council Resolutions 353 (1974), 357 (1974), 367 (1975), 774 (1992), 889 (1993), 939 (1994), 969 (1994), 1000 (1995), 1032 (1995), 1062 (1996), 1092 (1996), 1117 (1997), 1146 (1997), 1178 (1998), 1179 (1998), 1217 (1998), 1251 (1999).

Ungerleider, John. "Bicommunal Youth Camps for Peace in Cyprus." *Peace Review*, Vol. 13, No. 4 (2001).

Volkan, Vamık D. *Cyprus: War and Adaptation*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1979.

_____. "Cyprus: Ethnic Conflicts and Tensions." *International Journal of Group Tensions*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (1989).

Varnava, Andrekos and Hubert Faustmann, (eds.). *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond*. London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2009.

Vural, Yücel and Nicos Peristianis. "Beyond Ethno-nationalism: Emerging Trends in Cypriot Politics After the Annan Plan." *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (2008).

Waever, Ole. "Securitization and Desecuritization." in Ronnie D. Lipschutz, *On Security*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

_____, Barry Buzan, Morten Kelstrup and Pierre Lemaitre. *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

Warner, Geoffrey. Review of "The United States and the Cyprus crisis of 1974", by Foreign Relations of the United States 1969–1976, Vol. XXIX, *Eastern Europe; Eastern Mediterranean 1969–1972* and Vol. XXX, *Greece; Cyprus; Turkey 1973–1976*. Washington DC: The United States Government Printing Office, 2007.

Webster, Craig. "Division or Unification in Cyprus? The Role of Demographics, Attitudes and Party Inclination on Greek Cypriot Preferences for a Solution to the Cyprus Problem." *Ethnopolitics*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (September 2005).

Weldes, Jutta, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson and Raymond Duvall (eds.) *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the Production of Danger*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Wendt, Alexander. "Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 2 (1992).

_____. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Wheeler, Nicholas J. "Beyond Waltz's Nuclear World: More Trust May Be Better." *International Relations*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (2009).

_____. "'To Put Yourslef into the Other Fellow's Place': John Herz, the Security Dilemma and the Nuclear Age." *International Relations*, Vol. 22, No. 4 (2008).

_____ and Ken Booth. "The Security Dilemma." In John Baylis and N. J. Rengger (eds.) *Dilemmas of World Politics: International Issues in a Changing World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Williams, Paul D. (ed.) *Security Studies: An Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge, 2008.

Wipmann, David. "International Law and Ethnic Conflict on Cyprus." *Texas International Law Journal*, Vol. 31 (1996).

Wyn Jones, Richard. *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1999.

Yakinthou, Christalla. “Consociational Democracy and Cyprus: The House that Annan Built?” In Varnava and Faustmann (eds.) *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond*, 2009.

Yeşilada, Birol and Ahmet Sözen. “Negotiating a Resolution to the Cyprus Problem: Is Potential European Union Membership a Blessing or a Curse?” *Journal of International Negotiation*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (2002).

_____. “Emperor Has No Clothes: EU’s Cyprus Challenge.” In Sözen (ed.) *The Cyprus Conflict: Looking Ahead*, 2008.

Yılmaz, Muzaffer Ercan. “Past Hurts and Relational Problems in the Cyprus Conflict.” *International Journal on World Peace*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (June 2010).

Zembylas, Michalinos. “Ethnic Division in Cyprus and a Policy Initiative on Promoting Peaceful Coexistence: Toward an Agonistic Democracy for Citizenship Education.” *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (2011).

APPENDIX A

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name: İpek Borman

Date and Place of Birth: 25 June 1978, Nicosia

Phone: +90 533 865 7225

email: ipekborman@gmail.com

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year
M.A. in International Affairs	Georgetown University Washington, D.C.	2001
B.A. in American Culture and Literature	Bilkent University Ankara	1999
High School	Türk Maarif Koleji Nicosia	1995

WORK EXPERIENCE

Enrollment	Place	Year
Foreign Affairs Officer	TRNC Presidency	2005-2010
Lecturer	Cyprus International University	2005-2007
Lecturer	Girne American University	2001-2003

APPENDIX B

TURKISH SUMMARY

Bu çalışma, Kıbrıs sorunu bağlamında güvenlik ikilemini yeniden düşünmektedir. Kıbrıs'ta yerleşik siyasi söylemleri ve toplumsal güvensizlikleri incelemekte ve sorunsallaştırmaktadır. Temel olarak, anarşi, düzen ve güven merkezli güvensizlik mantıklarından yararlanılarak, Kıbrıs sorununun eleştirel güvenlik bakış açısıyla yeniden kavramsallaştırılmasını savunmaktadır. Bu anlamda, Kıbrıs'taki güvenlik paradoksunun uzlaşı ve güven inşaası yoluyla aşılması bakımından yeniden düşünülmesi fikrini öne sürmektedir. Bu çalışma, ayrıca, gerek devlet gerekse de toplum düzeyinde insan faktörünün uzlaşı ve güven inşaası süreçlerindeki rolüne dikkat çekerek, bu süreçlerin adadaki iki toplumu millet sonrası ve çoğulcu bir topluma dönüştürmede anahtar olduğu sonucuna varmaktadır.

Bu bağlamda Kıbrıs'taki güvenlik paradoksu aşılabilir mi sorusunu irdeleyen çalışma, Ken Booth ve Nicholas Wheeler'in güvenlik ikilemini anarşi, düzen ve güven merkezli güvensizlik mantıkları aracılığıyla yeniden düşündükleri kuramsal çerçeveyi kullanmaktadır. Ana hatları ile Booth ve Wheeler, güvenlik ikileminin, dünya politikasının yapısal anarşik sistemin dışında anlaşılamayacağını savunan realist ve neo-realist kuramlar çerçevesinde şekillenen anarşi merkezli mantık ile liberal ve neo-liberal kuramları içeren düzen merkezli mantık dışında yeniden düşünülmesi gerektiğini savunmaktadır. Çünkü, gerek anarşi gerekse de düzen merkezli mantıklarda, sistemin anarşikliği esas alınmakta ve mümkün olabilecek değişiklikler bu kuramların pozitivist yaklaşımıyla irdelenmektedir. Bu yaklaşımlar, güvenlik

ikilemini sadece azaltmayı veya hafifletmeyi hedeflemektedirler. Dolayısıyla da güvenlik ikileminin bir dereceye kadar hafifletilebileceğini, ancak aşılmasının mümkün olmadığını öngörmektedirler.

Oysa, Booth ve Wheeler, güvenlik ikileminin önceden belirlenmiş ve dünya politikasının değişmez bir parçası olduğu tezini reddetmektedirler. Her ne kadar dünya politikasında belirsizliğin ortadan kaldırılamayacağını savunsalar da güvenlik ikileminin aşılmasının mümkün olduğu fikrini öne çıkarmaktadırlar. Bu çerçevede, anarşi ve düzen merkezli mantıklar dışında güven merkezli mantığın düşünülmesini esas almaktadırlar. Güven merkezli mantık, değişim ve dönüşüme dayalı kuramsal çerçeveleri harmanlayarak, güvenlik ikileminin aşılması için gerek devlet gerekse de toplumsal düzeyde güven tesis edici mekanizmaların hayata geçirilmesini benimsemektedir. Amaç ise, güvenin sadece devletler bazında değil, toplumlar arasında ve daha da doğrusu toplumlar düzeyinde yeşermesi ve yerleşmesidir. Booth ve Wheeler, güven kavramının empirik olarak çalışılmasına olanak sağlamak amacıyla güven inşaası sürecinin nitelik ve katmanlarını da ortaya koymaktadırlar. Bu katmanları karanlığa adım atmak, empati ve bağ kurmak, bağımlılık ve kırılganlık, ve de bütünlük ve güvenilirlik olarak tanımlamaktadırlar.

Güven merkezli mantık, sadece güvenin güvenlik çalışmaları bağlamında kavramsallaştırılmasıyla yetinmez. Aynı zamanda, insan faktörünün ve onun seçimlerinin gerek ikilemin inşaasında gerekse de aşılmasında ne denli önemli olduklarını da irdeler. Dolayısıyla, güvenlik ikileminin, bir sosyal olgu olarak, tarihi süreç ve sosyal etkileşimle ortaya çıktığı ve de dönüştürülebileceği tezini ortaya koyar. Temel olarak, Booth ve Wheeler'in kuramsallaştırdığı şekliyle güven merkezli mantık, eleştirel güvenlik bakış

açısından beslenerek, güvenlik, güvensizlik, kimlik ve ikilemlerinin gerici ve olumsuz kavramlar olarak düşünülmemesi gerektiğini, tam tersine tarihi ve sosyal süreçlerle inşaa edilmiş olgular olarak siyasileştirilip, sorunsallaştırılabileceklerine işaret eder.

Bu çerçevede, ilk olarak güvenlik ve güvenlik ikilemi kavramlarının kuramsal olarak analizi yapılan çalışmada, Uluslararası İlişkiler disiplininde nasıl ele alındıkları üzerinde durulmaktadır. Soğuk Savaş döneminde egemen olan realist ve neo-realist kuramlar ışığında şekillenen güvenlik ikilemi kavramının Soğuk Savaş'ın sona ermesiyle disiplinde öne çıkmaya başlayan eleştirel yaklaşımlardan nasıl etkilendiğine odaklanılarak, güvenlik gibi güvenlik ikilemi kavramının da eleştirel güvenlik bakış açısıyla yeniden düşünülebileceği irdelenmektedir. Burada temel alınan, gerek güvenlik gerekse de güvenlik ikilemi kavramlarının nesnelliğinin değişmez olmadığı, tam tersine türedikleri siyasi görüş içerisinde anlam kazandıkları varsayımıdır. Dolayısıyla da her iki kavramın farklı yaklaşımlarla siyasileştirilerek çalışılabileceği ortaya konmaktadır. Devamla, Booth ve Wheeler'in yeniden düşündükleri şekliyle güvenlik ikileminin güven merkezli mantıkla nasıl kavramsallaştırılabileceği incelenmektedir. Bu bağlamda, güven kavramının kuramsal olarak ana hatları belirlenmekte ve güvenin güvenlik ikileminin aşılmasında oynadığı rol üzerinde durulmaktadır.

Booth ve Wheeler'in tanımlamasına göre, Kıbrıs'ta güvenlik ikilemi değil, güvenlik paradoksu mevcuttur. Çünkü ortada iki seçenek arasında kalmış siyasi aktörler ve herhangi bir belirsizlik bulunmamaktadır. İkilem, iki tarafın da diğeri ile ilgili niyetlerinin anarşik sistemi esas alan kaderci bir yaklaşımla yorumlanmasıyla bir paradoks olarak şekillenmiştir. Bu bağlamda, Kıbrıs'ta güvenlik bugüne kadar önceden verilmiş kimlik ve politikalar olduğu varsayılarak irdelenmiş, güvenlik paradoksu ise aşılamaz olarak

düşünülegelmiştir. Ayrıca, Kıbrıs sorunu bağlamında güvenlik Kıbrıs'ın stratejik ve jeopolitik değerine atıfla çalışılagelmiştir. Kıbrıs sorunu genelde uluslararası bir sorun olarak addedilerek, güvenlik çalışmalarında adadaki sosyal ve toplumsal yapılar büyük ölçüde göz ardı edilmiş ve çözüm çabaları Kıbrıs'ın stratejik bir değer olması çerçevesinde ele alınmıştır.

Bu çalışmanın amacı ise, mevcut pozitivist yaklaşımları sorgulayarak, Kıbrıs'ın her iki tarafında da yerleşmiş olan ve gerçek kabul edilen siyasi söylemlerin ve toplumsal güvensizliklerin siyasileştirilmesini ve de güvenlik paradoksunun aşılmasını hedeflemektedir. Bu doğrultuda, Kıbrıs sorununun bir güvenlik paradoksu olarak ortada duran bir gerçeklik olmadığını ve aslında sosyal bir olgu olarak inşaa edildiğini göstermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Buna binaen, ilk olarak, anarşi merkezli mantık çerçevesinde dışlayıcı ve birbirine zıt kimlik oluşumlarının ve toplumsal güvensizliklerin tarihi süreçte nasıl inşaa edildiğini analiz etmektedir. Özellikle koloni dönemindeki politikaların Kıbrıs'taki toplumların etnikleştirilmesinde oynadığı role dikkat çekmektedir. Anarşi merkezli mantık çerçevesinde şekillenen ayrıştırıcı etnik kimlikler, 1960'ta anavatanların müdahalesiyle kurulan ve aslında her iki toplum tarafından istenmeyen Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti'nin akıbetinde de etken olmuşlardır. Dışlayıcı ve zıt kimlik oluşumları yine dışlayıcı politikaların oluşmasında belirgin bir faktör olarak ortaya çıkarak, Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti çatısı altında halihazırda bir güvenlik ikilemi içerisinde başlayan toplumlararası ilişkilerin 1963-1974 yılları arasında yaşanan trajedilerle bir güvenlik paradoksu ile sonuçlanmasına yol açmıştır. Bu noktada önemli olan zıt kimlik ve tarih anlayışlarının ve farklılaştırılmış sosyal travma ve korkuların siyasi söylem ve politikaları ne derecede etkilediğidir. Tarihsel süreç ele alındığında, karşılıklı bir etkileşimin ve oluşumun mevcut olduğu görülmektedir.

İkinci ve dolaylı olarak, siyasi söylem ve politikalarla toplumsal güvensizliklerin Kıbrıs sorununu çözme çabalarında oynadıkları rol irdelenmektedir. Bu aşamada, anarşi merkezli mantığın toplumlararası müzakerelere ve bu müzakerelerde ele alınan konulara ne derece hükmettiği ortaya çıkmaktadır. Anarşi merkezli mantığın müzakereler üzerindeki egemenliği, her iki tarafın da değişen siyasi koşullara karşı direnen temel çözüm felsefesinin değişmezliği bağlamında manidardır. Sonuç olarak, karşılıklı bir şekilde beslenen zıt siyasi söylem ve politikalarla toplumsal güvensizlikler, mevcut güvenlik paradoksunun sürekli olarak canlı kalmasını sağlamışlardır. Bu bağlamda, anarşi merkezli mantığa ve toplumsal güvensizliklere dayanılarak, farklı ve birbirini dışlayıcı güvenlik politikalarının benimsenmesine yol açılmıştır. Bu güvenlik politikalarının özünde, bir toplumun güvenliğinin öteki toplumun güvensizliği ile şekillenmesi anlayışı yatmaktadır. Bu anlayıştan hareketle, iki toplumu da tatmin edecek şekilde güvenliğin bir araç olarak ilerici politikalarla ele alınması olanaksızlaştırılmıştır. Hal böyle olunca, çözüm çabaları da dar bir rasyonellikten öteye taşınamamıştır. Özellikle de toplumsal güvensizliklerin Kıbrıs'ta kapsamlı bir çözüme erişilmesini hangi oranda etkileyebileceği 2004 yılında Annan Planı'nın eşzamanlı, iki ayrı referanduma sunulmasıyla belirgin hale gelmiştir. Planın Kıbrıslı Rumların büyük çoğunluğu tarafından reddedilmesinin ardında güvenlik sorunlarının olduğunu aşikardır. Dolayısıyla, mevcut yerleşik siyasi söylem ve politikalarla her iki toplumda da var olan güvensizlikler sorgulanmadan ve bunların aşılmasının yolu aranmadan, Kıbrıs'ta kalıcı bir barışa ulaşmak mümkün görünmemektedir.

Bu varsayımdan hareketle, Kıbrıs'ta değişim ve dönüşümü tetikleyen 2004-2010 dönemi incelenerek, yerleşik siyasi söylemlerin toplumsal güvensizlikleri ortadan kaldırma bakımından ne oranda değiştirildiğine

bakılmıştır. 2002 yılında Annan Planı'nın ortaya çıkmasıyla, özellikle Kıbrıs Türk toplumunda etkili olan AB üyelik perspektifi ve federasyon çabalarının Kıbrıs Türk siyasi yaşamını sadece etkilemekle kalmadığı ve etkin bir şekilde dönüştürdüğü bu dönemin ele alınmasıyla görülmektedir. Ayrılıkçı politikalarla yönetilen Kıbrıs Türk toplumu tarihinde ilk defa çözüm ve barış vizyonuna sahip bir liderliği başa getirmiştir. İlerleyen süreçte, Kıbrıs Rum tarafında da aynı vizyona sahip bir liderliğin yönetime geçmesiyle, Kıbrıs sorununun çözümü yönünde beklentilerin yüksek olduğu bir döneme girilmiştir. Bu dönemde, her iki liderliğin Kıbrıs sorununu bulunduğu paradokstan çıkararak, ikilemi azaltmaya yönelik politikalar izlediği açık bir şekilde görülmektedir. Anarşi merkezli mantık yerine bu dönemde ortaya çıkan düzen merkezli mantık, tabu olarak kabul edilen birtakım siyasi söylemleri ve politikları sorgulamıştır. Bunun sonucunda da ortak hedef olarak federasyon vizyonu şekillenmiş ve toplumlararası müzakereler yeniden başlatılmıştır. Güvenlik paradoksunun hafifletilerek, ikilemin aşılmasının önünü açacak karşılıklı olarak gösterilen hassassiyetler bu noktada büyük önem taşımaktadır. Liderlerin söylemleri ve izledikleri politikalar, günün sonunda Kıbrıs sorununun önceden verilmiş bir gerçeklik olmadığını, tam aksine dönüştürülebileceğinin sinyallerini vermiştir. Bu bağlamda, insan faktörü ve onun seçimlerinin ön plana çıkmasıyla, gerek siyasi gerekse de toplumsal yaşamı nasıl etkiledikleri irdelenmektedir.

Ne var ki, bu dönemde, anarşi merkezli mantığın siyasi söylem ve politikaları etkin bir şekilde sorgulansa da öngörülen değişim sağlanamamıştır. Dönemin söylem ve politikaları incelendiğinde ise, bunun sebebinin Kıbrıs'ta süregelen güvenlik anlayışının devam ettirilmesi, mecvut güvenlik politikalarının esas alınması ve toplumsal güvensizliklerin ikincil önemde düşünülmesidir. Dolayısıyla, siyasi söylem ve politikalar toplumsal güvensizlikleri etkilemeyi

sürdürmüş ve gerçek anlamda sınır aşıcı politikalar uygulanamamıştır. İlk olarak, düzen merkezli mantıkta, federasyonun rasyonel bir olgu olarak düşünüldüğü görülmektedir. Aslında, her iki taraf açısından federasyon uluslararası hukuk ve uluslararası toplumun gerçekleri ışığında kavramsallaştırıldığı için toplumlararası bir dönüşüme etken olamamıştır. Bunun anlamı açıkça şudur; federasyon bir zaruret olduğu ve uluslararası hukuk çerçevesinde bunun dışında bir çözüm aranamayacağı için desteklenmektedir. Bu tür bir federasyon anlayışıyla, çözüm çabaları devlet düzeyinde salt bir işbirliği mekanizması içerisine hapsolarak, toplumları sosyal güvensizliklerinin giderilmesi bakımından etkileyecek kapasiteye getirilememiştir. Ayrıca, düzen merkezli mantığın da anarşi merkezli mantığın savunageldiği güvenlik politikaları çerçevesinde hareket ettiği görülmektedir. Bu bağlamda, yerleşmiş ve dışlayıcı güvenlik söylem ve politikaları sorgulanmayarak, toplumsal güvensizlikler bir nevi göz ardı edilmiştir. Tıpkı anarşi merkezli mantıkta olduğu gibi, düzen merkezli mantık da bir toplumun güvenliğinin diğer toplumun güvensizliğine yol açacak şekilde ele alınmasına olanak sağlamıştır. Özellikle de çözüm ve barış vizyonuna sahip liderliklerin uzlaşı ve güven tesis eden mekanizmaları ikincil değerde addedmelerinin sonuçları gerek resmi düzeyde müzakerelerin çökmesi, gerekse de toplumsal güvensizliklerin giderek derinleşmesi bağlamında trajiktir. Nitekim Talat ve Hristofyas'ın tabu kabul edilen konularda karanlığa adım atmaları ve karşılıklı gözetilen hassassiyetler çerçevesinde oluşan bağ güven tesis edici boyuta ulaştırılamamış ve yerleşik anarşi mantığının hakim gelmesiyle hafifletilen güvenlik ikileminin kısa sürede yeniden güvenlik paradoksuna gerilemesine neden olmuştur.

Halbuki, gerek yerleşik siyasi söylem ve politikaları, gerekse de toplumsal güvensizlikleri sorunsallaştırmada güven inşaası önemli bir araç olarak

ortaya çıkmaktadır. Dolayısıyla, hem devlet hem de toplumsal düzeyde güven inşaasına yer verilmelidir. Bunun yolu olarak da uzlaşı sürecinin toplumlararası güvenin oluşmasına katkısı üzerinde durulmalıdır. Bu çerçevede, bu çalışma Kıbrıs'ta mevcut uzlaşı anlayışını ve politikaları irdeleyerek, toplumsal güvensizliklere ne ölçüde değinilmesi gerektiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Kıbrıs'ta toplumsal düzeyde uzlaşı mekanizması bulunmamaktadır. Devlet düzeyinde ise, her ne kadar toplumsal uzlaşı bağlamında olmasa da güven artırıcı önlemler vasıtasıyla birtakım adımlar atılmaya çalışılmıştır. Ancak, güven artırıcı önlemler dar bir devlet-merkezcilik temelinde resmi müzakereler gibi ele alındığı için kapsamlı bir şekilde hayata geçirilememiştir. Genelde askeri önlemlerin ön plana çıkarılmasıyla, toplumsal düzeyde uzlaşıya etki edecek bir anlayışla düşünülmemiştir. Bu bağlamda, adanın bölünmüşlüğünden kaynaklanan ve her iki toplumda da bireylerin hayatlarını olumsuz etkileyen birtakım pratik önlemler öngörülse de bunların hayata geçirilmesi anarşi merkezli mantığın kıstasları içerisinde mümkün olamamıştır. Düzen merkezli mantığın hakim olduğu dönemde ise, toplumsal uzlaşıya katkı sağlayacak bazı politikalar düşünülmüş ve hayata geçirilmiştir. Bunun en somut örneği, Kıbrıs Türk tarafında ayrıştırılmış etnik kimlik oluşumlarını ortadan kaldırmaya ve ortak bir kimlik ve tarih vizyonunun benimsenmesine yönelik olarak tarih kitaplarının değiştirilmesidir. Ne var ki, Kıbrıs Türk tarafında liderliğin değişmesiyle birlikte, yeni kitaplar kaldırılarak yerlerine eski tarih kitapları getirilmiştir. Kıbrıs Rum tarafındaki benzer düşünceler ise söylemden öteye geçememiş ve anarşi merkezli mantıkla beslenen fikirlerin eleştirileri nedeniyle hayata geçirilememiştir.

Bu gelişmeler açıkça göstermektedir ki devlet seviyesinde öngörülen ve uzlaşıya katkı sağlayabilecek temel girişimler dahi liderliklerin ve de

dolayısıyla mantıkların değişmesiyle ters yüz edilebilmektedir. Bu çalışmanın da varsaydığı üzere, gerçek anlamda iki toplumu yakınlaştıracak ve güven bunalımını giderecek uzlaşı ve güven politikaları tesis edilmediği sürece, Kıbrıs'ta güvenlik paradoksunu aşmak mümkün olamayacaktır. Karşılıklı geçişlerin olduğu bir ortamda, bireysel ilişkilerin bu kadar kısıtlı kalması ve güçlü bir toplumsal diyaloğun yaratılamaması ciddi anlamda uzlaşı mekanizmalarının gerekliğine işaret etmektedir. Güven inşaasındaki niteliklerin gerçek anlamda güven tesis edici bir sürece dönüştürülmesi bakımından her iki toplumdaki bireylerin karşılıklı korkularını giderebilecekleri, birbirlerinin travmalarını anlayabilecekleri, empati kurarak sosyal etkileşime geçebilecekleri mekanizmalarla uzlaşı kültürüne doğru sosyalleşmeleri gerekmektedir. Bu bakımdan, devlet düzeyinde uygulanacak politikaların önemi büyüktür. Buna vurgu yapma açısından, bu çalışmada güven inşaası nitelikleri gerek mevcut anket çalışmaları kullanılarak, gerekse de bu tezin yazarı tarafından oluşturulan odak grupları vasıtasıyla ölçülmeye çalışılmıştır. Anket çalışmaları analizi açık bir şekilde ortaya koymuştur ki, toplumsal düzeydeki korku ve güvensizlikler çok önemli boyutlardadır, ve gerek kapsamlı bir çözüme ulaşılmasının gerekse de kalıcı bir barış ortamının yaratılmasının önündeki temel kısıtlayıcı faktörlerdir. Yine bu analizle ortaya çıkan bir diğer unsur ise, toplumların kendilerini etnik olarak ayrıştırdığı ve güvensizliklerinin kaynağı olarak birbirlerini gördükleridir. Bu çerçevede, karşılıklı empati geliştirme kısıtlı bir olgu olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır.

Ancak, diğer taraftan, odak grupları çalışması da açık bir şekilde göstermiştir ki bireyler homojen grupları dışına çıktıkça ve karşılıklı etkileşime geçtikçe, empati gösterme ve karşılıklı bağ kurma kabiliyetleri artmaktadır. Her ne kadar her iki çalışmanın sonucu güven tesisi bakımından sorunlu görünse de toplumsal diyalog ve ötesinde uzlaşı yolları açıldıkça, toplumsal

güvensizlikler sorunsallaştırabilir ve uzlaşı mekanizmalarının hayata geçirilmesiyle uzun vadede güven tesisine yönelik adımlar atılabilir. Çünkü, Annan Planı örneğinden de görülebileceği üzere, güven toplumlar düzeyinde oluşmadığı sürece, ne kapsamlı çözüm çabaları sonuç bulacaktır, ne de her iki toplumun kucaklayacağı bir ortak gelecek vizyonunun temeli atılabilecektir. Bu çerçevede, bu çalışmanın ortaya koyduğu Kıbrıs'ta iki farklı, ancak birbirini besleyen sürece ihtiyaç duyulduğudur. İlk olarak, sosyal güvensizliklerin kaynaklandığı tarihi olaylara atıfla geçmiş yaşanmışlıkları sorgulamak ve de ikinci olarak mevcut durumda güven tesis edici olanakları kullanarak geleceğe dair ortak bir kurgu yapmaktır. Her iki sürecin de gerek yerleşik siyasi söylem ve politikaların gerekse de toplumsal güvensizliklerin sorunsallaştırılması bakımından önemli olduğu çalışmanın ana sonuçları bakımından önemlidir. Booth ve Wheeler'in de işaret ettiği üzere, güvenlik paradoksları veya ikilemleri ancak ilerici bir güvenlik anlayışı ve toplumsal kimliklerin dönüşümü ile mümkün olabilir. Kıbrıs sorununa bakıldığında ise, hakim gelen dışlayıcı ve zıt kimlik oluşumları ve de buna bağlı olarak öngörülen dışlayıcı ve zıt güvenlik politikalarının dönüştürülmesi, uzlaşı ve güven inşaası yoluyla Kıbrıs'ta millet sonrası ve çoğulcu bir toplum kimliğini benimsemeden geçmektedir.

Sonuç olarak, Kıbrıs'ta güvenlik paradoksu aşılabilir mi sorusunda güven inşaası en temel faktör olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Elbette ki toplumsal korkular ve güvensizliklerin aşılması kolay bir sürece işaret etmemektedir. Ancak çalışmanın da varsaydığı ve incelediği gibi, Kıbrıs sorununun dönüşümü uzlaşı ve güven tesis edici mekanizmaların gerek devlet gerekse de toplumsal düzeyde hayata geçirilmesiyle mümkündür. Bu bağlamda, insan toplumunun dönüştürülebileceği gibi, dönüştürmesi de sağlanabilir. Dolayısıyla, anarşi merkezli mantığın güvenlik paradoksunun inşaa

edilmesindeki rolüne karşılık güven merkezli mantığın insan ve değişim araçları ile mevcut paradoksu aşabileceği bu çalışmanın ana sonucu olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır.

TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	X
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	
Enformatik Enstitüsü	
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	

YAZARIN

Soyadı : BORMAN
Adı : İPEK
Bölümü : ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : INSECURITY AND TRUST IN CYPRUS: RETHINKING THE SECURITY DILEMMA WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE CYPRUS PROBLEM

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans [ ] Doktora [X]

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın. [ ]
2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullancılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.) [X]
3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.) [ ]

Yazarın imzası ..... Tarih .....