Duquesne University
Duquesne Scholarship Collection

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Spring 1-1-2004

Case Study: Nicosia Master Plan; Cooperation in the Midst of Conflict

Doga Akinci

Follow this and additional works at: https://dsc.duq.edu/etd

Case Study: Nicosia Master Plan;

Cooperation in the Midst of Conflict

A Thesis

Presented to the

McAnulty College and Graduate of Liberal Arts

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment of

The requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

by

Doğa Akıncı

March 19, 2004

Preface

I dedicate this thesis to my father; Mustafa Akinci, former Mayor of North Nicosia, the leader of

the Peace and Democracy Movement and a current member of parliament, who tirelessly devotes

his life to the unification of his country and the enrichment of Turkish and Greek Cypriots to

create a peaceful future.

I also thank my readers Dr. Charles Hanna and Dr. Mary Frances Antolini for the patience,

support and the encouragement they provided me while writing my thesis.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The island of Cyprus has been physically divided between its Greek and Turkish communities since 1974. Its unresolved political status has been a constant problem in the international community as well as for the people of the island.

Since the division of Cyprus many initiatives have been undertaken to resolve the dispute. Most have failed to produce results. One of the most visible exceptions to this was the successful negotiation and cooperation between the Greek Cypriot and the Turkish Cypriot municipalities of the divided city Nicosia, the capital of the island. The Nicosia Master Plan came into action after the successful cooperation of completing the first phase of a sewage system in divided Nicosia in 1979. After the division in 1974 there was a pressing need for a sewage system in the city. "The health hazards did not recognize any boundaries therefore it was inevitable to solve this problem." (Akinci, interview) After a rather quick completion and implementation of the sewage system, the mayors of the North and South Nicosia envisioned the needs of a divided city at the time, as well as, the needs of a unified city in the future. With the vision of a united city they worked on a joint master plan of the city in order to stop the unplanned development and the inevitable deterioration created by the division.

Although this successful cooperation had not solved what is know as the Cyprus Problem, it proved that a successful cooperation is possible when the conditions permit. Today, the Greek Cypriot administration has completed negotiations with the European Union and officially the Greek Cypriot side will be

an EU country on May 1, 2004. Without a solution between the two sides, the future

EU membership will only benefit the Greek Cypriot community who lives in the

South part of the island and who is the only recognized government on the island.

The EU would provide major economic, social and political benefits to the both

communities but more so to the Turkish Cypriot side which is less developed and

more in need for an economic and a political stability. The Greek Cypriot side's

benefit would be the possible solution of the conflict and a political stability on the

island and in the region. Consequently, there are many incentives on both sides to

succeed.

This thesis will examine the process that was used to develop the Nicosia

Master Plan to determine whether any of the factors that allowed it to be successful

can be used to facilitate the process that needs to occur between the Greek Cypriot

and the Turkish Cypriot leaderships in regard to the future status of Cyprus in the

European Union.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

History of Cyprus Problem

Cyprus is located in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea, about 40 miles (64 km) south of

Turkey, 60 miles (97 km) west of Syria, and 480 miles (772 km) southeast of Greece.

Its maximum length from Cape Arnauti in the west to Cape Apostolos Andreas at the

end of the northeast peninsula is 140 miles (225 km). The maximum north-south

extent is 60 miles (97 km). With an area of 3,572 square miles (9,251 square km), it

is the third largest Mediterranean island after Sicily and Sardinia.

The history of Cyprus can be better understood if studied against the background of its geographic setting. Its successive rulers include the Egyptians, Greeks, Assyrians, Persians, Ptolemies, Romans, Byzantines, Franks, Venetians, Ottomans and British. The Turkish Cypriots and the Greeks Cypriots existed simultaneously on the island since 1571. In 1570 Ottoman landed in Cyprus and seized Nicosia but to the sultan, Cyprus was an unimportant province. In 1878, the Ottoman Empire leased the island to Britain while it remained under Turkish sovereignty. Britain's aim in occupying Cyprus was to secure a base in the eastern Mediterranean for the oil in the Middle East. In 1914 the Britain annexed the island and Cyprus remained a British colony until 1960. There were purely Greek Cypriot, Turkish Cypriot and mixed villages in all regions. The Greek and Turkish Cypriots do not share the same language, religion, neither historical nor ethnic background. Although the two sides could not establish a Cypriot nation they identify themselves as Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots, different than their fellow motherlands, Turkey and Greece.

The Greek Cypriot population, who from the start expected the British colonialists to transfer Cyprus to Greece, initially welcomed British occupation. The demand for *enosis* (union with Greece) was opposed by Turkish Cypriots, which created a major division on the island's politics. In 1947 the governor of Cyprus in accordance with the British Labor Party's declaration on colonial policy published proposals for greater self-government. The Greek Cypriots in favor of the slogan '*enosis only enosis'* rejected them. In 1955, Lieutenant Colonel Georgios Grivas, a Greek Cypriot who had served in the Greek Army, began a concerted campaign for

enosis with the support of the Greek nationalists. In 1955, Grivas formed an

underground guerilla organization, E.O.K.A (National Organization of Cypriot

Struggle), which took up arms against the colonial power. They bombed public

buildings and killed both British and Greek Cypriot opponents of *enosis*, which in

later stages targeted the Turkish Cypriots as well. In 1956 self-government proposals

came from Britain and again it was rejected and attacks continued. In contrast to

Greek Cypriot sentiment, the Turkish Cypriots and Turkey wanted the British rule to

continue. If the British left they wanted the island to be returned back to its owner,

Turkey, or partitioned. Public opinion in Turkey and Greece supported the two

communities resulting in riots and the exclusion of Greek residents in Turkey. The

two sides reached no solution with frequent visits to the United Nations.

In 1959 Greek and Turkish governments reached an agreement on creating an

independent republic in Cyprus, which was accepted by the British government and

the representatives of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities. In 1960 Cyprus

became an independent republic and became the 99th member of the United Nations.

Greece, Turkey and Britain guaranteed the independence, integrity and security of the

republic. They all had the right to station military forces on the island. The

agreements provided for a division of power along communal lines. The president of

the republic was a Greek Cypriot, Archbishop Makarios, and the Vice president was

a Turkish Cypriot, Dr. Fazil Kucuk. Since the population in 1960 was 80% Greek

Cypriot and 20% Turkish Cypriot, in the constitution they agreed on representation

on a basis of 70% -30% ratios between the respective communities. In 1963 the two

sides' partnership in the new government came to an end because the Greek Cypriots

wanted to make some changes to the Constitution and the Turkish Cypriots did not agree with it. In 1963 inter-communal clashes began and the Turkish Cypriot participation in the joint government came to an end. This was followed by civil unrest between the two sides and turned into an inevitable ethnic cleansing process by the Greek Cypriots toward Turkish Cypriots. The Turkish Cypriots moved, in some cases willingly and in other cases by force, from rural areas and mixed villages into protected enclaves in which Archbishop Makarios's authority did not reach. The capital city Nicosia was divided by a cease-fire line and became known as the 'Green Line' that was policed by British troops. The Turkish Cypriots established a transitional administration to govern their affairs until the provisions of the Constitution were fully implemented. In March 1964 the UN Security Council sent a multinational peacekeeping force to Cyprus. Originally this force was authorized to be there only for three months; however, they are still there today. This indicates that a resolution to the Cyprus Problem was not expected to take 40 years.

In 1967, a military junta took over power in Athens and targeted to get rid of the Greek Cypriot President Makarios, who was not in harmony with the existing regime in Greece. Greek troops (junta) and the Greek controlled Greek Cypriot National Guard staged a bloody coup that brought to power an extreme pro-*enosis*, radical, right-wing, anti-Turkish regime. Bulent Ecevit, then Prime Minister of Turkey, dispatched troops to the North in response to the coup attempt to merge the island with Greece using Turkey's guarantor power over Cyprus. (Boulton and Hadjipapas 2001). Both sides have different interpretations of this historical date; for the Turkish Cypriots it is a peace operation whereas for the Greek Cypriots, this is

the Turkish invasion or occupation. With the collapse of the Greek junta, talks

started in Geneva to stabilize the island. Meanwhile, the Turkish Army conducted a

second military operation and seized one third of the island. The talks did not bring

any solution to the problem; the island still remains under a Cease-Fire agreement

today. People from both sides could not return to their homes and became refuges.

The North became the new home of the Turkish Cypriots and the South went to the

Greek Cypriots.

 The Greek Cypriot side had retained the 1960 Constitution (that was

dissolved in 1963) although all provisions relating to the participation of the Turkish

Cypriot community in the exercise of executive, legislative, and judicial powers are

no longer applied (EU website). With the exception of Turkey, the Greek Cypriot

administration in the south is recognized by the international community as the only

legitimate government in Cyprus. Meanwhile the North declared her government on

November 15, 1983 to be recognized only by Turkey. Today, there is a fence running

down the entire length of Cyprus from east to west dividing the two communities.

The same fence also runs down the middle of Nicosia with the northern part of the

city serving as the capital of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and the

southern part serving as the capital of the Republic of Cyprus. The fence represents

division forcing the two sides to live in total isolation from one another.

 Greek Cypriots applied for membership in the European Union in July 1990.

In 1993 the European Union Commission concluded that the application was made in

the name of the whole island. In 1995, the General Affairs Council Conclusion

confirmed Cyprus' suitability for membership and established that accession

negotiations with Cyprus would start in 1998. The Turkish Cypriots were invited to be included in the Cypriot delegation under the government of the Republic of Cyprus however they refused. This is because the European Union was negotiating with the Greek Cypriots as the only recognized side and they were not recognizing the Turkish Cypriot side as a separate delegation of their state, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The talks, to unite the island, continued on different levels with no avail. In August 1998, Turkish Cypriot President, Rauf R. Denktas, proposed confederation and demanded recognition of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus before resuming negotiations towards a settlement (Pearce 1999). This demand was not welcomed by either the Greek side or by the EU, leading to another dead-end. On the other side, substantial negotiations for the adoption and the implementation of the EU legislation were completed on April 16, 2003.

Bicommunal talks between the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot leaders took place with the initiations of the UN until December 2000 when President Denktas announced his withdrawal from the talks, with Turkey's consent. Considering it was not leading to what he was prepared to accept as a solution that being two separate sovereign independent states that were loosely connected. In December 2001, the Turkish Cypriot president Rauf Denktas and the former Greek Cypriot President Glafkos Kleridis met face-to-face again.

While the two sides were continuing negotiations, the Republic of Cyprus, in the name of the whole island, was simultaneously fulfilling the requirements for EU accession. In accordance with the roadmap of the European Commission endorsed by the European Council the negotiations ended at the end of 2002 and Cyprus would be

ready to be part of the first wave of acceding countries in 2004. One very important anecdote is to acknowledge the close relationship between North Cyprus and Turkey especially after the declaration of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. "The North has become a backwater appended to Turkey, something between a free state and a province" (Munur, 2001). Romano Prodi, the President of the European Commission, visited Nicosia in October 2001 and said that Cyprus would be among the group of entrants expected to join in 2004.

The Greek Cypriot Foreign Minister Ioannis Kasoulides, one of the founding fathers of the European Union has said "if one cannot solve a problem, one can change the context of the problem so it can be solved. And this applies in the question of Cyprus" (Kasoulides 2001). European Union envisage that progress towards EU membership by the Greek Cypriot part of the island and a viable solution to the problem would mutually reinforce each other and that accession would contribute to bringing peace and reconciliation to the island (Pearce 1999).

The Turkish Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit spelled out for the first time on November 4, 2001, that Turkey would annex the northern part of Cyprus if the Greek Cypriot government in Nicosia takes the divided island into the European Union. In response, Greece said that they would veto accession of the other countries if Cyprus were not one of them. Amidst all this action, as of December 4, 2001, a new momentum had started in the history of the Cyprus Problem. The EU timetable had been a pressing issue. A solution had been expected to come about by the end of 2002 but talks failed once again.

UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan, presented a new peace plan to leaders of the divided island on November 11, 2002, which was hoped to form the basis for a reunification agreement before an EU summit in Copenhagen on December 12 was to set an accession date for Cyprus. The Secretary General urged the negotiators to work toward meeting the deadline that was extended to March 7, 2003. That would allow the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots to schedule a referendum for March 30, 2003 to approve a settlement in time for a reunified Cyprus to sign the EU treaty accession on April 16, 2003. Kofi Annan warned that any delay beyond March 7 would hinder the prospect of a unified Cyprus signing the treaty (Western Policy website). On March 11, the Secretary General announced that they reached the end of the road, Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktas was not prepared to agree on a referendum on the UN plan and raised fundamental objections to basic points in the revised plan. The Greek Cypriot leader Tassos Papadopoulos said that he was prepared to put the peace proposal to a referendum and accepted the plan as a base for negotiation. As a result the Greek Cypriot President signed an accession agreement with the EU on behalf of the whole island but the Turkish Cypriot side will be kept out of the block if no solution is found by May 2004.

Denktas's non-negotiating attitude was not welcomed by the Turkish Cypriots whose right to vote in a referendum for their future was stolen from them when Denktash said "No" to public referendum. In reaction, the Turkish Cypriot leader Denktas announced that he would lift the travel restrictions across the island. The divided North and South Cyprus would be opened on April 23 2003. After 29 years they were going to be able to go to the 'other side' and visit the homes they left.   On

the first day of the crossing more than 100,000 people traveled to the other side. The

Turkish Cypriots side held parliament elections in December 2003. The opposition

parties agreed that if they were elected they would continue the negotiations with the

Greek Cypriots side towards unifying the island before the EU accession in May

2004.

In addition to the political circles' efforts, for many years there had been

ongoing efforts by the international peace builders, scholars and mediators to bring

together different sectors of people from both sides for confidence building, and

conflict resolution trainings and workshops in order to create sustainable peace on the

island but most importantly peace among communities. In the light of the recent

developments the need for the two communities to interact and get familiar with each

other's similarities and differences became greater.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Starting in 1978, the visionary mayors of the divided city of Nicosia
Lellos Demitriades and Mustafa Akinci formed a team of experts to spur the
completion of a joint sewage system for Nicosia, the construction of which
was interrupted by the hostilities in 1974. The success of this effort led them
to creation of a joint force that would develop a Nicosia Master Plan, a
development blueprint dealing with all aspects of life in city that both men
hoped would soon be re-united under a single government comprised of
separate ethnic zones. Architects, city planners, sociologists and economists
met regularly during the 1980's and 1990's in order to develop a scheme for
developing business districts, housing areas, parks, and even traffic patterns
(Broome 1998).

The divided capital of Cyprus, Nicosia, inhabits two communities. On the

North of the dividing Green Line the Turkish Cypriot community and on the South of

the Green Line the Greek Cypriot community has been living separately for 30 years.

Where there is an ongoing conflict in any given region it is not likely to see cooperation and agreement towards a common goal. A feeling of patriotism and nationalism overshadows the needs of the cities and citizens in many cases. In the case of Nicosia, the city's need for a sewage system at first, and then for an infrastructure, put the two mayors of the city at work for the betterment of their city and citizens.

Torgovnik (1990:137) analyzes the central-local parallel planning in Jerusalem. He analyzes the conflict, the major actors and the 1968 Master Plan. This chapter shows the different elements between the Nicosia Master Plan and the Jerusalem Master Plan, including the different visions and motivations behind it and the different end results. Torgovnik suggests that master planning generally involves low conflict and is likely to elicit a high level of agreement among professional and political elites. Master Planning has built-in flexibility and assures contestants that their views are heard and that their values are represented or can be incorporated. On the other hand, he suggests that parallel planning involves competition of interests, intense action and conflict. It is uncertain in regard of goals; its major concern is the quick translation of planning to implementation (Torgovnik 1990:137).

In 1919, the MacLean plan was the first major planning effort for Jerusalem, followed by a second plan in 1923, a Halliday plan in 1934 and Kendall plan in 1945, all evolved under the British Mandate and focused on the Old City. In 1948 the state of Israel was established. In 1949 the city of Jerusalem was divided by barbed wire with the Old City under Jordanian control and the western part under Israel's. Despite

the difficulties of a divided city, the planning for the Israeli part of Jerusalem continued.

Before the 1967 Six Day War, the local planning authorities drew up a master plan viewing it as an opportunity for special urban planning. Jerusalem's importance as a holy city, assured the national government's involvement in the planning. The master plan prepared by the municipality was guided by a steering committee comprised of representatives of various national bodies as well as of the municipal government. The war changed the physical facts; Israel was in control of all Jerusalem and new goal became the state's desire to quickly establish its permanent control over the unified city. Torgovnik comments that to expect planning under these circumstances to be solely based on local urban or professional considerations is unrealistic (p.140). The new conditions created a conflict between the planners and the national government politicians, ministries, and the government as whole, thus resulting in parallel planning. Parallel planning has dominant political motivations. Torgovnik describes it as the competition of interests between the central and local actors; "Under parallel planning policy in Jerusalem a number of organizations made efforts to halt each other's initiation efforts and alternatively to advance their own"(1990:140).

Schattschneider notes that a stronger conflict tends to overshadow a lesser conflict. In Jerusalem at that time, the stronger conflict was generated by the government's efforts to expand the Jewish population of the city rapidly and the lesser conflict for the government was over planning procedures and professional planning norms (Torgovnik 1990:142).

1968 Master Plan was prepared to create physical conditions that would enable comfortable, pleasant and efficient urban activities, and to design the city in a way that would be consistent with Jerusalem's status as the capital of Israel and a holy city. Planned by the consultant architects, the goal of pleasant and efficient living meant that the planners did not approach the planning differently from that any other city. However, the planners proceeded as though specific goals were agreed upon while it is common for planning policy that affects so many people and interested to be defined vaguely (Torgovnik 1990:142). Levin suggests that unspecific goals allow planners to treat the planning process as purely technical, non-political (Torgovnik 1990:145).

Jean Luc Pepin's article shifts the focus to Canadian Federalism (1992). He suggests that the Cyprus case is similar to Canada and a possible federalism could work in Cyprus. In addition he pinpoints the importance of leadership for making certain decisions regarding the future of a country and in the case of Canada, agreeing to sign Canadian federalism. First, he defines the factors of diversity as geography, physical, human and economic; ethnicity; languages; legal systems; religious; and cultures. A higher degree of diversity in the population increases the acceptability of a federal system whereas too high or too low a degree decreases it. "Federal state begins with a core of agreements among leaders and communities which are not expected to be perfect" (Salem 1992:127). Pepin states that common interest, respect, fear and common sense were the psychological conditions of the Canadian Federal State. "These attitudes must first find their incarnation in leaders" (p.129). According to Pepin, the leaders involved in the Canadian Federalism "had

brains, drive, imagination and they were realistic" (p.130). Besides psychological factors, there are factors of philosophy that are as important. Mainly, vision, tolerance, spirit of compromise amongst the leaders and in the communities, "the need, the knowledge and the will must combine" (p.130). This is quite contradictory to Torgovnik's angle of view "patriotism, and nationalism, not urbanism dominated the planning of Jerusalem" (Torgovnik 1990:150).

The social- psychological analysis of conflict escalation has received significant input from over forty years of theorizing and research by Morton Deutsh (Salem 192:247). The major contribution has been the specification of the differences between a co-operative and a competitive social interaction. The basic idea is that the approach that parties take to their relationship in terms of perceptions, attitudes, communication and task orientation will in large part determine the nature and outcomes of their relationship. In a cooperative interaction the parties see that they have positively related goals, and hold friendly, trusting and helpful attitudes toward each other (Salem 1992). In a competitive interaction, the parties perceive negatively related goals. They are sensitive to differences, and hold suspicious, hostile and exploitative attitudes (Salem 1992:247). Ronald J. Fisher suggests that most intergroup relations are 'mixed-motive' situations, that is, involving both co-operative and competitive elements, it is extremely important which approach the parties take since this determines the predominant nature and outcome of the interaction. In a co-operative interaction the communication is open, accurate and relevant whereas in a competitive interaction, it is limited, non-existent, misleading and used for propaganda and espionage. Task orientation in a co-operative interaction

addresses conflict as a mutual problem to be solved, whereas in a competitive interaction, each party attempts to impose its solution through coercion and escalation (Salem 1992:248). Deutsch extends his analysis by formulating his "crude law of social interaction", where co-operation breeds co-operation while competition breeds competition (Salem 1992). This is in line with the almost universal norm of reciprocity in human relations where one tends to get what one gives. In the case of Cyprus, Fisher concludes that many of the elements of the competitive interaction have been present throughout recent history.

In the history of Cyprus, going back to dates when the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots coexisted on the island, there are examples of cooperation as well as competition. In its history certain events manipulated these outcomes.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Jean Luc Pepin suggests that Canada and Cyprus both have the required preconditions for federalism. Canada became a federal state in 1876 by the "North American Act", the first federal document o the Canadian constitution. Pepin also suggests that Cyprus can learn from the Canadian federalism. Pepin states that there are three sets of pre-conditions (or factors) that has affected and still affects the Canadian federalism:

- Geographic and cultural conditions, fostering diversity
- Psychological and philosophical conditions, fostering unity
- Constitutional conditions put together by politicians.

According to Luc de Pepin, philosophical factors such as 'vision, tolerance, spirit of compromise' amongst the leaders and in the communities are equally important. In his description of the Canadian Federalism he concludes that for a federation to form 'the need, the knowledge and the will must combine'. (Salem 1992:130) According to Pepin, the leaders involved in the Canadian Federalism "had brains, drive, imagination and they were realistic" (p.130). Besides psychological factors, there are factors of philosophy that are as important. Mainly, vision, tolerance, spirit of compromise amongst the leaders and in the communities, "the need, the knowledge and the will must combine" (p.130).

In my analysis of the Nicosia Master Plan I am using Pepin's theory and suggesting that for the successful cooperation on the Nicosia Master Plan the Pepin's preconditions must exist, most importantly the psychological and philosophical preconditions: vision, spirit, common sense, need, will and knowledge.

In the making of the Nicosia Master Plan the need for a structured city and the will of the leadership created a successful cooperation between the Turkish Cypriot and the Greek Cypriot municipalities of Nicosia. The pressing need (initially for a sewage system) and the political will worked together with the leadership of the unifying Mayors. Unifying leadership can be defined as Pepin's philosophical factors: a vision, tolerance, and spirit of compromise amongst the leaders. The pressing need can be defined as a political, social or economical condition (problem) that is in need of an improvement for the communities of Cyprus. Political will can be defined as the attitude of the governments towards cooperation.

In this case study analysis, the final goal will be applying these factors that worked in making the Nicosia Master Plan to today's conditions in Cyprus towards the settlement of the Cyprus problem. The European Union membership is only an incentive for both sides to speed up the process of finding an agreeable solution on the island before the EU accession on May 1, 2004.

Operational Definitions

In 1976, there was a pressing need for a sewage system in the capital city, Nicosia. The sewage system that was being built in 1970's was not completed because of armed conflict and the physical division in 1974. The plant of the system stayed on the North of the green line which was occupied by Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots on the South had two options: either build another one or cooperate with the Turkish Cypriot side complete and utilize the existing one. The political will became evident when the Turkish Cypriot and the Greek Cypriot leaders, Mr. Denktas and Mr. Kleridis, did not oppose to the cooperation on a shared sewage system, not helping the process in any way but also not blocking it. The unifying leadership showed itself in the cooperative attitudes of the two Mayors at the time: Mustafa Akinci and Lellos Demetriades, the Turkish Cypriots mayor and the Greek Cypriot mayor respectively. These two men took initiative to work together for a common sewage system for the city and when the project was completed successfully they took on a bigger challenge and developed a master plan for the city with United Nations Development Project (UNDP) aide.

Today, there is a pressing need for the Turkish Cypriots to be economically comfortable and have their government internationally recognized. The Greek Cypriots on the other hand need to have a political stability on the island as well as in the region in addition to the property issue; 39% of the island is under the control of the North Cyprus. Today joining EU seems to be the answer to the pressing needs of both sides. The question is whether a political will could and would emerge under the current conditions.

METHODOLOGY

Research Question

What factors allowed for the successful development of the Nicosia master Plan? Can these factors form the basis for additional agreements in solving the Cyprus Problem before the island joins the European Union?

Research Hypothesis

The successful development of the Nicosia Master Plan was due to political will, mutual needs and unifying leadership that existed on the North and the South of the island at that time.

Research Design

The research comes mostly from secondary data which includes books, articles, and official documents on the Nicosia Master Plan obtained from the Turkish Cypriot Municipality in Nicosia, United Nation reports and published materials obtained

from Mr. Akinci and Mr. Demetriades. The primary data comes from my informal conversations with Mr. Mustafa Akinci, the former mayor of the Turkish part of Nicosia and Mr. Lellos Demetriades, the former Mayor of the Greek part of Nicosia. On July 2001 I visited Cyprus and this gave me the opportunity to engage in personal conversations with Mustafa Akinci where I asked a lot of questions with the intention of getting a more personal insight on the matter. I asked questions which focused on his personal thoughts and feelings on the Nicosia Master Plan; what made this plan come about; what was expected of this plan; how did he become involved with this project; what was the agreements, and disagreements between the sides; how were these resolved; what were the positions of the Turkish Cypriot side and the Greek Cypriot side; what was his political views at that time; his thoughts on the third party involvement; what made this project succeed; did his expectations in the beginning matched the end result; if the boundaries were to be removed would Nicosia be a unified city; in addition to the infrastructure of the city, how could the people of Cyprus be united.

I did not have the opportunity to talk with Lellos Demetriades because he resides in the Greek side and as a Turkish Cypriot I could not cross the borders. However, he was kind enough to allow me to ask him the same questions over email in 2002.

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction of Nicosia

Nicosia, the capital city, was established in the center of Cyprus, flatland called the Mesaoria Plain. Over the centuries, the city has been a living legacy of the island's

rich heritage and contains some of its finest examples of Byzantine, Venetian, French Medieval and Ottoman architecture. The mixture of cultures that shaped Cyprus' unique identity has also contributed to its turbulent history as it still continues today (UNDP).

> "Nicosia became the capital in the 11th century. A capital in the inland instead of a coastal area as it was before is due to the need primarily to be as far as possible or at equivalent distance from the sea and points of access to the island because of attacks and the importance accorded to the territory in which the settlement becomes the center" (Diaz-Berrio 1982:3).

The physical separation of the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot communities that had started in the 1950s became more solidified in the 1960s. In 1974 Nicosia was broken in two through its historic and cultural heart- the ancient inner Walled City; a massive 16th century Venetian Wall. This circular stone monument, five kilometers in circumference, has around its perimeter eleven projecting bastions that form a many-pointed star. Within its limits lies Old Nicosia with narrow meandering streets, lined with slender palms and latticed windows, medieval churches, Gothic archways and skyward-reaching minarets (UNDP).

Nicosia is the center of urban activity in Cyprus. In the last century the city's role as administrative, commercial and cultural center of the island has been strengthened. Despite the growth of Greater Nicosia, the historic core of the Walled City had been dying. Several problems have accompanied the rapid growth of Greater Nicosia. According to the diagnosis by international specialists, first is the unplanned, uncontrolled and wasteful nature of urban sprawl that was pulling the city outward in many directions. The second is the reality of human partition (UNDP). The buffer zone that cuts through the Walled City is a daily reminder of division,

encouraging the unrestrained growth of two separate parts deteriorating the historical, cultural and architecturally valuable areas. In addition, lack of interest, lack of necessary funding and legislation also added to the unplanned development. (Akinci, interview) The Nicosia Master Plan was created to end the deterioration of the city and the making of it represents more than its purpose: cooperation between the two communities, goodwill of leadership and a step forward towards a unified city.

Evidence of Unifying Leadership

 "The Nicosia Master Plan reflects the courageous vision of Lellos Demetriades and Mustafa Akinci- the former Mayors, respectively, of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities of Nicosia. While both leaders looked forward to a common solution to the political crisis they believed that no time should be lost in dealing with the immediate problems of the day, reversing the decay and centrifugal growth of the city." (UNDP)

Through my informal dialogues with Mr. Demetriades and Mr. Akinci, I learned that the idea of the Nicosia Master Plan came about right after the successful agreement and partial implementation of the sewage system (Akinci, interview). The attempt to set up and coordinate a joint sewage system started in 1977.

> "At that time Nicosia had no central sewage system however, one was under construction by the Greek Cypriot municipality of Nicosia. Its completion was expected at the end of 1974. When 1974 events took place and the division followed it with the agreement of a cease-fire, some parts of the main trunk sewer, which was passing through the middle of the Walled City, and the Treatment plant itself that was in Haspolat (Miamilia) (east of Nicosia) was left in the North. This system was referred as the kidneys of the city and unless there was an agreement with the Turkish side, the work that was started could not have been completed. Of course other alternatives were possible for the Greek Cypriot side such as building another treatment plant elsewhere.

Although this option would have been theoretically valid, in practice the existing treatment plant was located at the best place topographically available" (Akinci,interview).

Akinci sees that cooperating rather than opting for other alternatives was more economic and realistic for the Greek Cypriots. Furthermore they were going to finish an unfinished project for which they were collecting immovable property tax and sewage tax.

"In my mind, there was no alternative because it would have been illogical to allow a modern public sewage system remain unused" (Demetriades, interview).

For the Turkish Cypriot side, cooperation for the completion of the plant and in the meantime reaching compromises on the inclusion of the Northern part of Nicosia into the system was the main objective because of the existing health hazard. Due to the lack of project funds and the status of the northern part vis a vis the international community, the North was not in a condition to start such a project solely depending on its own resources. Therefore, cooperation initially was a result of a mutual and a pressing need, which created a win-win situation for both sides.

Three years after the events of 1974, Mr. Demetriades and Mr. Akinci, met for the first time at Mr. Demetriades' house in the South. This was the very first bilateral meeting to take place excluding those between the political leaders of both sides, after 1974. Mr. Demetriades remembers the first post-war meeting between Mr. Rauf Denktas (the Turkish Cypriot leader) and Mr. Cleridis (the Greek Cypriot leader):

"When the personal Representative of the UN Secretary General invited the two leaders for the first time, I also managed to get myself invited there. This was the first time they met after the events. I know Mr. Denktas and Mr. Cleridis well all of us are lawyers and practiced law together years ago. They both have a sense of

humor; I should say rather peculiar at times but it's there. We had a nice dinner and after we finished I said to Mr. Denktas in a meaningful and sinister way: 'Rauf, don't you think that you need a sewerage system and we also do? He smiled in a cunning way for he understood what I meant. Then I continued: 'look, it's a pity, both of us need a sewerage system and the system is there but is not functioning so why don't we do something about it? We all need it.' So they started laughing and Glafkos said 'here is that fool again with his funny ideas' and they both agreed that we do something about it. That was, believe it or not, how an agreement was reached which could not be reversed afterwards. That is how later on we could arrange a meeting between Mr. Akinci and myself." Political will was there because Denktash did not try to block this cooperation mainly because the Turkish side was in big need of a sewage system (Demetriades 1998).

In 1976 Mr. Akinci was elected as the Mayor of Northern Nicosia. He was informed about the initiative for cooperation on the sewerage project at the end of 1977. He states:

"There were some initial talks at the central government level. Apparently Mr. Lellos Demetriades was in a difficult situation. For many years he was collecting taxes from the inhabitants in the South to provide them sewerage facilities and in addition his municipality had received a loan from the World Bank to implement the project yet after 1974 the work had stopped. He needed to find a solution and was seeking ways. Also the World Bank was sending its representatives to the island trying to find a way out. The UNDP and the UN in Cyprus also found themselves in an awkward position. The very first meeting with my involvement took place at the house of Mr. Demetriades at the end of 1977. The resident representative of UNDP then took us across the green line in his car together with my colleagues. At that meeting I became aware that there was a draft agreement already prepared for the completion of Phase I of the sewerage system. I found that the draft didn't give the Turkish side its fair share out of this project. I had three additional points I wanted to include in the draft: to include the preparation of the working drawings of the central parts of Northern Nicosia, to share the operation costs of the plant in proportion to the usage and, to bring experts to examine ways for the fulfillment of the effluent which was to be discharged into the Pedios - Kanlidere River. My involvement at the very beginning created uneasiness on the part of the Greek Cypriots, UNDP and the World Bank representatives. Since there was a draft agreement (which I didn't know) they thought that the Turkish Cypriot (TC) mayor was creating obstacles. In fact, I was trying to create a just foundation for a fruitful cooperation" (Akinci, interview).

Mr. Akinci recognized that the two communities were living next to each other in the same city which needed development on both sides (more on the Turkish side) and infrastructure projects such as sewerage was a must for the city. "There was

a buffer zone in between however; health hazards do not recognize any borders"
(Akinci). Pedious (Kanlidere) River was a health hazard for the Turkish side.
Without any pre-treatments the effluent was discharged from the flour, milk and soft
drink factories, which all three are within close proximity to each other. The
discharge from these factories was going into the riverbed that runs through
neighborhoods.

  "Cooperation was not an easy job. Taking into consideration that this was
happening only after three years after the tragic events when the country was in
turmoil and, traumas were fresh, it wasn't considered clever to meet the other side"
(Akinci, interview). "In the case of Nicosia, the presence of a third party was a must.
The role of the UN was of paramount importance. Without the presence and positive
role of the UN and its organizations, like UN Development Programs (UNDP), UN
Center for Human Settlements (HABITAT) and UN Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) we
couldn't be able to come together" (Akinci, interview).

  The two mayors had their disagreements, some trivial and others more
significant but they looked for ways to find alternative solutions. The biggest
obstacle they faced was the issue of recognition. The government in the South,
Republic of Cyprus, did not wish to act in any way, which implied the recognition of
a state in the North, therefore, the existence of two mayors. For them there was one
Nicosia and one mayor, which was the Greek Cypriot mayor. The Turkish Cypriot
side was within the limits of the 1960 Constitution, which envisioned that there
should be two municipalities in Nicosia with a coordinating committee in between,
consisting of councilors from both municipal councils. If the provisions of the 1960

Constitution were followed accordingly this would have not been a problem because

one of the provisions regarded creating separate municipalities in the major cities of

the island.

According to the 1960 Constitution "Separate municipalities shall be created in the five largest towns of the Republic that is Nicosia, Limassol, Famagusta, Larnaca and Paphos. The council of the Greek municipality in any such town shall be elected by the Greek electors of the town and the council of the Turkish municipality by the Turkish electors. A coordinating body shall be set up composed of two members chosen by the council of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot municipality and a president chosen by agreement between the two councils. Such coordinating body shall provide for work which needs to be carried out jointly, shall carry out joint services entrusted to it by agreement of the councils of the two municipalities within the town and shall concern itself with matters which receive a degree of cooperation." (1960 constitution, Article 173, p.159)

These provisions in the Constitution had never been implemented. The

Turkish Cypriot side was ready to accept the notion of two mayors but the Greek

Cypriot side was not in a position to do so. So the question was who were Mr.

Demetriades and Mr. Akinci? After some discussions in good faith to resolve the

issue and elaborate steps that they took to avoid press publicity, they agreed that

whoever they were, they were two persons representing their communities in matters

of Nicosia. They decided to choose a formula similar to the one used by Mr. Rauf

Denktas and Mr. Glafkos Clerides: the leaders of the Turkish Cypriot community of

Cyprus and the Greek Cypriot community of Cyprus respectively. Mr. Akinci

became the representative of the Turkish Cypriot community of Nicosia and Mr.

Demetriades became the representative of the Greek Cypriot community of Nicosia.

The venue for the meetings was Ledra Palace Hotel at the buffer zone. It was a round

table meeting. The chairman was always the resident representative of UNDP. Sitting

on the right of the chairman was alternating at every meeting. (Demetriades, 1998)

This statement is taken from the UN minutes at the meeting when two representatives came together under the chairmanship of Mr. Philip Marisic, UNDP Resident Representative, on October 25, 1978:

"The meeting was held in an atmosphere of constructive cooperation and mutual understanding at which both had expressed their satisfaction that this agreement for the completion of the Nicosia sewerage project is being speedy and successfully implemented."

The recognition issue also created difficulties with the funding, which was coming from international agencies. On this issue UN played a positive role and assisted the parties. They went away from the central UN organization and got under the umbrella of UNDP because UNDP was concerned with issues such as funding and technicalities rather than political issues. UNDP, through the World Bank, provided financial assistance. For instance when the sewerage system started to be implemented the system constructor was a Turkish Cypriot. In order to receive payments the funds were coming from Brussels since the Turkish Cypriot side did not accept to receive the funds via the Greek Cypriot side. The money was going to London into an account of Turkish Cypriot Cooperative Central Bank, which was the official bank of the Turkish Municipality of Nicosia. Later the money was transferred to North Cyprus to be paid to the contractor.

Both mayors took into consideration the prevailing political circumstances on both sides. Since the Turkish Cypriot mayor belonged to the opposition the situation in the North was not always helpful. The media was complaining about the bad smell arising from the plant and the riverbed from time to time. Fingers were pointed at the

Mayor as the responsible person. The media was saying that he brought the Greek Cypriot's dirt to the Turkish Cypriot North forgetting that the factories in the North were discharging their effluent without any treatment at all in the riverbed in the midst of neighborhoods before they were connected to the system. Most of the media was not trying to create favorable conditions for cooperation; instead they were attacking the only project implemented jointly. According to Mr. Demetriades there were adverse reactions and comments from the Greek Cypriot side as well. "When I mentioned this effort I received scornful smiles… they would leave me alone sometimes believing that the project would fail by itself" (Demetriades 1998).

The presence of a neutral party was necessary for setting up and facilitating the negotiations. The negative part was the bureaucracy of the UN. The Mayors stayed away from the formalities such as the decision not to keep minutes of their meetings after the first three meetings with elaborate minutes taken by secretaries in the presence of political and UN officer. From then on they only wrote down the decisions made. Before the official meetings began the two mayors sat in a corner and talked about the problems they were facing, and what was achievable. That way they knew not to bring up something that was impossible to accomplish and kept it for a later time. As a result they both more or less knew where they were going before the meeting started. That way they didn't set unrealistic goals and waste time. For apparent reasons, they also tried to do their work in silence without attracting constant media attention for the project would have been in jeopardy if it became an issue for political discussion.

It is important to notice that the solutions to the arising problems were pragmatic approaches.

In 1980, the sewerage system was ready to operate. Without any prior publicity certain units were connected to the system in the hope that those who might disagree with this project would be reluctant to act against it once it became evident. Places such as the Russian Embassy, the American Embassy, and the hospital on the Greek side; Saray Hotel (the main hotel) in the North, the municipal market and 3 factories on the Turkish side were the first ones to be connected to the system.

Demetriades summarizes the factors of their success as trust; good faith; the sense to reach practical solutions that were beneficial to both sides; staying away from politics, and not talking too much to journalists (interview).

Akinci summarizes the main reason for success as two-fold: the most important being the existence of a mutual need and as importantly the visions of the leadership of the respective local authorities (interview).

A good example of practical solutions in good faith is clear in the accounts of Ahmet Savas Orek, a Turkish Cypriot city planner who was a member of the Nicosia Master Plan Team. He recalls that two major problems came up during the first phase of the project. The first one was the names (of the cities, village and regions) on the map. The Greek Cypriots opposed to using the names that were changed to Turkish after 1963 and 1974. They wanted to use the old Greek names. At the end they decided to use both names and solve the problem. The second problem was the use of political trigger words in the brochures published by both sides. This time they tried to use more technical than political terms.

"The first pamphlet book published by UNDP on this project showed pictures of the work being done in the city. An Italian photographer took the pictures that would go in this pamphlet. When the Greek Cypriot Mayor saw it he said that he could not go back to Cyprus now because the book makes Nicosia look like a Muslim town because there were more pictures of mosques than churches. So, they put one more church picture and a balance was achieved. The point is that even the pictures were equal. This happened during a team visit to the United States at a hotel room in 1981."

"If the mayors both or one of them was not sharing the vision for mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence in a compromising mood, there might have not been any cooperation at all." (Akinci, interview)

Evidence of Political Will

After the successful agreement and partial implementation of the sewage system the idea of Nicosia Master Plan came about. Encouraged by this success the two mayors decided to enter into a more challenging area, which at the same time was related to the benefit of their citizens. Mr. Akinci, an architect himself and Mr. Demetriades felt strongly about urban planning issues and the need of it in Nicosia. In a normal situation master plan should have come before the infrastructure projects. Yet the situation in Cyprus and Nicosia created the conditions to do the opposite. Sewage was a pressing need and so was the planning. With the assistance of UNDP at that time the two sides agreed to cooperate for such a major project. There were two main goals: a Nicosia that could function independently while divided, and a city that could function as a whole in a future reunification.

In Nicosia the major problem was the unplanned development. The city was extending from North to South in an unplanned manner creating more infrastructure

needs such as sewage, water, electricity, schools and transportation. There were thousands of empty building lots in the built-up areas. The local authorities on both sides were not happy with this situation. The green line passing through the walled city of Nicosia prepared the ground for deterioration of the historical, cultural and architecturally valuable area. However, besides the green line, the lack of interest, lack of necessary funds and legislation but above all lack of a comprehensive plan was adding to the destruction of the city. There was also a demand for a better traffic system, a need for more green areas, and for zoning of the areas within the city. The two mayors visited Venice together to ask for financial assistance for the restoration of the Venetian walls of Nicosia. They also went to Berlin, which was divided then and was an important experience for the mayors, a reality in which they did not want to see their country. In order to avoid what happened in Berlin, museums and beautiful buildings of East Berlin right next to the most depressed area of West Berlin, they decided to create the Nicosia Master Plan, which would create a smoother transition for the city. To integrate the two sides of Berlin required a lot of money and effort. This problem would have been solved if it were taken care of before the wall came down. The action for Nicosia Master Plan was taken under this light, by learning from the mistakes of other countries.

The work of the Nicosia Master Plan teams began with an analysis of the problems and projected trends. They utilized socioeconomic surveys, assessments of physical structure, land use patterns, and existing legislation and other control measures influencing urban growth. The teams concluded that in the absence of substantial new investments and a whole set of planned and integrated actions,

warehouses instead of houses would soon replace the heart of Nicosia, public amenities would collapse and the young families would give way to elderly and unemployed. To prevent this the teams drew up a blueprint, mapping out the projected shape of the city to the end of the century, planning for green spaces, designing traffic managements and pedestrian schemes, and identifying needed zoning regulations and other controls. By agreeing on this framework, the two sides started the second phase of the Nicosia Master Plan in 1984. (UNDP) The Nicosia Master Plan Team was composed of architects, urban planners and sociologists from both communities. On both sides there were two individual teams functioning as one when they got together. In the technical teams all team members were Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots. Great attention was paid not to have any person from the mainlands because at that time it was a sensitive issue. At times international staff from HABITAT and UNDP was helping out with the project. The staff was also selected to maintain neutrality. All staff had to be approved and accepted by both sides. The two teams were under the supervision of the project manager. The two technical teams also met under the presence of the project manager. The project manager was Lube Pota who was from Skopje, Macedonia. Akinci states, "He did not give us the impression that he favored either side. He was coordinating and trying to be helpful to both sides to conclude the job" (interview). For different sectors different international staff helped. Aware of the existing conflict between the two sides, the international staff worked in cooperation. Akinci also stated that the involvement of a third party, in this case UN, was very helpful:

"It was instrumental in bringing the two sides together as well as in putting various inputs for different sectors of the NMP in the form of international expertise.

When one considers that there was work to be completed in the sewage project in the buffer zone, in narrow streets where soldiers of the two sides were stationed only 3 meters apart from each other, it will be clear to understand that without the presence of UNFICYP work could not be carried out in those areas" (interview).

"Underlying the project-and its remarkable planning success so far is the idea that close and systematic technical cooperation can foster new bonds of understanding. Such linkage, it is believed, may help overcome the prevailing fear and mistrust between the two communities." (UNDP)

Two beautiful neighborhoods, Arab Ahmet (North of buffer zone) and Chrysaliniotissa (South of buffer zone) were the first objects for renovation, restoration and rehabilitation project; of housing and other physical structures, redesigning of traffic patterns and creation of sidewalks, landscaping and community facilities and services.
These neighborhoods were very rich with historical heritage and culture, also located in the center of the city with easy access to the existing but dying business district. (The vision for the future of Nicosia)

It is important to recognize that the bi-communal meetings on Nicosia Master Plan continued even when the diplomatic talks between the two leaders came to a dead end on many occasions throughout the process of Nicosia Master Plan. The Nicosia Master Plan received the World Habitat Award in 1989.

In 1990 Mustafa Akinci resigned from his duty as a mayor after serving the North Nicosia community for 14 years. The Nicosia Master Plan continued to work with Lellos Demetriades and the new mayors who followed after Akinci left office and more and more areas on both sides had been included into the sewage system, which benefited more people. Lellos Demetriades resigned from his office in 2002. It

is very sad to report that the Nicosia Master Plan, although had started 22 years ago, has yet to be implemented fully due to the failure of solving the Cyprus Problem. In addition, the political unwillingness, lack of determination, as well as conflicting interests of certain influential sections of the Turkish Cypriot society prevented the implementation of the Nicosia Master Plan in the North. It was only when Akinci became an elected minister, responsible also for the city planning, that he was able to put the plan into effect after necessary revision.

On May 9, 2003 Mustafa Akinci and Lellos Demetriades jointly received prestigious Europa Nostra Medal of Honor "for their consistent, exemplary and successful efforts, for the cause of the heritage of their common but divided city and the benefit of all its citizens during particularly difficult times," explained HRH the Prince Consort of Denmark, President of Europa Nostra (Europa Nostra press release). Europa Nostra is the pan-European federation for heritage, and the Medal of Honor recognizes the merit of a sustained and exemplary contribution made by a particular person to the protection and/or enhancement of Europe's culture heritage, both built and natural.

As a result, it can be summarized that the pressing need, the political will of local authorities, and the collaboration and peace seeking leadership of the two mayors brought about the first bicommunal project which created the visible footsteps for others to follow towards a united Cyprus.

Evidence of Mutual Need

 The Incentives for the Turkish Cypriot Community. The analysis of the need factor

should be viewed form two perspectives: that of the Turkish Cypriot and the Greek

Cypriot communities and in terms of incentives. Under today's circumstances it is a

fact that the need of a solution is more vital for the Turkish Cypriot side than the

Greek Cypriot side. Greek Cypriot side secured its membership to the European

Union and after May 1, 2004 their willingness to negotiate may diminish.

 National Identity. The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is not recognized by

any country in the world except Turkey. This factor alone caused the Turkish

Cypriots to live in isolation from the rest of the world. Turkish Cypriots cannot travel

to any country except to Turkey with their Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

passport because it is not recognized. Countries like England and United States of

America give visas to Turkish Cypriots as Cypriot citizens, not as Turkish Republic

of Northern Cyprus citizens. In order to travel to other European countries it is

required by the embassies to hold a passport of Republic of Turkey, which can

receive a visa.

 Turkish Cypriots have to use a mailing address, which has 'Mersin 10

Turkey' as the country address. Any letter, which is sent to North Cyprus or Cyprus,

will not reach the destination with the likelihood of reaching the hands of the Greek

Cypriot post offices. To call North Cyprus one still needs to dial the international

code for Turkey. All these may seem small components however they are the

components of national identity, personal identity as well as a stable society. If a

solution is found the Turkish Cypriot community will become individually as well as a community an EU member. Becoming an EU country in itself is a big incentive for the TC community.

The exodus of many young and talented Turkish Cypriots has accelerated, as immigrants from Turkey, with few ties to the local culture and no natural attachment to the notion of Cypriot identity, replace them (Barkey and Gordon 2002). Turkish Cypriots who left their country to pursue higher education in Europe and USA are fearful of the lack of job opportunities they would face upon returning back to the island therefore looking for employment or furthering their education that will enable them to stay abroad. The ones who have stayed on the island look for ways to leave the island in the pursuit of a better future. If the status quo persists the Turkish Cypriots will disappear from the island through emigration by receiving the Republic of Cyprus passports already available to them, which will make them individually, not as a community, Europeans.

Economics. Barkey and Gordon state that in theory all parties to the Cyprus problem have an incentive to reach a deal (2002). "On the Turkish side economic conditions- brought about by a Greek Cypriot led embargo on its exports and homegrown mismanagements and corruption-have assumed almost disastrous proportions" (2002:6). In 2002, the estimated GDP in the north was 4500 Euro per capita whereas this figure is 18,500 Euro in the south (EU website). The northern part has no independent monetary policy and uses the Turkish Lira as its currency, which makes it very vulnerable to the inflation and from economic crises that occurs in

Turkey. The Turkish Cypriots are almost totally depending on mainland Turkey. Exclusively Turkey pays for defense and infrastructure. There has been virtually no foreign investment in the north since the island was divided and the north was not recognized. Tourism is largely under utilized and trade is heavily dependent on the Turkish market (EU website). The government is the biggest employer and investor with the money coming from Turkey (Munur 2001). The south has intensified its economic links to Europe during the last decade. Although the unstable economic conditions in Turkey may seem to indicate that Turkish Cypriots cannot expect the motherland to send financial help, support on all levels continues coming even today.

Security. EU accession may appear increasingly attractive to Turkish Cypriots who are afraid of becoming a minority under Greek Cypriots. There are many people who had been deeply affected during the years of unrest from both sides, who became refugees in their own country. Although percentages may be low, they rightly view the other community as '*the enemy*' and do not trust them. They are afraid that Greek Cypriots will violate any agreement whenever the opportunity arises like they did in 1963. It is important to mention here that doing such an act will not be as easy to commit as it was many years ago because the rights and interests of both sides will be protected through membership in EU. This brings to the surface the need of community reconciliation and the importance of trust building measures in order to create the long lost trust and good faith between the two communities.

Self-Governance. Gaining a solution under EU umbrella would bring to Turkish Cypriots the long-lost right to be the masters of their house. Ever since their existence on the island Turkish Cypriots have always been mastered by other rulers. Upon Turkey's intervention in 1974, the Turkish Cypriots domestic affairs became dependent on the motherland and north became a bargaining chip for Turkey in EU affairs. Turkey has been very open, with her public media and politicians, supporting Denktash for 30 years. Instead of following a logical and practical path to solution, the Cyprus Problem has been a 'national cause' for the motherland. The Turkish government including her military and civilian bureaucracy has interfered with every election, thus maintaining the status quo. It is very ironic that although Turkey claims to be the only   country that recognizes Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, yet she cannot send a soccer team to play with the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus teams but she can send her teams to Larnaca (South) to attend an international tournament (Rakoczy 2003). In other words, even Turkish motherland is not able to recognize her so-called '*yavruvatan*' a metaphor used by the Turkish government when referring to Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. To name a few of Turkey's interference with north's domestic issues: Turkish Cypriot Police Forces do not belong to civilian authority but to Turkey's military forces; the president of Central Bank in North is appointed by Turkey; Turkish Cypriot Airline's five member board receives three board members appointed from Turkey; a Turkish Cypriot military officer cannot be promoted beyond Colonel, highest ranking military officials are appointed from Turkey (Rakoczy 2003). The most recent elections in December 2003, protests mobilized by mass numbers of Turkish Cypriots in 2003, and public

polls show that the Turkish Cypriots are ready for a solution under EU which would make them the masters of their state.

The incentive for the Turkish Cypriots to make a deal before the South joins the EU is very crucial especially because their bargaining power would be weaker after May 1, 2004. The Greek Cypriots already guaranteed a membership to the EU with or without a solution to the problem, they may be less willing to negotiate a fair partnership after the final accession to the Union as the Annan Plan suggests today. Moreover, the inclusion of TCs in the EU would add Turkish as an official EU language, which would in addition benefit Turkey's eventual accession. (Rakoczy 2003:6)

The incentives for the Greek Cypriot Community

One cannot deny what the eye sees. Especially after the removal of the travel restrictions in April 2003, which enable thousands of Turkish Cypriots travel to the other side of the Green Line, the differences between the North and South became clear as the Mediterranean Sea. Many people made analogies of the North to a Middle East country and South to a European point of attraction for more than 2.5 million young and old tourists every year.

As it he situation stands today, the Republic of Cyprus will be a member of the EU in May 2004 as the sole beneficiary on the island unless there is a solution between the sides before this date. At the 1999 Helsinki summit, EU stated clearly for the first time that the end of the island's division was not a precondition to membership (Barkey and Gordon 2002). An EU Commission spokesman also told

Reuters: "We assume and we work very hard for this that there will be a political agreement before accession. This remains our preferred option. We continue to work on the basis of the conclusions of the Helsinki summit which called for political agreement over Cyprus but without making this a precondition for membership" (Christou 2001).

The EU and the Greek Cypriot officials have said repeatedly that many opportunities were missed to sign an agreement throughout the 29 years of dispute and namely the last peace plan presented by Kofi Annan. Many analysts and politicians agreed that this plan could have been accepted as a basis to start the negotiation towards a viable solution. "The Annan Plan has serious flaws but is a good basis for negotiations" (Larigakis 2003). Without going into a further detail on the plan in this case study, whether Cypriot or not, many agree that the time has come for a solution and joining under the EU will only increase the credibility and security of a lasting solution.

Having said this, one may think that the incentives for Greek Cypriots may not be as strong as it is for Turkish Cypriots for a solution. There are some data that proves it otherwise.

Security. The need factor is evident for both sides. Safety and security for Greek Cypriots is a leading factor. According to George Vassiliou, the former president of Republic Of Cyprus, and former Chief negotiator for the accession of Cyprus, the Greek Cypriots are afraid that although they form the majority within Cyprus, they are a small minority compared to Turkey (2003). Just like Turkish Cypriots, Greek

Cypriots also maintain distrust, and fear of Turkey who according to their perspective took over 1/3 of the island and still occupies the North. This denies many Greek Cypriots of their properties that they left in the North. When Cyprus joins the EU the size will not be as important for they will all comprise one nation under EU (Vassiliou 2003). Eventual demilitarization with immediate reduction in Turkish troops in the North, and peace settlement with Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots will diminish the security concerns.

   Land and Refugees. According to Nathalie Tocci (2003), Greek Cypriots gains would not be in terms of status or economic. Because any agreement would entail extensive power sharing, where Republic Of Cyprus would not be the only legal government, economic redistribution for the purposes of balancing living standards between the communities. Yet, she believes, Greek Cypriots have much to gain in terms of territory. The Annan Plan calls for Turkish Cypriot federated state to include 28.2 percent and the Greek Cypriot federated state for the remaining 71.8 percent of the new republic. In addition nearly 90,000 Greek Cypriot refugees could go back to their homes in the territory, which would be returned to the Greek Cypriots; another 50,000 would be able to go back to the Turkish Cypriot state over a period of 15 years. When Turkey joins EU, all limitations on the return of refugees to their villages and land would be lifted (Vassiliou 2003:2).

CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The paramount question that needs to be asked is, do the factors that existed for the Nicosia Master Plan exist today for a unified island to join the European Union? Is there a pressing mutual need that could push the sides to come together for a solution? Do the same or similar political dynamics that were present for the creators of the Nicosia Master Plan exist for unified accession today? Is there a political will that visions the end of this problem either in Cyprus, Turkey or in other influential countries? Is there trust and good faith between the two communities of Cyprus? After answering these questions it will be easier to see the clear picture that the island reflects under today's conditions.

Today, the Cyprus Problem is very close to be solved simply because of the EU factor. Turkey finally seems to be determined to join the EU, and solving the Cyprus Problem would be one of the conditions affecting Turkey's membership. Furthermore, if Cyprus goes into EU divided, Turkey's future attempts for membership will not only be vetoed by Greece but also by the Republic of Cyprus. Mr. Denktash still continues to be against a solution, wanting to join EU only when Turkey is ready to do so. In reality Turkey has all the power and decision making ability on behalf of North and Turkish Cypriot leader's negative attitudes are the very opposite of the peace minded visions of the Mayors.

After the last parliamentary elections on December 14, 2003, a new coalition was established in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus parliament. A left wing, peace-supporting party replaced a very hardline right wing party as the major party in the parliament. No matter how much this seems to increase the likelihood of a

solution, the fact that the coalition was established with Denktash's party maintains the suspicions of a positive outcome. However the majority of the Turkish Cypriots are in favor of a solution and although solution of the Cyprus Problem is not a precondition for Turkey's candidacy to the EU, supporting efforts to resolve the Cyprus Problem seem to be a strong incentive for Turkey's eventual accession to the Union.

Unlike the Nicosia Master Plan, the neutral third parties such as the UN and the EU being the primary initiators, efforts of governments of the United States and United Kingdom are also amongst the initiators of bicommunal talks between the leaders. The vision that was beheld by the Mayors of Nicosia had not yet been mutual at any time period for the leaders in power. One difference regarding the third party involvement is that when Nicosia Master Plan was in progress UN and UNDP were utilized as a means to come together and to provide facilitation. The recent talks have been pressed upon parties more on Turkish Cypriot side than the Greek Cypriot side. Not only did the leaders not manage to come together on their own terms, they also couldn't exhibit the trust, good faith and peace seeking leadership, which made the Nicosia Master Plan a success.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I.   The Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot leaders should continue negotiations on the basis of Annan Plan with a constructive and positive manner towards a solution, not a non-solution; should do most if not all the revisions of the presented plan without not leaving mush work for

Turkey and Greece to complete as guarantor powers on behalf of the 2
sides.

II. The TC negotiating team should not only include the present prime
minister, deputy prime minister and the president; but also include
political party leaders who have been pro-solution and pro-unified island.

III. The efforts of bringing the two communities together to break the mental
barriers should continue with local support as well as the international
support that was been offered during the days of physical barriers.

IV.   The Turkish Cypriots should lobby at international forums and tell their
story to create alliances to accomplish their desire of a democratized,
European standard future.

V. The Turkish Cypriot and Turkish administrations should listen to the
voice and votes of the people and let the Turkish Cypriot community use
their sole right of referendum as set for April 2004.

CONCLUSION

The author concludes that although the unifying vision of the leadership factor that
existed in Nicosia Master Plan does not exist in today's conditions, solution is yet a
very strong possibility because of other factors at work. The need factor does exist on
both sides for similar conditions necessary for both sides' survival and welfare.

It is the expectation and undying hope of this author that once the Cyprus
Problem comes to an end, many Cypriots, no matter Greek or Turkish, will return to

the island where they will be able to create a future for themselves and will put every

effort to bring the two communities closer.

REFERENCES

Annan Pushes for Settlement on Eve of deadline. (n.d.). Retrieved April 7, 2003 from

http://www.westernpolicy.org/SRR/CY-7-9.ASP

Barkey, Henry J. & Gordon, Philip H. "Cyprus: The Predictable Crisis," *The
National Interest,* No.66.

 Broome, Benjamin J. 1998. "Bridging the division in Cyprus: The role of
bicommunal activities in building a sustainable future," *Cyprus Review*,
winter.

Bollens, Scott. 2001. *On Narrow Ground: Urban Policy and Ethnic Conflict in
Jerusalem and Belfast.* State University of New York Press.

Boulton, Leyla and Andreas Hadjipapas. 2001. "Cyprus leaders agree to hold face-to-
face negotiations." *Financial Times,* November 27, pp.10.

Christou, Jean. 2001. "EU slams Turkish annexation threats." *Cyprusmail, The
International Daily."* November. pp.6.

(http://wwwcyprus_mail.com/november/6/newsq.htm)

Constitution of Cyprus. Presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for the
Colonies, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and the Minister of
Defense by command of Her Majesty. July 1960.

Demetriades, Lellos. 1998 "The Nicosia Master Plan," *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*. ISNN: 1016-3476 Vol.8, No.2: 169-176.

Diaz-Berrio, Dr.Arch. *Nicosia Master Plan Urban Conservation*. UNDP, UNCHS. January 1982.

Europa Nostra. Press Release, May 9, 2003

Interview with Mustafa Akinci. April 2002

Interview with Lellos Demetriades. October 2002.

Kasoulides, Ionnis. 2001. "Cyprus reunification and membership in the European Union." Woodrow Wilson International Center for scholars, April 5. (http://wwics.si.edu/NEWS/cyprus.htm)

Larigakis, Nick. "Cyprus and US diplomacy." *The Washington times,* Letter to the editor. October 2003

Munur, Metin. "'Backwater' watches as south heads for EU." *Financial Times,* November 27, 2001, pp. B4

Pearce, Anthony.1999. "The Role of the European Union: the cause of permanent division of Cyprus or the solution." Presented at the conference 'Peacemaking in Cyprus: two peoples, two states' May 29. (http://www.id-strategies.com/cyprus-eugenes.htm)

Rakoczy, Agnieszka. 2003. Perihelion Interviews, December. (http://www.epic.org/perihelion/interviews/akinci.htm.

Restoring the Heart of Nicosia. UNDP Publication, 1997.

Salem, Norma, "Cyprus: A Regional Conflict and Its Resolution," St. Martin's Press
in association with the Canadian Institute, 1992.

Tocci, Nathalie, "Towards Peace in Cyprus: Incentives and Disincentives," Brown
Journal of World Affairs, Summer/Fall 2003, Volume X, Issue 1.

Torgivnik, Efraim. 1990. *The Politics of Urban Planning Policy*. University Press of
America, the Jerusalem Center for Public affairs.

Vassiliou, George. "Cypriot Accession to the EU and the Solution to the Cyprus
Problem," *Brown Journal of World Affairs* Summer/Fall 2003, Volume X,
Issue 1.

Western Policy Center: www.westernpolicy.org