



University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): George Christou

Article Title: The European Union, borders and conflict transformation:  
The Case of Cyprus

Year of publication: 2010

Link to published version:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0010836709347213>

Publisher statement: None

# The European Union, Borders and Conflict Transformation: The Case of Cyprus

## Abstract

*Much of the existing literature on the European Union (EU), conflict transformation and border dynamics, has been premised on the assumption that the nature of the border determines EU intervention and the consequences that flow from this in terms of EU impact. This article aims to transcend this literature through assessing how domestic interpretations influence EU border transformation in conflict situations, taking Cyprus as a case study. Moreover, its objective is to fuse the literature on EU bordering impact and perceptions of the EU's normative projection in conflict resolution. Pursuing this line of enquiry is an attempt to depart from the notion of borders being constructed solely by unidirectional EU logics of engagement or bordering practices to a conceptualisation of the border as co-constituted space, where the interpretations of the EU's normative projections by conflict parties, and the strategies that they pursue, can determine the relative openness of the EU border.*

**Keywords: European Union; conflict transformation; borders; normative power; Cyprus conflict.**

Dr George Christou

Associate Professor

Department of Politics and International Studies

Coventry

CV4 7AL

Tel: +44 (0) 24 765 23110 Fax: +44 (0) 247652 4221

E-mail: [g.christou@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:g.christou@warwick.ac.uk)

## **Introduction**

A central issue for this article is how we can better understand the EU's ability to constitute open frontiers and create a climate for reconciliation in conflict situations. Much of the existing literature on the EU, conflict resolution and border dynamics, has been premised on the assumption that the nature of the border determines EU intervention and the consequences that flow from this in terms of EU impact i.e. a linear or causal relationship. This article aims to transcend this literature through assessing how domestic interpretations influence EU border transformation. Fusion of the literature on EU bordering impact and the EU's normative projection in conflict resolution, it is suggested, captures in a more nuanced way precisely how differentiated interpretations of the EU as a force for good (Pace 2007) amongst conflicting parties hinder or enable the EU's ability to create a more fluid, networked (non) border in conflict situations (Walters 2004; 679-682). To this end, it is argued that the Cyprus conflict, with insider and outsider dynamics, provides a salient case study of how EU borders are co-constituted and more specifically, how such borders emerge out of a dynamic political process.

The Cyprus issue represents a unique and challenging problem given the involvement of the two communities in Cyprus, Greece and Turkey, a candidate for EU accession. It has had negative consequences for internal EU governance across a diverse range of issues, and the EU objective of achieving relative stability in the eastern Mediterranean. There are also broader security implications in terms of the evolving NATO-EU relationship and European energy policy. Moreover, it has clear ramifications for the Turkish accession process: the Cyprus issue is *the* major obstacle to Turkish progression. Turkey refuses to comply with its EU contractual obligations and has been given until the end of 2009 to do so by the EU. The Cyprus issue then, is truly 'a real European problem...hurting the European Union' (Olli Rehn, 2008; 7) which if not resolved in the very near future, will have ramifications for the EU across many policy dimensions, and its security aspirations in particular.

Cyprus joined the EU on the 1 May 2004 as a divided island following the rejection by the Greek Cypriot community<sup>1</sup> of the United Nations (UN) sponsored plan for reunification<sup>2</sup>. This plan advocated a bicomunal, bizonal, federal solution with equal political rights for each community – and was supported by Turkey and a majority in the Turkish Cypriot community. However, they remain outside the EU,

with Turkey a candidate for accession, and the Turkish Cypriots institutionally excluded and unable to fully benefit from EU initiatives designed to enhance their economic welfare. The EU, despite being embroiled in the dispute, has been constrained in transforming the (de facto) EU hard border that separates the two communities in Cyprus. A significant reason for this was the approach of the Cypriot government under the nationalist President, Tassos Papadopoulos (2003-2008). His modernist conception of the border led him to pursue a ‘European solution’<sup>3</sup> with the goal of securing a tight federal solution (unitary and sovereign Cypriot state) and the rule of the majority community. This was sustained by using a narrow definition of the EU’s normative construction to legitimate and reinforce his position – and a strategy of manifest manipulation, both inside and outside the EU milieu.

Furthermore, progress within the primary mediating process under the UN umbrella was slow in this period. Despite agreement between the leaders of the two communities under the ‘Gambari process’ (8 July 2006) to accelerate resolution efforts<sup>4</sup>, and agreement on a common framework<sup>5</sup>, the reality was more reflective of a ‘creeping divergence’ (Cyprus After Accession 2007). This political dynamic placed limitations on the EU’s ability to facilitate movement to an EU open frontier in Cyprus. The election of a more moderate Greek Cypriot leader, Dimitris Christofias, in the Presidential elections on the 24 February 2008, led to renewed optimism that the EU hard border separating the conflicting parties could be transformed into an open frontier.

This article aims to examine the extent to which the EU border in Cyprus is being re-constituted within the above context. It takes as a starting point Rumelili’s model of EU bordering practices (2007). Second, it suggests that we need to move beyond this framework in order to explore more precisely how interpretations of the EU as a normative construction (Pace 2007), and the strategies pursued by conflict parties, impact on the EU’s ability to constitute borders at different times, and ultimately, to transform EU borders in conflict situations. Pursuing this line of enquiry is an attempt to depart from the notion of borders being constructed solely by unidirectional EU logics of engagement or bordering practices to a conceptualisation of the border as co-constituted space, where the interpretations of the EU’s normative projections by conflict parties, and the strategies that they pursue, can determine the relative openness of the EU border.

The next section will provide an overview of the theoretical literature on the EU and conflict transformation and differentiate the approach to be utilised in the paper. Section three will provide an overview of EU bordering practice in the pre-accession period, with an emphasis on the critical post-1999 period, when Turkey was accepted as a candidate for EU accession. Section four will assess how interpretations of the EU as a force for good by conflict parties in the Cypriot dispute, and the strategies pursued by them, affected EU bordering practice in Cyprus in the Papadopoulos era (2003-8). This section will focus on the Greek Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots and Turkey. It will not include an analysis of Greece, as despite it being a significant actor and one of the three guarantor states, since 1999 and during the period in question, it distanced itself from the position of the Cypriot government and chose to engage only at a minimal level diplomatically, with the Cyprus issue (i.e. Greece has been more withdrawn and has thus had less impact on the overall dynamics of border transformation in Cyprus). Section five will provide a brief analysis of the impact of the more moderate Christofias government, elected in February 2008. The concluding section will draw out the main implications of the analysis.

### **The EU, Conflict Transformation and Bordering Practices**

Many scholars have been engaged in explaining and providing a more complex understanding of the EU's role in conflict transformation. Such analyses have focused on enlargement, and the conditions under which the EU's power of attraction can facilitate conflict transformation (Christou 2004, 2002), as well as Europeanisation as a conflict resolution tool (Coppieters *et al*, 2004). Such a perspective emphasises the EU's potential as a third party actor and framework in mediating disputes, influencing conflict dynamics through conditionality or socialisation (Tocci 2004; Coppieters *et al* 2004). Tocci (2007; 17) has also promoted the idea of conflict resolution through passive enforcement of rules that emanate from the EU. She argues that conceptually, this is distinct from conditionality, in that it is not based on changing behaviour based on reward and punishment, but rather, on an in-built system of incentives and legally based rule-bound cooperation.

Others have focused on both the direct and indirect effects of the EU actions in conflicts (Hill 2001, Diez *et al* 2006, 2008). For example, in relation to direct effect Diez *et al* highlight a 'compulsory' impact, referring to the employment by the EU of carrots and sticks related to membership prospects and association, in order to induce

a change of behaviour amongst the (elite) actors in the conflict, towards resolution. They also identify a ‘connective impact’, which relates more to the EU’s impact within the societal/civil society dimension, through both its material resources but also its normative influence. In relation to indirect effect, they identify an ‘enabling’ impact and a ‘constructive’ impact. The former refers to the potential ideological and normative impact of the EU framework in terms of legitimising alternative options for foreign policy and resolution of conflict at elite level, and the latter, on the EU’s discursive ability in terms of transforming identities at societal level and desecuritising the conflict.

Although such an approach provides valuable insight into the strengths and limitations of the EU as an actor and framework in conflict situations, it has also led to a linear (non-dynamic) analysis of the EU’s impact in terms of border transformation. In addition, it has been less successful, as pointed out by Rumelili (2007; 109), in sufficiently addressing the ‘interactive dimension of conflict resolution, particularly the question of how the EU can simultaneously influence the insider and outsider states to promote conciliatory policies on both sides’. She suggests that the most fruitful way of achieving this is through a systematic evaluation of the EU’s bordering practices, which are seen as a significant condition for the EU’s impact beyond its boundaries.

Rumelili (2007; 109) posits that EU borders can be understood within a multi-dimensional framework – and drawing from Smith (1996), distinguishes between the EU’s institutional, physical and identity borders (Table 1 below). It is argued that the EU’s bordering practices can be understood within a spectrum (ideal-type) of hard borders on one end and open frontiers on the other, with several implications for EU impact (as conceptualised by Diez *et al* above).

**Table 1 here**

In terms of the outsider state or community, a hard EU border first, restricts severely the EU’s compulsory impact because effectively, it impedes the development of dense institutional relations and other bilateral and transnational links from evolving beyond a low-level dynamic. Second, it negates the enabling impact, as the legitimacy of the EU and its policies, as well as identification with the EU, is low. Finally, hard borders also have a negative (non-constructive) effect in terms of

connective and constructive impacts in the outsider state. It is difficult to engage in transnational or trans-community interaction and contact with a hard border, and it also reinforces 'the conflict-enhancing self versus other identity distinctions between the conflict parties by superimposing on them the more authoritative distinction of European versus non-European' (Rumelili 2007: 111).

Conversely, with EU open frontiers, impact is much stronger and the EU's ability to positively influence movement towards resolution of a conflict is enhanced. In this sense, the compulsory impact on the outsider state is stronger both in terms of the increased density of institutional relations and increased links between governments and communities, creating a greater sense of common identity between the inside state and the outside state. The EU's enabling impact is also enhanced through more positive identification with the EU and its policies at community and governmental level, thus providing a more legitimate basis for implementing changes emanating from the EU. Finally, there is a more effective connective and constructive impact through open EU frontiers. Enhanced contact across all levels builds mutual trust and cooperation, and is underpinned by shared EU values and an interest in resolving the conflict. It also weakens the fractious and divisive discourses of self versus other in the two communities thus promoting a conflict reducing rather than conflict enhancing milieu (Rumelili 2007; 108-12).

In terms of the insider state, a hard EU border allows the empowerment of hardliners at domestic level that wish to utilise the EU milieu, and the instruments within it, against the outside community or state, in order to promote a divisive rather than a reconciliatory approach. This in turn, creates a perception within the outside state or community of a non-neutral EU, captured by the insider state for the pursuit of its own interest. Such a perception further reinforces a negative identification with the EU amongst elites and societal actors in the outsider state or community.

Conversely, with EU open frontiers there is more likely to be a reconciliatory approach and a greater possibility that the conflict will be transformed through being part of the same EU community. Such open frontiers, it is argued, allow for the empowerment of more moderate domestic actors and the incapacitation of 'maximalist' elites seeking to utilise the EU to secure concessions from the outsider state or community. Indeed according to Rumelili (2007; 112), 'the instruments of power possessed by virtue of EU membership...become less convenient and more costly...for the insider state'. In turn, the perception of capture becomes less

significant, with an increasing willingness between the conflicting communities or states to reconcile through the use of EU norms and principles.

Whilst the Rumelili framework (2007) provides a basis for evaluating conflict situations with insider/outsider dynamics, it is also structuralist in its approach (i.e. emphasising where EU policies and practices can constrain and constitute domestic conflict actors to act in certain ways). Moving beyond it, therefore, will allow for a more nuanced and *agency-based* analysis of border transformation through providing an understanding of precisely how differentiated interpretations of the EU's self construction as a force for good amongst conflicting parties<sup>6</sup>, hinder or enable the movement to open frontiers or 'interdependent borderlands' (Newman and Paasi 1998; Newman 2000). The approach taken here then, implies a notion of the border that is based on a critique of mainstream modernist approaches to conceptualising territory and space (Agnew 1999; Newman 2000; Paasi 1996, 2003; Newman and Paasi 1998; Ruggie 1993)<sup>7</sup>. Within modernist approaches those at the margins, local conflict actors in this case, are largely ignored in their ability to constitute borders. The suggestion here is that conflict actors, whilst closely linked to and defined by the centre (the EU) to which they are marginal, also exist as sites of action themselves (Shields 1991; Parker and Armstrong 2000; Parker 2008).

In this context it is argued that the more recent literature exploring the concept of the EU's normative power (Manners 2002, 2006) in conflict resolution (Pace 2007) can be helpful. This literature has sought to critically assess the powerful self-construction of the EU<sup>8</sup> as a force for good in world affairs and in particular, whether such a construction contributes to the EU's success in constituting open or integrated borders, or disempowers it as an actor in conflict resolution (Pace 2007, Diez and Pace 2007). Moreover, such an approach allows for a better understanding of the construction of borders in conflict situations and offers more analytical specificity in assessing the potential limits and strengths of the projection of the EU as a normative power in constituting borders. More precisely, though the Rumelili (2007) framework allows for the idea that reconciliation is more likely between conflict parties where they identify with key EU values in a situation underpinned by open frontiers – it is important that we understand precisely *how* conflict parties, through the strategies they construct and pursue, identify and interpret EU norms projected through bordering practices, if we are to move to a more complex assessment of when the EU can transform borders in conflict situations and indeed create open or integrative

frontiers characterised by ‘transformative, dynamic space where social relations are recreated’(Walters 2004).

Of course, domestic perceptions of EU interventions and the EU’s normative power in conflict situations have been addressed in the academic literature (Rumelili 2008, 2004; Pace 2007; Diez and Pace 2007). This article proposes to add to this through a case study of Cyprus, and a synthesis of the work on EU bordering practice and the EU’s normative power, in order to enhance our understanding of why (van Houtum 2005) and how borders can be (re- and co-) constituted in conflict situations. In other words, the main contribution of this article is on how conflict parties can constitute EU conflict borders – not just on how the EU can provide the necessary incentives to determine the actions and change the behaviour of conflict actors. It also attempts to add to the existing approaches by suggesting that there are various (ideal type) strategies that conflict parties can adopt based on their interpretation of EU norms, which also impact on the EU’s ability to transform hard borders into open frontiers, through the different logics at play.

### **Diagram 1 here**

Drawing on and adapting the work of Parker (2008; 13), several strategies can be identified that are salient to conflict parties in exerting influence in the context outlined above (see Diagram 1). The first of these strategies is that of *manifest emulation*, which is interpreted here, as a situation whereby a conflict party identifies with the EU as a force for good and *all* the EU norms that underpin this. Under these circumstances the EU would be expected to have a positive influence, with conflict parties more likely to change adapt their behaviour in line with EU action and the integration framework. The second strategy is that of *manifest manipulation* by conflict parties. This refers to a strategy that embodies different scenarios: acceptance of the EU as a force for good and a rejection of EU norms; acceptance of the EU as a force for good, and manipulation of EU norms to enhance rather than ameliorate conflict; and finally, a situation where EU norms are accepted by conflict parties, but the image of the EU as a force for good is only shared by some conflict parties (Diez and Pace 2007). These scenarios suggest reinforcement of conflict enhancing dynamics and a negative EU influence on conflict party behaviour. The final strategy is that of *manifest incompatibility/rejection* of the EU as a force for good and all EU

norms, and constitutes a situation whereby the EU is 'powerless' to transform conflict situations through direct or indirect means.

Of course these strategies are only analytical 'ideal types' and it is recognised that there is a great deal of 'fuzziness' and 'overlap' in reality. However, such ideal types provide us with analytical benchmarks and starting points, from which, complexity can be understood through empirical analysis of case studies such as Cyprus. This, in turn, can provide us with further evidence of the forces that can determine EU border dynamics and indeed, the opportunities and limitations of the EU to pursue strategies that will lead to EU integrated frontiers characterised by a *networked (non) border* (Walters 2004) - where there exists a dynamic of deterritorialisation; a diminishing relevance of (spatial) lines of division; and differences between self and other are reduced.

Finally, certain points of clarification are needed before proceeding to the analysis. First, the suggestion in this article is not that conflict parties agreeing on an EU 'values' script (manifest emulation) is a panacea for resolving conflict (Diagram 1 - point b), but that this is minimum requirement for the prospect of transformation in the fluid process of (socially) constructing a reconciliatory climate between the conflict parties. This is even more salient in the case of Cyprus where the UN is the primary and more credible interlocutor for resolving the conflict. In the same vein, it is not to suggest that a EU 'open frontier' (non-networked border) is anything but an ideal type, the central dynamics of which offer the possibility of creating a climate for transforming conflict in a sustainable way. Recent evidence does suggest that there are both points of agreement and disagreement between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots communities on the nature of the EU border that should be created (see Kaymak, Lordos and Tocci 2008), but that this does not necessarily imply such views are in any way static<sup>9</sup>. In this way, offering a prescription based on such views at any one point in time would be to miss the point of the argument being made here – that border conflict transformation is a dynamic process where conceptions of the 'right' type of border are constantly under construction. In this context we can simply hypothesise that a sustainable solution in Cyprus is more likely if the ongoing negotiations in Cyprus under UN auspices lead to an agreement that accommodates the views of both communities within a variant of the 'open frontier' type (e.g. hard/open, soft/open etc)<sup>10</sup>. Second, although a key assertion is that a more dynamic picture of EU bordering practice in conflict transformation can be achieved through

the framework outlined, it is also acknowledged that the ‘context’ can change at any particular point in time depending on the forces and logics to be found within the conflict space<sup>11</sup> being analysed. Finally, purpose of this article is to illuminate, in a more nuanced way, how *agents* can determine and constitute borders in conflict situations. It is therefore to highlight and analyse the interactive (co-constitutive) dimension of the process of EU bordering and how it can be understood in conflict transformation. In doing this, it seeks to move away from the idea of conflicts existing ‘out there’, with only the ‘correct’ strategy of intervention needed through the appropriate EU logic in order to bring about transformation and reconciliation (Albert et al 2008; 9).

### **EU Bordering Practice and Cyprus 1999-2004**

A logical starting point for an analysis of the Cyprus conflict is the impact of the EU’s policy of exclusion prior to the Helsinki Summit in December 1999, when Turkey was granted candidate status. Here, Greece, as the insider state since 1981, sought to exert its influence in Greek-Turkish disputes (including Cyprus) through the leverage afforded to it by membership and a strategy of manifest manipulation. Indeed, the EU was seen a force for good by Greek elites and EU norms were used to constrain movement towards an open frontier, empowering hardliners in the Greek government and marginalizing alternative voices on the Greek-Turkish relationship that sought long-term *rapprochement* through supporting Turkish orientation towards the EU. Furthermore, such a policy provided for relative success in foreign policy terms for Greece, and a legitimate platform that was used to secure domestic support against Turkey, which was portrayed as ‘non-European other’, and threat to the Greek state and its security interests.

Conversely, within Turkey, Greece’s policy of negative conditionality meant that any EU policy intervention in Greek-Turkish relations was interpreted as evidence of further European reluctance to include Turkey, and the capture of the EU by Greece to pursue its hostile agenda. In essence, the EU’s hard border with respect to Turkey, maintained because of the Greek strategy, served to create a perception amongst Turkish elites of the EU as a negative force that only escalated the conflict. The impact was the prevention, indirectly, of positive transnational links evolving between civil society, business and other interests. Moreover, it legitimated the securitised frame within which bilateral relations between Greece and Turkey were

conducted and served to accentuate the othering of Turkey, adding, rather than alleviating, Turkish insecurity about its own identity and European orientation (see Rumelili 2007, 2008 for detailed analysis).

This above context had a direct and indirect impact on the EU dynamics for transforming the Cypriot conflict. Greece, whilst supporting the Greek-Cypriot cause in different ways at different times, took a strong and more aggressive line under Andreas Papandreou's leadership in the 1980s and 1990s. The Turkey-EU Customs Union Agreement signed in 1995 was perceived by the Turkish government and the conservative Turkish Cypriot leadership under Rauf Denktaş, as evidence of 'Greek' capture in order to secure greater leverage over Turkey in the Cyprus dispute. Effectively, Greece had agreed to lift its veto on the Agreement in return for a deal which secured the start of accession negotiations with Cyprus six months after the conclusion of the Intergovernmental Conference in 1996.

From a Greek Cypriot perspective, Greek support inside the EU, and the subsequent decision to accept it as a candidate and begin accession negotiations, served to further legitimise its longstanding strategy for resolving the Cyprus issue through involving international organisations and sympathetic third parties. For the Greek Cypriot leadership, the EU platform, with Greece as the supporting insider state, provided additional leverage and mechanisms for resolving the conflict through agreed and established UN agreements on the parameters and principles of a solution. From a normative perspective, it was justified on the grounds that the EU could not punish the Greek Cypriots for what was a violation of international law by Turkey: adherence to and observation of international law being a central element within the EU's normative power construction (Diez and Pace 2007: 8; see also Pace 2007). Indeed this justification allowed the Greek Cypriots to pursue a strategy of manifest manipulation both within the EU milieu and domestically.

Acceptance of Cyprus as a membership candidate reaffirmed the European identity of the Greek Cypriots, whilst reinforcing the image of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership as the main threat to a secure and sustainable solution in Cyprus<sup>12</sup>. Moreover it served indirectly, to superimpose the European versus non-European distinction between the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots/Turkey, and limit intercommunal and transnational communication and exchange. Whilst the application of the (Greek) Cypriot government was seen as legitimate within the EU normative framework, it served to marginalise the alternative Turkish Cypriot voices

in the north that supported a European orientation through a narrative of manifest emulation, and also devalued their sense of European identity through exclusion. This reinforced the position of the hardliners in the north under the longstanding leadership of Rauf Denktash. EU actions, by confirming their ‘outsider’ status, strengthened the hand of the Turkish Cypriots in the north and those in Turkey that neither supported EU membership or a federal solution to the Cyprus question mediated by the UN. Indeed, the conflict enhancing dynamics between the two communities were perpetuated by EU policy, with Rauf Denktash, as a direct consequence, pursuing a strategy of manifest rejection, and proposing a confederal solution and effective separation as a solution to the Cyprus issue in 1998. Denktash, a longstanding critic of EU involvement, did not perceive the EU to be normatively ‘good’ for the Cyprus conflict, consistently arguing that, ‘They seek to give the Greek Cypriots those rights taken away from us and then call this peace. With this so-called peace, they actually seek to turn us into an attractive minority and own the whole of Cyprus by means of the EU...’ (Denktash cited in Denktash wants Peace with Sovereignty, 2002). This negative view of the EU was also espoused by the more conservative voices (anti-EU) within the Turkish establishment that supported the status quo situation on the island and that believed the conflict was resolved in 1974 (see Bahcheli 2006; Kaliber 2005; Robins 2007; Tocci 2007).

The situation after 1999, triggered by improved Greek-Turkish relations bilaterally, was sustained and consolidated by the EU through its decision to grant Turkey candidate status, and led to the enhancement of the EU’s identity border with Turkey. The affirmation of Turkey’s identity as a potential EU candidate state and the subsequent decision at the Copenhagen European Council in December 2002 to set a date for discussing when accession talks could actually begin, complemented by the victory of a more moderate Turkish government in November 2002 led by Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, triggered a fundamental change in Turkish policy towards support for the Annan Plan. Indeed, Erdoğan and the Justice and Development Party (AK Party), by February 2004, had altered the traditional Turkish position on Cyprus espoused by the hardliners<sup>13</sup>, and consolidated support for resolution of the Cyprus conflict through the UN Plan, providing the basis for movement to EU open frontiers and transformation of the conflict.

It also provided a basis for the empowerment of Turkish Cypriots that identified with the EU as a force for good and resolution of the Cyprus conflict within EU and

internationally established norms. Most importantly, following mass demonstrations, it led to the opening of the physical border between the north and south in April 2003, allowing for the first time after 1974, movement and exchange on a cultural and socio-economic level, between and within the two communities (albeit not entirely free or open)<sup>14</sup>. Fundamentally, the positive image of the EU as a force for good provided a reference for the mobilisation of moderate and liberal voices in the north, replacing the manifest rejection strategy of the nationalist hardliners, in particular Rauf Denktash. Moreover, as part of this movement, the more moderate Mehmet Ali Talat was elected as Prime Minister in December 2003 and President on 17 April 2005 (with 55% of the vote) on a pro-EU membership and pro-reunification platform, in support of the Annan Plan.

The Greek Cypriot leadership, under Clafkos Clerides, oscillated between a hardline approach at the beginning of his Presidency (1993), to a more moderate stance towards the end (2003). This was triggered by the realisation of what the EU normative framework could provide for Cyprus in security terms, and led eventually to a strategy of manifest emulation rather than selective appropriation of EU norms, emphasising in January 2003 that EU accession was of ‘critical, decisive significance’ for Cyprus and that ‘no mistakes could be made [that] delayed European integration...’ (Clerides 2003). However, the election of President Tassos Papadopoulos (right wing DIKO party) in February 2003 led to a much narrower interpretation of the EU’s normative construction based on implementation of the four freedoms (services, goods, capital and labour). Although accepting that the EU was a force for good in Cyprus, such a strategy enabled the Papadopolous government to pursue a strategy of manifest manipulation, strengthening and reinforcing its hardline position (Diez and Pace 2007; 9), with the consequence that it enhanced rather than reduced the opportunity for creating a EU open frontier in Cyprus.

### **The Accession of Cyprus: Maintaining Hard EU Borders**

#### *The EU Context*

The clear failing of the EU’s catalytic effect through the process of accession<sup>15</sup>, despite the hope that was attached to it, led to a re-evaluation and upgrading of EU policy towards the Turkish Cypriots in order to facilitate the movement towards EU

open frontiers in the Cyprus conflict. Whilst EU policy towards Cyprus remained unchanged on a macro level in the post-accession period (after 1 May 2004) – ‘to engage and intervene to facilitate the main UN process of mediation between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots’ (Interview, European Commission, 2006) - on a micro level, measures were introduced reflective of the shift away from the previously dominant discourse for blame which rested with Turkey and the hardline Turkish Cypriot leadership.

The EU sought to reward the positive attitude of the Turkish Cypriot community with Regulations aimed at reinforcing the Turkish Cypriot identification with the EU as force for good, and opening up institutional<sup>16</sup> and physical borders. Indeed the Commission approach was to open the border in Cyprus ‘through fostering direct links with the Turkish Cypriots and reducing the gap so that they feel less isolated’ (Interview, European Commission, 2006). The consequence, however, was the reinforcement of the EU hard border towards Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots, as the Papadopoulos government strategy was to maximise its leverage within the EU to force concessions compatible with a tight federal (unitary state) solution, rather than a more flexible bizonal, bicomunal federation (with two constituent states).

Most significantly, the EU sought to open the institutional and physical border and transform the identity border through enhancing an existing package (agreed in June 2003) of measures for northern Cyprus worth a total of €12 million that was aimed at promoting economic development and bringing Turkish Cypriots closer to the EU. The Green Line Regulation (GLR) (EC No 866/2004) was adopted and implemented prior to the accession of Cyprus on 1 May 2004, in order to secure its passage unchallenged. The Financial Aid Regulation (FAR) (EC No 389/2006) and the Direct Trade Regulation (DTR) (Proposed Council Regulation, COM 2004) that followed, were proposals put forward by the European Commission in July 2004 with the objective of enhancing the EU’s direct and indirect impact and transforming the economic status of the Turkish Cypriot north, with the aim of simultaneously removing one of the significant barriers to finding a solution. The FAR involved a disbursement of funds, totalling €259 million, and was agreed by all member states with one Greek Cypriot provision – that funds should not be utilised to build on land owned by the Greek Cypriots or on public organisations or bodies.

The DTR, however, was more controversial. Its main purpose was to allow direct trade between the EU and the north, with the potential of opening up the physical and

institutional border, as well as reinforcing the European identity of the Turkish Cypriots. In relation to Turkey, the positive decision to recognise her as a candidate for membership in 1999 was followed by an offer to review progress at Copenhagen in December 2004. The terms for Turkish accession were eventually defined, formulated and agreed in December 2005, committing Turkey to fulfil the contractual obligations (implement accession norms) of the process leading to eventual membership of the EU (discussed below).

Despite international as well as internal institutional pressure, once Cyprus entered the EU on the 1 May 2004, an additional platform was provided on which the Papadopoulos government could project and reinforce its strategy, based on a narrow, yet legitimating, interpretation of the EU's normative construction that emphasised the 'implementation of the *acquis communautaire* throughout the territory of the Republic of Cyprus [to] reverse the tragic division of our country in united Europe' (Papadopoulos cited in Cyprus Signs EU Accession Treaty, 2003). However, the Greek Cypriot interpretation of the EU norms based on the strict requirements of the *acquis*, were not necessarily compatible with the broader EU norms relating to cooperation, equality, and peace, with the consequence that EU impact was minimised in terms of its direct compulsory and enabling effects, but also its indirect connective and constructive effects. There existed a paradox: the Greek Cypriot solution did not necessitate embedded change in relation to key EU norms on the ground (see Richmond 2005: 7), despite its compatibility with the four freedoms.

### *Domestic Context: Conflict Party Strategies*

#### *The Greek Cypriots*

Although the Papadopolous strategy of manifest manipulation was opposed in the south by the more moderate right wing quarters represented by the Democratic Rally (DISY)<sup>17</sup> and the United Democrats (EDI), this was effectively marginalised. The Cypriot government had considerable support for its policies within Greek Cypriot civil society and significantly, from the communist party AKEL (Progressive Party of the Working People), which held the support of a third of the electorate. AKEL, traditionally at the forefront of reconciliation initiatives and maintaining intercommunal links with Turkish Cypriots in the north, was until February 2004,

associated with a more moderate position in relation to the 'terms' for a solution of the Cyprus conflict (as agreed in international law).

It can be argued that AKEL's 'no' vote in the referendum<sup>18</sup>, and the coalition formed with the Papadopoulos government, was critical in shifting the opinions of the Greek Cypriot public towards a negative vote in the Annan Plan referendum. Indeed, AKEL's importance to the continuation of a the policy of the Papadopoulos government on the Cyprus conflict was reinforced by parliamentary elections in the south in May 2006, where they received 131, 066 of the votes (31%) compared to 75, 458 of the votes (18%) for the Democratic Party (DIKO) of Tassos Papadopoulos (Cyprus ruling coalition wins poll, May 2006).

Cyprus, as the insider state, aimed 'to make the Cyprus problem a European problem...believing in this way that we can increase our possibilities of seeking a solution' (Interview, COREPER, 2006). This meant manipulation of EU norms through the available mechanisms and tools, to achieve a 'European solution'<sup>19</sup>. For Tassos Papadopoulos, the strategy of manifest manipulation, reflected a belief that he had 'received a state' on election and that he did not want to 'deliver a community'. Indeed in his televised address to the nation encouraging the rejection of the Annan Plan (7 April 2003), he urged Greek Cypriots 'to defend the Republic of Cyprus, saying no to its abolition'. Moreover this was underpinned by a historical conviction<sup>20</sup> that power with the Turkish Cypriots could not be shared on the basis of equal political status.

Although the Cypriot government was willing to share prosperity and soften the border in a socio-economic sense, as demonstrated by domestic measures allowing increased freedom of movement for Turkish Cypriots to live and work in the south, it was unwilling to allow any initiative that impacted directly on the 'sovereign' power and (Greek) identity of the Cypriot state, before a solution securing its rights as a *majority*, was agreed (i.e. modernist interpretation of the border). Thus, whilst the FAR in principle, and as a separate tool for potentially opening up the physical and institutional border between the EU and the north was agreed separately in February 2006 (€259million), the DTR was rejected for fears that it would result in an increased 'international presence for the administration in the north and the overt recognition of the secessionist entity', subsequently impacting negatively on 'Turkish Cypriot aspirations for movement towards reunification' (Interview, COREPER, 2006).

### *The Turkish Cypriots*

The new and ambitious FAR and DTR proposals raised the expectations of Turkish Cypriots that perceived the EU to be ‘normatively’ beneficial in Cyprus. There was an assumption that the Turkish Cypriots, having voted positively for the Annan Plan, would be rewarded through measures to extend EU benefits to the north, with the aim of facilitating growth and prosperity, and providing a more cooperative basis for moving towards a more open frontier and negotiated settlement. Within the moderate leadership circle, Mehmet Ali Talat, and officials within his Republican Turkish Party (RTP), expressed the importance of establishing ‘voice opportunities for the Turkish Cypriots institutionally’; enhancing the economic status of the north and opening up the physical borders between the north and the EU through the FAR and DTR; and providing a platform for reinforcing the sense of ‘European identity’ that evolved in the north in the pre-accession process. Discursively, at least, they projected a strategy of manifest emulation (see Talat 2005).

The consequence of the Greek Cypriot strategy, however, prevented an inclusive EU approach that would allow the necessary inter-communal links and interdependence and exchange between the two communities to evolve through EU initiatives. The necessary climate for cooperation was not created, leading to the incomplete implementation of the GLR because of its unpopularity with Turkish Cypriots, reluctant to entrust more than 3 per cent of their trade to Greek Cypriots, and because of obstructionist legislation put in place by the Greek Cypriot government for its effective working. The implementation of the FAR has not led to a more open physical or institutional border with the EU because Commission officials have been constrained from formally developing working relationships with ‘entities in the north’ because of the issue of ‘political recognition’. The DTR still remains on the EU negotiating table without agreement to implement it and has the potential to unlock substantive conflict reducing and desecuritisising dynamics and opportunities for the movement to EU open frontiers.

The consequences of this have been twofold: first, the bordering impact of EU initiatives on pro-solution and pro-European elites and civil society actors and groups in the north, has been negative, directly and indirectly; second, the Turkish Cypriots supportive of the EU, have been constrained in pursuing a strategy of *emulation* and integration with the EU. More specifically, polls indicate that disappointment in the

north has manifested itself in different ways (see Lordos 2006), with evidence suggesting a decrease in the support for the EU as a ‘force for good’ and its credibility in relation to lifting the isolation of the Turkish Cypriot community through projection and diffusion of EU norms (Kaymak, Lordos and Tocci 2008; Senyigit 2006; Lacher and Kaymak 2005; Interview, European Commission, 2006). From a Turkish Cypriot leadership perspective, the lack of progress in the development of the north was directly attributable to the failure of the EU to turn its rhetoric into action –with criticism of EU officials and (Greek) Cypriot government strategy that constrained progress. The alternative voices within liberal-leftist circles (known as the Jasmine coalition)<sup>21</sup>, although critical of the Cypriot government’s strategy to further Greek Cypriot interests within the EU (perception of capture) and undermine those of Turkish Cypriots – argue that the best way to overcome this is through further and *incremental emulation* of the EU’s normative framework as citizens of the EU, and the rights that this accrues to them. From the perspective of nationalist and conservative forces in the north, which do not perceive the EU as a force for good, Cypriot membership of the EU is viewed as illegal – thus the lack of any impact with regard to EU measures and the scepticism this creates, serves as fuel for their arguments of secession and a strategy of manifest rejection, although there is still only minority support for their position within civil society.

### *Turkey*

The strategy of the Papadopoulos government, in particular its manifestation within the EU milieu - through a refusal to discuss the DTR - also had implications for moving towards an EU open frontier between the Greek Cypriots and Turkey. The Turkish government’s perception of capture, and manipulation by the (Greek) Cypriot government of EU norms in order to achieve its aims, led to the linking by Turkey of the EU’s commitment to end the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots, and Turkish contractual obligations relating to the diffusion and implementation of the norms associated with the accession process. This effectively, hardened the border between the EU and Turkey and the possibility of further cooperative movement on Cyprus policy within Turkey. Moreover, it led to a Turkish government strategy of manifest manipulation within the accession process in order to secure EU (read Greek Cypriot) concessions on the Turkish Cypriot north.

A critical obligation has been that of the extension of Turkey's custom union with the EU towards the ten new member states that joined in May 2004, which included Cyprus. The terms of the accession negotiations that were agreed in December 2004 committed Turkey to the ratification of an Additional Protocol for the extension of the Customs Union, which in relation to Cyprus meant opening Turkish ports and airports to (Greek) Cypriot ships and planes. However, the Turkish government has asserted consistently that it will not fulfil any such obligations because of the issue of recognition, and the fact that the Greek Cypriot leadership has blocked EU initiatives aimed at lifting the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots in the north i.e. the DTR in the Council of Ministers<sup>22</sup>.

Indeed, the perception of the EU as a force for good in Cyprus amongst pro-EU reformists in Turkey has dissipated given the inability of the EU to create the necessary environment or mobilise the necessary mechanisms and processes in order to turn its rhetoric into action. Whilst informal efforts have been made by various EU Presidencies<sup>23</sup> to resolve the DTR issue (see Christou 2006a), the lack of agreement has served to enhance the support of the hardline conservative voices in Turkey within the military and bureaucracy that are sceptical of the EU's normative construction, and the EU-orientated AK Party policy on Cyprus. Even though such voices, and parallel to these, a neo-nationalist sentiment, has grown in Turkey against 'Western' interference (Turkey and Europe: The Way Ahead 2007), it has not, thus far, despite support from the Kemalist CHP, the Democratic Left Party and the right wing Genç Party, emerged as a dominant political ideology or discourse supported by a majority in civil society.

Significantly, although such opposition has constrained the pace of Europeanisation (implementation of EU accession norms), it has not resulted in the defeat of the more moderate AK Party, who won 46.7% of the vote in the parliamentary elections in July 2007, with former Foreign Minister, Abdullah Gül, also being elected as President of Turkey in August 2007, despite the objections of the armed forces and its leadership under General Yasar Büyükanit. Such hardline opposition to the EU normative construction, and to granting any further concessions on Cyprus via the EU process, however, cannot be underestimated, and is a constraint on the manoeuvrability of the AK Party domestically and on the Cyprus issue<sup>24</sup>.

In this context the Papadopolous government strategy of manifest manipulation pursued through the use of negative conditionality to secure concessions from Turkey

on Cyprus, had several consequences. First, it led to a perception of bias and capture by the Turkish government, which supported the Annan Plan and a bizonal, bicomunal solution to the Cyprus problem. This only served to perpetuate the conflict enhancing dynamics in Cyprus, with a fundamental conflict between Turkish implementation of the EU's accession norms (in the form of the Additional Protocol provisions), and the Turkish government's interpretation of those norms in relation to the Cyprus conflict and the movement to EU open frontiers with the north (through the DTR). Moreover, this served to impede the evolution of trustful and cooperative relationships between Turkish and Greek Cypriot elites, business representatives, tourist organisations, and civil society groups. The issues of the DTR and the Additional Protocol, therefore, remain a major constraint on movement to an open frontier, with the latter representing 'the main obstacle for significant progress in Turkey's accession process' (Barroso 2008, 10 April 2008). Moreover, it hinders both the potential direct and indirect impact that the EU might have in Turkey in relation to the Cyprus conflict. It also promotes and reproduces discourses that reinforce division, and identities in Turkey and southern Cyprus that emphasise difference and antagonism, in particular in relation to being 'European'.

### **Transforming the Cyprus Conflict: Towards Open Frontiers?**

The election of the more moderate Dimitris Christofias, as President of Cyprus on the 24 February 2008, created a similar *potential* dynamic for conflict transformation to that of the earthquake diplomacy between Greece and Turkey in 1999, which triggered the subsequent EU decision to reinforce the positive climate that evolved between the two countries. After splitting from the governing AKEL-DIKO-EDEK<sup>25</sup> coalition in July 2007, Christofias, the leader of AKEL, campaigned on a more constructive strategy to finding a solution to the Cyprus issue than the hardline approach of Tassos Papadopolous.

Indeed, on his election, he pledged that it would be 'a Presidency for all Cypriots' with the aim of delivering 'a just solution to the Cyprus problem'. He also stressed the importance of the UN (Gambari) process, providing for bicomunal talks at technical and working group level, as an important 'starting point' for breaking the deadlock with the Turkish Cypriots. Only one member of the previous Cypriot Council of Ministers remains in post (see Cyprus News No.222, Feb 2008) and importantly, the Foreign Minister position went to the more moderate Markos

Kyprianou, who has both experience and knowledge of working within the EU machinery after resigning his post as EU Health Commissioner to take up this responsibility. Other changes indicating a more proactive approach to reaching solution have included the establishment of a Turkish Affairs Bureau at the Presidential Palace.

Christofias' victory suggests that civil society attitudes have become less militant within the Greek Cypriot south over the last four years<sup>26</sup>. Sixty five percent of Greek Cypriots voted for pro-solution candidates in the first round of the election (Lichfield, 18 Feb 2008), indicating the dissatisfaction with the divisive 'us and them' approach to the Cyprus issue pursued by the Papadopoulos government. This significant domestic change has certainly marginalised the hardliners and provided a more cooperative climate for movement towards transformation of the Cyprus conflict. The Christofias approach, within a month of election, led to substantively more progress than his predecessor, in the UN process. A meeting between Christofias and Talat on the 21 March 2008 yielded agreement<sup>27</sup> on the establishment of technical committees to deal with power-sharing, EU matters, security, territory, property and economic matters and working groups, to address everyday issues such as crime, commerce, cultural heritage, crisis management, humanitarian matters, health and the environment. Moreover, in their final review of the work of the groups and committees on 25 July 2008<sup>28</sup>, the two leaders decided to start negotiations for a solution on 3 September 2008, under UN auspices<sup>29</sup>. In addition, the symbolic Ledra Street crossing point, which had previously been the subject of much political rancour and resulted only in conflict enhancing dynamics on the island,<sup>30</sup> was opened in April 2008 to allow the further socio-economic, cultural and political evolution of trans-communal links.

It is unclear at the time of writing whether there has been a reinterpretation by the Christofias government of EU norms (the meaning of Europeanisation), beyond the 'narrow' application of the Papadopolous era, and indeed a transformation of strategy. Whilst he has rejected the accusation of being a Euro-sceptic, and indeed asserted that he is a 'Euro-fighter...[working] for Cyprus's best interests within Europe', it is not yet clear how this will translate into strategy in relation to EU norms beyond the fact that on EU issues there were 'gaps that could be bridged' (Christofias cited in Cyprus News, March 2009). Early indications suggest that the more conciliatory approach has catalysed some movement on EU issues. An example here

is the amendments to the Green Line Regulation that were approved by the European Commission following the momentum created by the Ledra Street opening. The changes, which Cypriot government officials have not raised any objections to, provide for a blanket lifting of the duties on agricultural products originating in the north when being traded across the Green Line<sup>31</sup>, and an increase in the value of goods contained in personal luggage of persons crossing the line from 135 euros to 260 euros (Cyprus Weekly, 11-17 April 2008)<sup>32</sup>.

The amended GLR could, therefore, strengthen the positive direct and indirect impact of the EU. However, simply amending the GLR, whilst a step in the right direction, is not symbolic of a historic shift that indicates transformative change in the interpretation of EU norms (i.e. strategy) and subsequently, the important issues of the DTR or indeed the implementation of the Additional Protocol to the EU-Turkey Custom Union. Whilst the EU continues to warn Turkey that the Additional Protocol must be implemented by the end of 2009 for it to make any further progress on its accession path, the EU hard border between Turkey and the Cypriot government prevents any direct or indirect EU impact on the Turkish government. Indeed, movement to an EU open frontier will not materialise unless these issues are resolved.

## **Conclusions**

The purpose of this article was to focus not just on the cause-effect relationship between EU action and Cypriot conflict transformation, but also on the extent to which this can be influenced by differing interpretations of the EU as a normative force for good amongst conflict parties, and the strategies pursued by them. It has shown that despite Commission policy to influence border transformation in the post-2004 period, the strategy of manifest manipulation pursued by the (Greek) Cypriot and Turkish governments, at different times and within different contexts, served to marginalise the influence (and *emulation* strategy) of the (moderate) Turkish Cypriots, and undermine EU efforts to constitute a more open, networked EU border in Cyprus, through direct or indirect impact.

Moreover, the case of Cyprus has shown that whilst the conflicting parties shared the idea of the EU as a normative power, there existed significant difference in the way in which key EU norms were interpreted, accepted and embedded, through the different logics at play. From a Greek Cypriot perspective, Europeanisation entailed implementation of the four freedoms, whilst for Turkey, any positive movement

flowing from the EU normative power construct in the pre-accession period was negated by a more conservative interpretation linked to what was perceived as an inconsistency relating to the EU's normative projection towards Turkish Cypriots, and its inability to convert policy into effective action because of the manifest manipulation strategy of the 'insider' Cypriot government. The consequence in Cyprus was the inability of the EU to catalyse movement to more open institutional and physical borders and reinforce the European identity of the Turkish Cypriots that perceived the EU as a force for good. It also hardened the identity border between the EU and Turkey, further undermining the EU's normative power (through conditionality) in the accession process and in relation to the Cyprus conflict, whilst also perpetuating rather than alleviating Turkish insecurity about its European orientation.

The election of a more moderate President in the south has led to a positive 'local' climate for cooperation in Cyprus within the UN process. Although this has not manifested itself in any significant change in the interpretation of EU norms to date and thus a change in the strategy of influence on the part of the new Cypriot leadership and government, it has created the *potential* for the movement to strategies of manifest emulation amongst all conflict parties. Ironically, in the case of Cyprus, the more reconciliatory climate has not emerged from EU action or policy, but through a domestic dynamic 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 amongst the conflict parties in the Cyprus dispute.

On a theoretical and policy-making level, the case of Cyprus illuminates some important issues in relation to the EU ability to constitute and transform border conflicts. It highlights the need to understand in a more sophisticated way, how the EU as a normative power construct can have a positive bordering impact in conflict situations. In order to achieve this, further research is required to conceptualise the 'stages of a conflict' (Çelik and Rumelili 2006) within which this is possible, how EU policies 'fit' with local interpretations of the intervening actor, and at what point in the 'cycle of intervention' EU action would be most effective (for this, see Albert et al 2008). On a broader level, it also points to the EU's 'logics of engagement' when aiming to transform borders, and the constitutive power of those outside as well as

those inside the EU, to impact not just on the nature of the border the EU is attempting to reshape, but also on the identity of the EU as an international actor and the narrative that underpins its projection as a force for good in (re) ordering Europe. This is a particularly salient issue for future research on the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) (see Browning and Joenniemi 2008; Browning and Christou, 2008) which aims to create security and stability and resolve conflicts from the ‘outside’, through offering predominantly, an extension of the EU physical border, without the requisite deep institutional and identity confirming benefits.

## NOTES

I would like to thank Christopher Browning for his supportive, insightful and critical comments on this article, as well as the three anonymous reviewers. I would also like to acknowledge the very useful comments received at the GARNET Conference on the ‘EU in International Affairs’ in Brussels (24-26 April 2008), where this article was first presented.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the referendum held in April 2004 on the Annan Plan 75% of Greek Cypriots voted against and 65% of Turkish Cypriots voted for. See Anastasakis et al (2004) for critical evaluation of the plan. For analyses of the main reasons behind the Greek Cypriot rejection, see Attalides (2004), Coufoudakis (2004), Lordos (2005, 2006). For an analysis of the Turkish Cypriot ‘yes’ vote, see Bahcheli (2004).

<sup>2</sup> Referred to as the Annan Plan. This allowed for the creation of a ‘common’ state government and two equal ‘component states’, one Greek Cypriot and one Turkish Cypriot, thus ensuring political equality for the two communities.

<sup>3</sup> See Ker-Lindsay (2007) for elaboration on what a ‘European solution’ entails

<sup>4</sup> Agreed in principle between Mehmet Ali Talat and Tassos Papadopoulos. This process involves technical committees to deal with day-to-day issues, working groups to discuss substantive issues, and confidence building measures (CBMs) to create a more reconciliatory environment for reaching agreement.

<sup>5</sup> To a bizonal, bicomunal federation based on the equal representation of both communities.

<sup>6</sup> More detail is provided on the ‘domestic politics’ aspect and the importance of domestic perception on EU impact in relation to Turkey and Greece in Rumelili (2008)

<sup>7</sup> This is just a small sample of the literature on borders. Obviously there is a rich debate on the ontology of borders, which it would be impossible to cover in any great detail within this article. For an overview of some of the key literature and debates on Europe and ‘borders’ most relevant to this article see van Houtum and Scott (2005); Axford (2006); Delanty (2006); Diez (2006); Walters (2006).

<sup>8</sup> Note this article is not about how EU normative power is self-constructed, as this is covered adequately and comprehensively elsewhere – see Diez (2005), Manners (2006), Pace (2007), Diez and Pace (2007), Diez and Manners (2007).

---

<sup>9</sup> Indeed what is implied is quite the opposite – that confidence building measures and the right incentives and dialogue can lead to the reconstruction of conflict borders (open borders).

<sup>10</sup> See Delanty (2006) for a discussion on these dimensions of European borders. See Kaymak, Lordos and Tocci (2008) for detail on what is acceptable to Turkish and Greek Cypriots in this context.

<sup>11</sup> The central analytical focus of this paper is on the ‘local’ context, and whilst outside the remit of this article, it is important to recognise the ‘complexity’ of such a context, especially in relation to the (re) construction of the identity border in conflict situations through the lens of colonial practices and the colonial legacy of European Empire. For analyses of the Cyprus problem from these perspectives see Constantinou (2007); Kramsch (2006); and Boedeltje, F et al (2007).

<sup>12</sup> Potential membership also provided a normative framework through the *acquis communautaire* for implementation of the four freedoms.

<sup>13</sup> For details see Christou (2004); Kaliber (2005); Tocci (2004, 2007)

<sup>14</sup> A report by the United Nations in Cyprus (UNFICYP Survey, 2007) indicates that this not been very successful in fostering a conflict reducing dynamic between the two communities.

<sup>15</sup> This is now well documented: See Christou (2004); Demetriou (2008); Tocci (2004, 2007)

<sup>16</sup> More recently (Dec 2007), there was a suggestion that the EU would identify twelve areas of governance in which it would help Turkish Cypriots officials harmonise with those of the EU (see Cyprus: Reversing the Drift to Partition 2008; p.9).

<sup>17</sup> Founded by former President, Glafkos Clerides (1993-2003).

<sup>18</sup> This was on the grounds that the UN (and Turkey) refused to postpone the referendum to provide more time for discussion of the critical aspects of the Annan Plan settlement.

<sup>19</sup> In Greece the view was different to that of the Papadopoulos regime. The effects of the process of EU socialisation and the Greek-Turkish rapprochement triggered by changing domestic dynamics meant that Greek foreign policy, under Prime Minister, Costas Simitis, and Foreign Minister, George Papandreou, underwent a transformation that led to a new strategy of manifest emulation of EU norms. The result of this was a policy that unequivocally supported and encouraged Turkish membership – indeed the view from Greece was that a Turkey included within the EU would bring bilateral and regional benefits and facilitate the movement towards developing a more trusting basis for transnational cooperation across a range of issues. This also led to a divergence of opinion and gradual dissociation with the manipulation tactic pursued by the Papadopoulos regime. Greece’s support for

---

Turkish membership remained strong, even though Turkey was constantly reminded of its obligations on the Cyprus issue through the process of accession. This did not change Costas Karamanlis was elected in March 2004. He not only continued the policy of supporting an EU open frontier for Turkey (the accession process), but also supported the Annan Plan as a means for transforming the conflict border in Cyprus. Such a decision not only marked the most significant divergence in positions between Cypriot and Greek officials for many years, but also led to further withdrawal of Greek support and distancing of the Greek position from that of Papadopoulos within the EU and bilaterally with Karamanlis making it clear that ‘we do not want...to be two against 23 against in the union...the interests of Greece are above the interests of any other country, irrespective of how friendly it is’ (Cyprus Mail 2006). More recently, Greece has also made clear that support for Turkey is not *unconditional*. Indeed, Karamanlis, in March 2009, underlined that Turkey’s path to the European Union was very much dependent on it changing its strategy of manifest manipulation and ‘fully complying with its European obligations’ arguing that ‘full implementation also means full accession’. Greece has also iterated that the historical security framework of ‘guarantees’ and ‘interventions’ does not have a place in the EU, that the Annan Plan ‘belongs in the past’, and that full normalisation of relations with Greece presupposed a solution to the Cyprus issue. To this end, Greece continues to lend its support to the intercommunal dialogue under the auspices of the UN, to allow a solution to be found by ‘Cypriots themselves’, although many have argued that Greece should raise its profile and use its influence to greater effect inside and outside the EU to facilitate the normalisation of relations (and thus a more open EU frontier) between Cyprus and Turkey (Reunifying Cyprus, 2008; 23).

<sup>20</sup> Papadopoulos was active in PEKA, the political section of EOKA (a Greek Cypriot military resistance organisation that fought for self-determination and for union with Greece in the 1950s), and took part in the London Conference in 1959, voting against the signing of the London and Zurich agreements.

<sup>21</sup> They have also been critical of the policy of Mehmet Ali Talat and have included the Peace and Democracy Movement, Communal Liberation Party, Unified Cyprus Party, Turkish Cypriot Chamber of Commerce as well as a handful of trade unions, business groups and intellectuals (see Kaymak and Vural, 2006, 18).

<sup>22</sup> When Turkey did sign the additional Protocol on 29 July 2005 it attached an accompanying declaration stating that signing, ratification and implementation of the protocol did not amount ‘to any

---

form of recognition of the Republic of Cyprus'. The Protocol has not, at the time of writing, been implemented by the Turkish Grand National Assembly

<sup>23</sup> The Luxembourg (2005) and Finnish (2006) Presidencies

<sup>24</sup> The vulnerability of the AK Party within Turkish domestic politics was demonstrated in 2008 by the opening of a case by the Turkish Constitutional Court against the AK Party on the accusation of harbouring a hidden agenda to build an Islamist state.

<sup>25</sup> EDEK is the 'Movement of Social Democrats'

<sup>26</sup> Ironically, this has less to do with the EU's normative power, than with domestic dissatisfaction with the Papadopoulos regime.

<sup>27</sup> In the many meetings between Papadopoulos and Talat agreement was never reached despite the July 8, 2006 'UN agreement'.

<sup>28</sup> Where 16 measures were agreed for immediate implementation in the low-level issues of cultural heritage, environment, crisis management, crime and criminal matters.

<sup>29</sup> At the time of writing (April 2009) twenty four face-to-face meetings had been held between the two leaders.

<sup>30</sup> See Bailie and Azgin (2006) for an interesting account and analysis of how the Greek and Turkish Cypriot media projected a conflict-centred approach towards the opening of the Ledra Street opening in 2005-6.

<sup>31</sup> Although the list of products that can be traded remains unchanged. The prohibition on animal products, which excludes honey and fish at present, remains in place.

<sup>32</sup> This would not apply to cigarettes and alcohol.

## References

Agnew, J. (1999) 'Mapping political power beyond state boundaries: territory, identity, and movement in world politics', *Millennium*, 28 (3): 499-521

Albert, M, Setter, S. and Diez, D. (2008) 'Cycles of Intervention: The European Union and International Conflicts, paper presented at the Garnet Conference 'The EU in International Affairs', Brussels, 24-26 April 2008

---

Anastasakis, O. Bertrand, G. Nicolaidis, K. (2004), 'Getting to Yes: Embellishment of the Annan Plan for Cyprus', South East European Studies Programme, European Studies Centre, University of Oxford

Attalides, M (2004), 'The Political Process in Cyprus and the Day after the Referendum', *The Cyprus Review*, 16 (1): 137-46

Axford, B (2006) 'The Dialectic of Borders and Networks in Europe: Reviewing 'Topological Presuppositions'', *Comparative European Politics*, (4): 160-182

Bahcheli, T. (2004) 'Saying Yes to EU Accession: Explaining the Turkish Cypriot Referendum Outcome', *The Cyprus Review*, 16:2, Fall 2004: 55-66

Bahcheli, T. (2006) '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: 161-178

Barosso, J.M (2008), 'Turkey: Master of the Straits, Master of its Destiny', Speech to Turkish Grand National Assembly, 10 April 2008. Available online at: <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/08/188&format=DOC&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en> (accessed April 2008)

Bailie, M and Azgin, B. (2006) 'Building Peace on a Mediated Reality? Cyprus, Communication and the Resolution of Conflict, Paper presented at ECPR Workshop 'Cyprus at the Crossroads', Nicosia, Cyprus, 25-30 April 2006

Boedeltje, F. et al, (2007), 'The Fallacious Imperial Geopolitics of EU Enlargement: The Case of Cyprus', *TESG*, 98 (1): 130-35

Browning, C. and Joenniemi, P. (2008), 'Geostrategies of the European Neighbourhood Policy', *European Journal of International Relations*, 14 (3): 519-52

Browning, C. and Christou, G. (2008), 'The European Neighbourhood Policy and the Eastern Dimension: Borders, Security and Identity', Paper presented at the UACES

- 
- Conference, 'Exchanging Ideas on Europe 2008: Rethinking the European Union',  
Edinburgh, 1-3 September 2008, BASEES-UACES Research Network: The EU,  
Russia and the Shared Neighbourhood III
- Çelik, B, A. and Rumelili, B. (2006), 'Necessary but not Sufficient: The Role of the  
EU in Resolving Turkey's Kurdish Question and the Greek-Turkish Conflicts',  
*European Foreign Affairs Review*, 11: 203-222.
- Christou, G. (2006a), 'The European Union: What Role in The Cyprus Conflict?',  
*International Spectator*, XLI (2): 19-32.
- Christou, G. (2006b), 'The Internalisation of Border Conflicts, Policy Change and the  
Case of Cyprus', Paper presented at ECPR Workshop 'Cyprus at the Crossroads',  
Nicosia, Cyprus, 25-30 April 2006
- Christou, G. (2004), *The EU and Enlargement: The Case of Cyprus*, (Basingstoke:  
Palgrave Macmillan).
- Christou, G. (2002), 'Enlargement and the Case of Cyprus and Turkey: The Power of  
Attraction as a Solution to the Cyprus Issue', *Journal on EthnoPolitics and Minority  
Issues in Europe*, Issue 2/Summer 2002: 1-26
- 'Clerides says mistakes could jeopardise EU accession', PSEKA. Available at:  
<http://news.pseka.net/index.php?module=article&id=2985> (accessed March 2009)
- Constantinou, C. (2007) 'Aporias of Identity: Bicomunalism, Hybridity and the  
'Cyprus Problem', *Cooperation and Conflict*, 42 (3): 247-270
- Coppieters, B et al (2004), *Europeanization and Conflict Resolution: Case Studies  
from the European Periphery*, (Gent: Academia Press).
- Coufoudakis, V. (2004) 'Cyprus-the referendum and the aftermath', *The Cyprus  
Review*, 16 (2): 67-82

---

*Council Regulation (EC), No 389/2006 of 27 February 2006, establishing an instrument of financial support for encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot Community and amending Council Regulation (EC) No 2667/2000 on the European Agency for Reconstruction, Official Journal of the European Union L65/5 of 7 March 2006*

*Council Regulation (EC), No 866/2004 of 29 April 2004 on a regime under Article 2 of Protocol 10 to the act of accession, Official Journal of the European Union L 161 of 30 April 2004*

‘Cyprus signs EU Accession Treaty’, PSEKA. Available at:

<http://news.pseka.net/index.php?module=article&id=3749> (accessed March 2009)

*Cyprus Mail*, ‘Burning Bridges Without Winning Anything’, 18 June 2006

*Cyprus News*, Issue 234, 1-31 March 2009

*Cyprus News*, Issue 222, 1-19 February 2008.

*Cyprus Weekly*, 11-17 April 2008

*Cyprus After Accession: Getting Past No?* (2007), Workshop report and Responses, Oxford, May 2007, SEESOX, European Studies Centre, University of Oxford

*Cyprus ruling coalition wins poll*, 21 May 2006. Available at:

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/5001750.stm> (accessed October 2006).

*Cyprus: Reversing the Drift to Partition* (2008), International Crisis Group, Europe Report No190, 10 January 2008.

Delanty, G. (2006), ‘Borders in a Changing Europe: Dynamics of Openness and Closure’, *Comparative European Politics*, (4): 183-202

Demetriou, O. (2008), ‘Catalysis, catachresis: the EU's impact on the Cyprus Conflict’, in Diez, T., Stetter, S. and Albert, M. (2008), *The European Union and Border Conflicts*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 64-94.

---

Denktash wants Peace with Sovereignty, 21 July 2002. Available at:

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/not\\_in\\_website/syndication/monitoring/media\\_reports/2141566.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/not_in_website/syndication/monitoring/media_reports/2141566.stm) (accessed October 2008)

Diez, T. (2005), 'Constructing the self and changing others: reconsidering "normative power Europe"', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 33 (3): 613-36

Diez, T. (2006), 'The Paradoxes of Europe's Borders', *Comparative European Politics*, (4): 235-252

Diez, T. and Manners, I. (2007), 'Reflecting on Normative Power Europe', in Felix Berenskoetter and Michael J. Williams (eds.) *Power in World Politics* (London: Routledge): 173–88.

Diez, T. and Pace, M. (2007) 'Normative Power Europe and Conflict Transformation', Paper presented at UACES Conference, Portsmouth, 3-5 September 2007

Diez, T., Stetter, S. and Albert, M. (2006), 'The European Union and Border Conflicts: The Transformative Power of Integration', *International Organization*, 60 (3): 563-93

European Council (1999), Presidency Conclusions of the European Council, 10-11 December 1999.

Hill, C. (2001) 'The EU's Capacity for Conflict Prevention', *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 6: 315-33

Kaliber, A. (2005) 'Securing the Ground Through Securitized 'Foreign' Policy: The Cyprus Case', *Security Dialogue*, 36 (3): 319-337

Kaymak, E. and Vural, Y. (2006) 'Intra-communal dynamics: EU discourses among Turkish Cypriot political actors since the failed referenda'. Paper presented at the ECPR workshop 'Cyprus at a Crossroads', 25-30 April 2006, Intercollege, Cyprus

- 
- Kaymak, E., Tocci, N., and Lordos A. (2008) 'Building Confidence in Peace: Public Opinion and the Cyprus Peace Process, Centre for European Policy Studies, Available at: [http://www.ceps.be/Article.php?article\\_id=318](http://www.ceps.be/Article.php?article_id=318) (accessed November 2008)
- Ker-Lindsay, J. (2007), 'Reconceptualising the "European Solution" for Cyprus', in *Cyprus After Accession: Getting Past No?* (2007), Workshop Report and Responses, Oxford, May 2007, SEESOX, European Studies Centre, University of Oxford: 37-43
- Kramsch, T O. (2006) 'Transboundary Governmentality on Europe's postcolonial Edge: The Cypriot Green Line', *Comparative European Politics*, (4): 289-307.
- Lacher, H. and Kaymak, E. (2005), 'Transforming Identities: Beyond the Politics of Non-Settlement in North Cyprus', *Mediterranean Politics*, 10 (2): 147-166.
- Lichfield, J. (2008) 'Shock defeat opens door to united Cyprus', Monday 18 February, Independent.co.uk, (accessed February 2008)
- Lordos, A. (2005) 'Options for Peace: Mapping the possibilities for Comprehensive Settlement in Cyprus', <http://www.cypruspolls.org> (accessed July 2006)
- Lordos, A. (2006) 'Building Trust: An Inter-communal analysis of Public Opinion in Cyprus', June 2006, Nicosia.
- Manners, I. (2002), 'Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40 (2): 235-58.
- Manners, I. (2006), 'Normative Power Reconsidered: Beyond the Crossroads', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13 (2): 182-199.
- Newman, D. (2000), 'Boundaries, Territories and Postmodernity: Towards Shared or Separate Spaces?' in M.A. Pratt and J.A. Brown (eds), *Borderlands Under Stress*, (Kluwer Law International): 17-34
- Newman, D. (2004), 'Conflict at the Interface: the impact of Boundaries and Borders on Contemporary Ethno-National Conflict', in C.Flint (ed.) *The Impact of Boundaries*

---

*and Borders on Contemporary Ethno-National Conflict*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 321-345.

Newman, D. and Paasi, A. (1998) 'Fences and neighbours in the postmodern world: boundary narratives in political geography', *Progress in Human Geography*, 22 (2): 186-207

Pace, M. (2007), 'The Construction of EU Normative Power', Available at: <http://www.fscpo.unict.it/europa/michellepace2007.pdf> (accessed Oct 2007)

Parker, N. (ed.) *The Geopolitics of Europe's Identity: Centers, Boundaries and Margins* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), 2008.

Paasi, A. (1996), *Territory, Boundaries and Consciousness*, (New York: John Wiley)

Paasi, A. (2003) 'Boundaries in a Globalizing World', in K.Anderson, M.Domosh, S.Pile and N.Thrift (eds.) *Handbook of Cultural Geography*, (London: Sage): 462-472

*Proposal for Council Regulation COM (2004) on special conditions for trade with those areas of the Republic of Cyprus in which the Government of the Republic of Cyprus does not exercise effect control*, Commission of the European Communities.

*Reunifying Cyprus: The Best Chance Yet*, International Crisis Group, Europe Report No194, 23 June 2008

Richmond, O. (2005), 'Shared Sovereignty and the Politics of Peace: Reconciling Regional Pluralism with Local Securitisation in the Eastern Mediterranean', *Research Paper presented to ACGTA*, 2005.

Robins, P. (2007), 'Turkish Foreign Policy since 2002: between 'post-Islamist' government and Kemalist state', *International Affairs*, 83 (2): 289-305

Ruggie, J.G. (1993) 'Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations', *International Organization*, 47 (1): 139-74

---

Rumelili, B. (2004), 'The Microprocesses of Hegemonic Influence: The Case of EU and Greece/Turkey', Available at:

[http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p\\_mla\\_apa\\_research\\_citation/0/7/3/5/8/pages73587/p73587-6.php](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/7/3/5/8/pages73587/p73587-6.php) (accessed July 2008)

Rumelili, B. (2005), 'Civil Society and the Europeanization of Greek-Turkish Cooperation', *South European Society and Politics*, 10 (1): 43-54

Rumelili, B. (2007) 'Transforming Conflicts on EU Borders', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 45 (1): 105-26

Rumelili, B. (2008), 'Impacting the Greek-Turkish Conflicts: The EU and "What we make of it"', in Diez, T., Stetter, S. and Albert, M. (2008), *The European Union and Border Conflicts*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 94-129.

Senyigit, Y. (2006), 'Current Political Attitudes Amongst the Turkish Cypriot Leadership and Interim Aims', ACGTA seminar, LSE, London

Smith, M. (1996), 'The European Union and A Changing Europe: Establishing the Boundaries of Order', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34 (1): 5-28

Talat, Ali. M. (2005), 'Turkish Cypriots' Expectations From the European Union', *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, 4 (3), Fall 2005: 1-5

Tocci, N. (2004), *EU Accession Dynamics and Conflict Resolution: Catalysing Peace or Consolidating Partition in Cyprus?* (London: Ashgate)

Tocci, N. (2007), *The EU's Role in Conflict Resolution: Promoting Peace in the Backyard*, (London: Routledge)

*Turkey and Europe: The Way Ahead*, International Crisis Group, Europe Report No.184, 17 August 2007.

UNFICYP Survey (2007), 'The UN in Cyprus: An Inter-communal Survey of Public Opinion', United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus

---

van Houtum, H. (2005), 'The Geopolitics of Borders and Boundaries', *Geopolitics*, 10: 672-79

van Houtum, H and Scott, J (2005), 'Boundaries and Europeanisation of Space: The EU, Integration and Evolving Theoretical Perspectives on Borders', available at: [http://www.ctc.ee/exlinea/pub/EXLINEA\\_State\\_of\\_the\\_art\\_document\\_06.pdf](http://www.ctc.ee/exlinea/pub/EXLINEA_State_of_the_art_document_06.pdf),

December 2005 (accessed November 2008)

Walters, W. (2004), 'The Frontiers of the European Union: A Geostrategic Perspective', *Geopolitics*, 9 (3): 674-98

Walters, W. (2006), 'Rethinking Borders Beyond the State', *Comparative European Politics*, (4): 141-159