

HOW SUCCESSFUL WAS DIPLOMACY AS A MEANS OF CRISIS RESOLUTION TOOL IN THE CYPRUS DISPUTE

DİPLOMASİNİN KIBRIS ANLAŞMAZLIĞINDA KRİZİN ÇÖZÜMÜ İÇİN BİR ARAÇ OLARAK BAŞARIYLA KULLANILMASI

Melike METİNTAŞ¹

Mustafa Yahya METİNTAŞ²

Özet

Tanımı gereği diplomasi, ulusların birbirleriyle ilişkilerinde çatışmayı ve anlaşmazlıkları arabuluculuk, müzakere gibi yollarla çözülmesini ve şiddet yollarının önüne geçilmesini amaçlar. Aynı zamanda, diplomasi milletlere herhangi bir kayıp vermeden tarafların kazançlı çıkmasının önünü açar. Diplomasinin bu tanımı ve fonksiyonları üzerinden şu yaklaşıma varmak mümkündür, diplomasi aynı zamanda bir barış yapma aracıdır. Hatta bu diplomasinin en büyük gayelerinden biridir. Diğer bir taraftan, pratikte bu amacın yüzde yüz başarılı olduğunu söylemek mümkün değildir. Dünya siyasi tarihinde gerçekleşmiş çoğu olayda diplomasinin barış yapma sürecinde bazen yetersiz kaldığı görülmektedir. Bu bağlamda, Kıbrıs Meselesi diplomatik sürecin çok uzun ve zahmetli geçtiği bir olay olarak Dünya tarihine geçmiştir. Çoğu görüşmelerde diplomasinin temel amacı olan barış yapma süreci eksik kalmıştır. Bu çalışmada, diplomasinin barış yapma ve tarafları ikna etme konusunda başarısı, Kıbrıs Meselesi üzerinden değerlendirilecektir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Kıbrıs, Diplomasi, Kıbrıs Anlaşmazlığı, Johnson mektubu, Görüşme

Abstract

By definition, diplomacy aims to solve conflicts and disputes that nations experience between each other with the ways of negotiation or mediation and also aims to prevent violence between states. At the same time, diplomacy opens the way for the sides to profit without giving any loss. It is possible to come to the following approach through these definitions and functions about diplomacy; diplomacy is also a means of peace-making. It is even one of the biggest goals of this diplomacy. On the other hand, it is not possible to say that this goal is 100% successful in practice. It is seen that diplomacy is sometimes inadequate about peace-making in most cases that took place in world political history. In this context, the Cyprus issue has passed into the history of the world as a very long and laborious process of diplomacy. In most negotiations in Cyprus issue, peace-making which is the main aim of diplomacy, has been inadequate. In this study, the success of the diplomacy on making peace and persuading the parties will be evaluated on the Cyprus issue.

Key words: Cyprus, Diplomacy, Cyprus conflicts, Johnson letter, Negotiation

¹İstanbul Şehir University Faculty of Human Sciences, İstanbul, Turkey

²Yrd. Doç. Dr., Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Faculty of Art and Science, Eskisehir, Turkey

Introduction

As its definition, diplomacy is the controlling of international relations with the way of negotiation. In that sense, in most of the crises before consulting the way of war states and international organisations try many types of diplomatic ways to solve conflict without deaths and troubles.¹ Thus, diplomacy is the essential actor for both international organisations and states to keep their self-interest without any losses. In that sense, diplomacy also can be defined with the terms of peace. Due to the fact that the main purpose and mission of the diplomacy is to reach a solution with the peaceful way and make an acceptable agreement for all sides without war. In other words, peacekeeping is the most essential purpose for diplomacy. However, on the other hand, despite this peaceful approach, diplomacy is challenging to prevent wars and conflicts at very critical events. In so much that sometimes it does not solve. Because the interests of states and international institutions often do not overlap, they cannot give up their wishes and interests and are not satisfied with the agreement. In other words, most commonly all states try to be superior in the both agreement and conflict solving process.

This superiority is based on very old times in the intended history but modern diplomacy makes it clearer and it is easier and clearer to examine this conflict of power and disputes in the near future. Because all power balances have begun to change, the third-party actors have entered into force, the supremacy of international organizations has begun to be accepted and these organizations have begun to be consulted as decision-making mechanisms. Also, types of war, trade, politics, agreements and all the other issues related with diplomacy have been changed in the modern era and shaped diplomacy based on these changes. For all these reasons, the recent history can give many evidence to how diplomacy challenges with power's conflict and how it collapses and how war began even the existence of the peacekeeping way of the diplomacy such as World Wars, Cold War or regional problems etc. Starting from this point of view, The Cyprus issue is important in terms of measuring the success of diplomacy. Because, in the Cyprus Dispute, until a certain conclusion was reached, very different types of diplomacy were resorted, many actors were engaged, but still a military intervention was inevitable.

Method

In that sense, It is important to measure the degree of success of diplomacy and modern species in this case, which is based on the old histories of diplomatic history and it is

¹ P. Kerr, **Diplomacy in a Globalizing World**, 2013, pp. 1-2.

important to understand the diplomatic influences of the actors such as Turkey, Greece, America, England in the Cyprus' problems because Cyprus is a good example to see how third actors are included conflict as in the modern diplomacy and understand did they whether successful or not in the process of solving conflicts. Moreover, Cyprus Dispute is an essential tool to understand how bilateral, multilateral, third –party, negotiation and conflict types of diplomacy works. In this study, mainly the extent the types of diplomacy are successful in resolving the problem and ensuring peace will be examined through the Cyprus Dispute.

Under this topic, respectively, the history of Cyprus Dispute will be examined in the light of diplomatic movements and which types of diplomatic ways used will be explained, a success scale will be created based on these historical examination to understand and decide which type of diplomatic actor or way were more effective in this issue.

History of the Cyprus Dispute in Diplomatic Terms (1940- 1969)

The history of the Cyprus Dispute based on late Ottoman era. After the 307 years of Ottoman ruling, in 1878, this island became a British colonialism. Until, 1930's and 40's the public in Cyprus lived under the British authority. However, in 1940's especially Rum society did not want this British authority more in island. Firstly, some protest emerged, then these protest became a fights and conflicts. So, Cyprus became a problem for Britain with these events.

Due to major Turk population in the island Turkey also became a naturally actor in the conflicts. However, first emerge of conflicts, Turkey did not want to into the conflict completely. Firstly, Turkey followed policy of continue to Britain authority in the island and followed parallel diplomacy with Britain.² In 1948, Greek Cypriots rejected Britain's autonomy plan and they have expressed their policies to join Greece which is called *Enosis*. However, Cypriot Turks was strongly against that idea and became organism and tried to pull Turkey their side but still Turkey remain same policies to continue Britain rule on island. Due to fact that Turkey did not want to face with diplomatically crises with the Western states in that time. In 1954, the intense diplomatic movements begun for Cyprus Dispute because in that time Greece carried the Cyprus issue to the United Nations under the name of societies' self-determination.

From that part it is seems that multilateral types of diplomacy emerged but there is also bilateral type of diplomacy emerged with the cooperative act between Turkey and

² A. Balcı, *Türkiye Dış Politikası: İlkeler- Aktörler, Uygulamalar*, 2013, s. 102

Britain. In other words, Turkey and Britain decided to work together in the Cyprus Dispute. In that sense, in the meeting of United Nations, Britain and Turkey express their opposite feelings to Greek Enosis policy with reasons of the density of the Turkish population on the island and its geographical proximity to Turkey.

With this bilateral diplomatic cooperation, Greece became unsuccessful in the United Nations. However, after these diplomatic failure, Greece has decided to launch armed resistance in the island against the British forces. Actually, this is the first evidence to show how diplomacy remain ineffective when it tried to provide peacekeeping and how self – interest became dominant on diplomacy. Because, Greece did not get success with their policies exactly in the diplomatic area, also diplomacy did not provide enough opportunities to Greece then Greece consulted to gun and fight. On the increase of tensions in the island, England invited Turkey and Greece to London to solve the problem in 1955. In that time, Adnan Menderes explained the Turkey’s main policy on the island. According to him, the clear solution for the Cyprus is to remain in Britain control but if Britain left the control, the island should give to Turkey’s control.³ However, this conference also did not put the final point to Cyprus Dispute, even the attack and fight in the island by Rums to Britain forces increased. About diplomatic point of view, England was a third – part actor for Greece and Turkey to arrive at a decision. However, the third – party actor could not find a proper solution for both side due to fact that the third – party actor also follow their own self- interest in this issue as well. Rum’s attacks on the island not only to British forces but also began to Turkish people.

In that sense, Turkish society established their self –defence cooperation which is called *Türk Mukamevet Teşkilatı*. These events have put the UK's presence in danger and Turkey’s continuity policies collapsed. In 1956, Cyprus divided into the two part based on demographic distribution. In that sense, Adnan Menderes and his government started to bilateral diplomatic contacts with Greece. Adnan Menderes present to their policies about Divide Island two part which is called *Taksim Tezi* to Greece. However, this time Britain was involved and explained that they were rejecting this policy. England wanted to apply their own policy which is making independed Cyprus Republic to protect their own bases. In the term of diplomacy, normally third – actor is just find a way to solve conflict between two main actors. However, England as a third-actor also broke to peacekeeping due to their own

³ İ, Uzgel, *Ulusal Çıkar ve Dış Politika: Türk Dış Politikasının Belirlenmesinde Ulusal Çıkarların Rolü, 1983 – 1991*, 2004, s. 317.

self – interest and the basic diplomacy was wrong again. After the all ineffective diplomatic contacts, United States took into the action. With this participation Greek government waive with their Enosis policy, also Turkey declared to waive their *Taksim Tezi* policy. Then, for finding new solution ways Greek and Turkish government went to London to join two essential congress with the invitation of British government. In that sense, multilateral types of diplomacy come again to the issue. Respectively, these congress were Zurich and London. After the detailed meetings, Turkey and Greece have agreed with Britain's support that the island be an independent Republic of Cyprus. Also, both side have signed a guarantor agreement and have ensured that the island is protected. In that sense, with the multilateral cooperation protection of the island's security, regime and constitutional order became responsibility of England, Turkey and Greece.

The effective part of the diplomacy here, each part saw with the previous event how they were clash each other because of their own self – interest. With this experiences, they also agree on if one of the guarantor states does not want to act jointly, the other guarantor state has the right to act. However, although it could be regarded as an effective diplomacy, this article could only succeed in a diplomatic effect in 1973 that opened the way for Turkey's intervention. In other words, even in effective diplomatic agreement and cooperation, opening the way for war sometimes inevitable. In 1960, Cyprus declared its own independency. However, after the all conflicts, Rums and Turks could not live in peace in a long time. Conflicts continue between both society and even many people killed each other.

During these events, sometime Greece government again talked about Enosis and Turkey again rejected it. In that sense, Cyprus issue did not remain a local conflict, it became an intercommunal conflict between Turkey and Greece.⁴ In that sense, based of guarantor agreement, the Turkish military units in Cyprus have begun to intervene to protect the Turkish people. Almost, 25.000 Turkish people in the island moved to safe zone close to Nicosia. After this migration in the island, demographical intense changed and the *green line* occurred which is dividing the island into two region based on demographically settlements. A London conference was convened again on January 15, 1964 for the resolution of your tension. In this conference Turkish presenter was Rauf Denktaş said that the common order which was established in 1959 did not process successfully and two new federal states should establish in the island. However, Greek and Greek Cypriots insisted on changing the constitution and

⁴ Y., Çoşkun, *Kıbrıs Sorunu Üzerindeki Türk – Yunan Diyalogunun Başarısızlığı (1966-67) ve İngiliz Politikası*, 2014, s. 48.

diplomatic negotiations resulted in failure. This time on 15 February, 1964 the UK appealed to the United Nations for a solution to problem. United Nations decided to send United Nation Peace troops to the Cyprus to provide peace in there. However, United Nation troops were inadequate. Therefore, in one year all multilateral, bilateral and third-party types of diplomatic contacts whether resulted with war or failure. After this event, National Grand Assembly of Turkey made a decision to send troops to Cyprus in 16 March, 1964 and National Security Council of Turkey decide to send military forces to Cyprus in 2 June, 1964. However, in that time very different kind of diplomatic reaction came into the action. In June 5, United State President Lyndon B. Johnson sent a letter which was involving threatening expressions to İsmet İnönü. In the letter, Johnson used statements that violate Turkey's rights in NATO and deprived of the privileges of NATO. According to him, if Turkey attack to Cyprus then if the USSR is involved in a crime, NATO will not be able to act and did not protect to Turkey.^{5,6} From a diplomatic point of view, this letter did not include any negotiation, mediation or agreement. Literally, this letter carried the Ultimatum feature and a good example for compelling diplomacy.

The Johnson letter changed all the obstacles to the Cyprus dispute. After this letter, despite the determined attitude, Turkey has come to the point of abandoning the intervention in Cyprus altogether. The weighted authority on resolving the problem has passed to the United States. The council, commissioned by the President of the United States, led the following policy in the presidency of Dan Acheson: instead to leaving a region in the northern part of Cyprus and the Meis Islands in the Aegean to Turkey, authority of Cyprus will give to Greece. However, this policy also failed due to Rum's new wishes on island. The Rums no longer wanted the autonomy of the island and the administration to leave it to them. Because of the resumption of the conflicts, the American council had to return before the negotiations began. So, in the crises situation diplomatic actors quickly changed their policies and interests and it prevents the diplomacy from progressing in a certain way. In 6 August, 1964 Rums attacked to *Erenköy* port. Turkey sent troops to protect their military forces in Cyprus. Firstly, air forces attacked to Rums and 33 Rums died with bombarding. After these event, Greece Jets started to fly on Nicosia and the tension has reached the highest level. The Cyprus Dispute moved to the United Nations agenda again. After the pressure of United States and USSR, Turkey compliance to ceasefire. In that sense, after all supporting Greece authority on

⁵ A. Balci, s. 117

⁶ In that time, Turkey had strong threat from USSR. Turkish government has no available power and sources to prevent these threat. In that sense, Turkey had to follow ceasefire policy based on Johnson Letter.

the island changed with Turkey's this behavior. USSR and United States became more close to Turkey.

So, in diplomatic sense, Turkey raised its own chance in the multilateral cooperation to solve crises. After the United Nation's ceasefire decision, in 1965 Turkey and Greece began to first bilateral meetings. These meetings were effective to provide peacekeeping in the Cyprus. Both side, renounced from their harsh self – interest and tried to reach complete solution. However, Rum side in the Cyprus did not happy with these bilateral cooperation and the Rum troops under the command of Grivas attacked the Turkish neighbourhood and killed 28 people. Turkey has not been able to intervene due to lack of resources and effects of Johnson letter. Johnson Letter should analyse more. Because, this letter has long been the beginning of a compelling diplomacy between Turkey and the United States.⁷ Turkey began to notice NATO did not provide a peace for security problems. From a diplomatic point of view, Turkey and the United States have had a compelling effect for a long time.

These effects are economic, military and public. Turkey has begun to refuse to allow its bases to be used for American purposes outside of NATO, although it has been blinded by that time. Moreover, in Turkey, the public has started to be seriously involved in these bilateral conflicts. NATO membership has begun to be questioned by the public, and the Turkish Workers' Party has made serious criticism. By contrast, America has cut its economic aid by offering justification for the war in Vietnam. In addition, Turkey's NATO presence has depreciated. In 1968, Turkish Foreign Minister Ihsan Sabri Caglayangil gave a note to the US that bilateral treaties had put Turkey under pressure and demanded that these agreements be simplified.

After the all collapse on bilateral cooperation between Turkey and United states, in 3 July, 1969 Joint Defence Cooperation Agreement signed between two sides. This new agreement formed with the all previously signed agreements was brought together and simplified. With these diplomatic contacts, Turkey gain more rights on their own bases which United States military forces used.

⁷ F. Aksu, *Türk Dış Politikasında Zorlayıcı Diplomasi*, 2008, s. 81.

Cyprus Peace Operation (1974)

In 1967, Coup D'état emerged in Greece and *Colonel Juntas* capture the ruling. This new administration was aiming for a success that would improve Greece instead of the existing order in Cyprus. On the other hand, Bulent Ecevit, which was elected in Turkey by winning elections, his primary goal was an independent foreign policy. In this context, the issue of coup in Greece and Cyprus was an important vehicle for achieving this goal.

Bulent Ecevit and his government, as seen the coup d'état as a violation of the island and the agreement and interfered with the island with their rights of guarantor. In addition to this, Turkey has been supported by United States of America and United Nations due to the situation of Greece under the coup and problems in Cyprus again. At the beginning of the article, diplomacy was described as a way of solving problems with negotiation. However, as seen in the Cyprus Operation, a multilateral organization can also provide a military intervention by supporting diplomatic concerns. However, in the first operation, Turkey was dominated by only seventeen percent of the island's due to lack of military support and for some domestic problems. After the end of this intervention, Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom came together in Geneva to assess the situation. At the end of the talks, Turkey has succeeded in adding to the signing of the Geneva Declaration that Turkey has a legitimate right for operation to Cyprus. This diplomatic interview demonstrates that in multilateral negotiations which are making with third-party actors and international actors, moving in the interests of the common interests in order to its own interests brings success in the field of diplomacy. On the other hand, Turkey began to discuss and prepare for the second military intervention after the first Geneva talks, due to the Greek Cypriot troops attacking Turkish neighbourhoods during the Geneva negotiations. However, the conclusion failed because the conclusion was not reached and Turkey started preparations for intervention. Unlike the first round of negotiations in Geneva, it seems that the same path of diplomatic negotiations went unsuccessfully here. But while these debates were underway, the second Geneva conference on the request of the United Nations and the United Kingdom was convened to prevent Turkey's interference.

To understand the difference, the second Geneva meeting was not made after a military intervention but made before a military intervention. However, about bilateral diplomatic side of this second military intervention, it was a period when relations between

Ankara and Washington became the tensest. In the second intervention, the United States has shown the strongest reaction and has decided to put an arms embargo on Turkey.⁸ And all other compulsive diplomatic mobility instead of negotiator started after the guns embargo. The United States faced an unexpected reaction from Turkey. Turkey's military bases used by the United States and NATO have completely shut down the use. The United States provided 70 percent of the intelligence it received from the Soviets at the Incirlik base.⁹ After this restriction, however, serious disruptions began to emerge in America's intelligence reports.¹⁰ Upon the emergence of these disruptions, the United States first relieved the arms embargo and removed it altogether by diplomatic negotiations. As it is understood from this, it is insufficient to define diplomacy by negotiation only. In Diplomacy; events, political and military interventions are the main determinants of negotiation.

Result

As mentioned above, the Cyprus Dispute is a complex and difficult issue to solve. Apart from Turkey and Greece, it has become a number of third actors. Both bilateral and multilateral interviews were conducted. Politics have changed a lot of times. Both negotiation and military intervention were applied. While some have achieved a clear result, some have failed. But it is important to clearly identify which actors and events were actually successful in diplomatic developments. And more importantly, what types of diplomacy has succeeded in solving this problem. Through actual events, it is clear that only a negotiated diplomacy is not successful on the Cyprus issue. Prior to this, there were compelling diplomatic movements. The ultimatum was given and mutually damaging decisions were taken. Also, the negotiator diplomacy could not prevent military intervention and conflict exactly. However, in whole issue, Turkey can accept as a most successful diplomatic actor because gave strong attention and labour to solve conflict with the both negotiate and militaristic ways. Unlike Turkey, Greece did not follow the same successful policy and diplomatic approach in the Cyprus Dispute. As a result of all this, it seems that only the example of the Cyprus Dispute, the negotiator's diplomacy have not been enough in the recent past. Because, actors do not prefer to give up their own interests, and in this context they do not avoid to use compulsory diplomacy or military intervention.

⁸ S. T. Laçiner, "Turkish Foreign Policy (1971-1980): Ideologies vs. Realities" *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Politika*, 2010, s. 79-80.

⁹ This information was given by retired Turkish ambassador Uluç Özülker in the Bahçeşehir University's *Diplomat School* Conferences.

¹⁰ A Balcı, pp. 145.

Mostly, negotiator diplomacy unlike its own purpose, it comes after these politics. In this context, its degree of success falls.

REFERENCES

- A. Balcı, **Türkiye Dış Politikası: İlkeler, Aktörler, Uygulamalar**. İstanbul: Etkileşim Yayınları.
- F. Aksu, **Türk Dış Politikasında Zorlayıcı Diplomasi**, İstanbul, 2008, Bağlam Yayıncılık.
- İ. Uzgel, **Ulusal Çıkar ve Dış Poitika: Türk Dış Politikasının Belirlenmesinde Ulusal Çıkarların Rolü, 1983 – 1991**, Ankara, 2004, İmge Kitap Evi.
- P. Kerr, & G. Wiseman, **Diplomacy in a Globalising World: Theories and Practises**, New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Y. Çoşkun, “Kıbrıs Sorunu Üzerindeki Türk – Yunan Diyaloğunun Başarısızlığı (1966-67) ve İngiliz Politikası”, **Cankiri Karatekin University Press**, 2014.
- S. T. Laçiner, “Turkish Foreign Policy (1971-1980): İdeologies vs. Realites” **Uluslararası Hukuk ve Politika**, 2010, 6(21), 61.