

From Colonialism to Neo-colonialism: The British Politics of Nationalist Violence in Cyprus

Abigail Marie Jordan

Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
In
Political Science

Yannis A. Stivachtis, Chair
Bikrum S. Gill
Desiree Poets

23 April 2025
Blacksburg, VA

Keywords: Cyprus, British Colonialism, Decolonization, Neo-colonialism, Postcolonial Studies,
Nationalism

From Colonialism to Neo-colonialism: The British Politics of Nationalist Violence in Cyprus

Abigail Marie Jordan

ACADEMIC ABSTRACT

One of the most complex and perilous geopolitical conflicts in the contemporary world is the Cyprus Problem. This conflict is directly tied to the impact of former colonial powers on newly independent postcolonial states. This thesis analyzes the relationship between nationalist violence, British colonial and neo-colonial policies, and Cyprus' geostrategic location within the imperialist world system. By contextualizing the Cyprus Conflict into the theories of decolonization and neo-colonialism, this research examines how Cyprus' geostrategic location motivated colonial powers to gain and maintain influence within this region. This case study of the Cyprus Conflict utilizes the process-tracing of archives, primary documents, and scholarly articles to emphasize the British colonial power as the catalyst and driver for the nationalist violence in Cyprus.

From Colonialism to Neo-colonialism: The British Politics of Nationalist Violence in Cyprus

Abigail Marie Jordan

GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

This thesis follows a single case study of British neo-colonialism in Cyprus. The island of Cyprus is found in the Mediterranean Sea, surrounded by Europe, Asia, and Africa. Cyprus has experienced a long history of conquest and colonization, most notably by the Ottoman Empire and then Great Britain, due to its geostrategic location of the island in relation to Middle Eastern affairs. During British colonial rule in Cyprus, the ethnic divisions between Greek and Turkish Cypriots became embedded in every facet of Cypriot life and governance. A violent ethnic conflict occurred in 1974 that created a fractured Cyprus population, and there have been no successful strides in finding a solution to the conflict. This case study of the Cyprus Conflict utilizes the process-tracing of archives and other primary sources, as well as scholarly articles, to illustrate that the relationship between the nationalist violence in Cyprus and Cyprus' geostrategic location is dependent on British neo-colonialism in Cyprus. By using the theories of decolonization and neo-colonialism, this thesis approaches the rise in nationalism in Cyprus as an anti-colonial movement that failed to dismantle all ties to Great Britain because the British government never intended to lose influence and power over Cyprus, even when granting the island independence in 1960. The contributions of this study reframe how the Cyprus Problem is viewed and theorized in international politics by shifting the narrative of nationalist violence to focus on British motivations to keep control over the island of Cyprus due to its geostrategic location in the Mediterranean Sea.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis chair, Dr. Yannis Stivachtis for his steadfast support and guidance throughout this entire process. To Kelsey Smith, Audrey Osei-

Bonsu, and Sarah Harvey, I would like to give special thanks for your moral support and encouragement. I am forever grateful for how you all stood by my side during all phases of this project. I would also like to acknowledge my committee members, professors, Bikrum Gill and Desiree Poets, for their invaluable contributions and collaboration. Last but not least, I would like to recognize my family, especially my parents, for cultivating my curiosity and my passion for history and politics, as well as allowing me the opportunity to visit Cyprus. Without this support, this research would not have been possible.

ABBREVIATIONS

CTP: Cyprus is Turkish Party

UNFICYP: United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus

JTF: Joint Truce Force

TRNC: Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

FCO: Foreign & Commonwealth Office

FCDO: Foreign, Commonwealth, and Development Office

EOKA: The ‘National Organization of Cypriot Fighters’ (English Translation)

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

UN: United Nations

TIMELINE

- 1571 Ottoman Empire took control over Cyprus
- 1878 British Empire establishes Cyprus as a colony
- 1931 Greek Cypriots rioted in favor of *enosis*
- 1955 Great Britain established a roadmap for a Cypriot constitution
- 1959 The Zurich-London Accords of 1959-1960
- 1960 Cyprus gained independence from Great Britain, and a constitution was established
- 1963 Turkish protests and nationalist altercation
- 1964 Establishment of UNFICYP; Turkish air bombardments
- 1967 Greek Cypriot Nationalists breached UN protocol
- 1970 Failed assassination attempt of Cypriot President Makarios III
- 1974 Turkish military invasion of Northern Cyprus
- 1977 First UN resolution talks for reunification in Cyprus
- 1990 Republic of Cyprus submitted an accession application to the EU
- 2004 Proposal of the Annan Plan 5 for Cyprus Reunification; Republic of Cyprus joined the EU
- 2023 Great Britain sent 500 troops to Cyprus to supply weapons for Israel
- 2024 British Parliament visited the Cyprus base
- 2025 Reignited Resolution talks in Geneva

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction & Methodology	1
1.1 Introduction to the Cyprus Problem	1
1.2. Methodology.....	5
1.3. Organizational Framework	9
Chapter 2: Theoretical Perspectives	13
2.1. Decolonization.....	13
2.2. Neo-colonialism	15
Chapter 3: Comparing the Ottoman System and British Colonialism	22
3.1. The Ottoman Conquest in Cyprus	23
3.2. Class Structure and Multiethnic Empire.....	24
3.3. Features of British Colonialism.....	26
3.4. Colonial Institutions and British Policies	29
3.5. The Onset of Sovereignty	31
Chapter 4: Nationalism in Cyprus.....	36
4.1. The Intersection of Decolonization and the Nationalist Rise.....	36
4.2. Rise of EOKA A and the Call for Enosis	40
4.3. Revitalization of Enosis in EOKA B.....	42
4.4. Turkish Cypriot Nationalism	43
4.5. Great Britain's Weaponization of Enosis.....	46
Chapter 5: Independence and the Struggle of a Postcolonial State.....	51
5.1. Zurich-London Accords (1959-1960)	51
5.2. The 1960 Constitution for the Republic of Cyprus	53
5.3. President Makarios and the Domestic Ethnic Conflict in 1963	55
5.4. 1964 Crises	58
5.5. 1967 Crisis and Reactions from Turkish Cypriot Enclaves	60
Chapter 6: Investigating the Cyprus Problem.....	62
6.1. The Turkish Military Invasion of 1974	62
6.2. Unmasking the Role of the British Government in 1974	65
Chapter 7: As a Conclusion	69
7.1. Annan Plan 5	71
7.2. Current State of Affairs in Cyprus.....	74
7.3. Great Britain as the Permanent Guarantor Power	76
Primary Sources	81
Secondary Sources.....	83

Chapter 1: Introduction & Methodology

“Decolonization, we know, is an historical process: In other words, it can only be understood, it can only find its significance and become self coherent insofar as we can discern the history-making movement which gives it form and substance.”¹

-Frantz Fanon 1961

1.1 Introduction to the Cyprus Problem

Before the British rule in Cyprus, the well-known divisions between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots preferred the terms Orthodox and Muslim as identifiers instead of being systematically divided by their ‘Motherland.’² Predating the colonization of the British Empire, the general understanding of this society focused on their similarities rather than their differences. In the years under British colonial rule and as a postcolonial state, Cypriot citizens have become so intensely and systematically divided on their national identity that nationalist groups became integral to their domestic politics. What happened between the beginning of British colonial rule on the island of Cyprus in the late nineteenth century and the ethnic conflict in 1974 that led to the current partition on the island?

Cyprus has a long history of colonization and conflict, most notably in the 200 years under the Ottoman Empire system and then, subsequently, British colonial rule from 1878 to 1960. This study emphasizes the importance of Cyprus’ geographical location within the international system and how it motivated colonial powers to gain and maintain influence within this region. Cyprus is an island in the Mediterranean Sea, which borders Africa, Asia, and Europe. The geostrategic location of Cyprus can be described as the motivation for the Ottoman

¹ Frantz Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth* (R. Philcox, Trans.). Grove Press, 2004.

² Adamantia Pollis, “Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus.” In *Comparative Politics* 5, no. 4 (1973): 575–99.

and British Empires to forcefully take over the island. These motivations revolve around power and, more specifically, political and military power. This differs from previous studies that argue empires engaged in territorial expansion solely to plunder and loot the resources of a foreign land. In the case of Cyprus, the focus of the motivations to obtain influence on the island aligned with its geospatial positioning that connects Africa, Europe, and Asia. Cyprus, as a satellite for the Ottoman Empire and then as a colony for Great Britain, allowed for new ways to trade, exert influence across continents, and install military bases. These reasons for colonization were present during the British colonization and neo-colonization of Cyprus. In the British neo-colonial exhibition in Cyprus, the geostrategic location was paramount in conducting covert operations to achieve its political goals in the region while not having to face the ramifications of public opinion from the British citizens or other Western European states.

British colonial efforts differed from other suppression strategies seen by the French, the other prevalent modern colonial powers, and even the Ottoman Empire in Cyprus. Adamantia Pollis offers an interesting perspective on the implications of British colonial rule compared to other versions of colonialism. Pollis noted that the French Empire utilized its sense of superiority to enforce the assimilation of the colonized bodies into their way of life, and the Ottoman Empire, while not a colonial power, accentuated religious ties but allowed their subjects to retain autonomy over their own affairs, but British colonialism tended to bolster ethnic cleavages within colonies and used it to their advantage.³ This shows the different approaches to modern colonialism as seen between the French and British Empires; the French used colonization as a civilizing process, while the British used it to expand their influence. Also, this assertion rejects the assumption that the Ottoman Empire and the British Empire adopted the same policies and

³ Pollis, "Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus," 1973.

tactics as the consecutive ruling empires in Cyprus. Regarding the theory of neo-colonialism, this thesis argues that different colonial powers implement different tactics for colonialism and neo-colonialism. The British politics in Cyprus during the neo-colonial era serves as the case study for this research project.

After 82 years as a British colony, Cyprus gained independence in 1960 during what was known as the Age of Decolonization, a pivotal point in history that alludes to the era when colonies gained independence from their colonizers in the 'West.' The island of Cyprus is divided between Turkish and Greek Cypriots. The Greek Cypriots made up more than two-thirds of the island's population with Turkish Cypriots representing the other one-third. The long-awaited transition to a postcolonial state came with irreparable repercussions for the Cypriot people. In 1974, within 15 years as a newly formed modern independent state, Cyprus experienced a violent nationalist conflict that fractured the island. The rising ethnic tensions between the Turkish and Greek Cypriots led to the Turkish military invasion of Northern Cyprus. This invasion resulted in the division of Cyprus by the installation of a United Nations (UN) Buffer Zone to separate the Greek and Turkish Cypriots. The buffer zone is still active today, and the governments involved have not yet been able to solve the ongoing division. This thesis set out to uncover the rise of these nationalist groups in Cyprus that exemplified the dangers of perpetuated colonial ideals in the contemporary world defined by imperialist ideologies and globalization practices.

The Cyprus Problem raises multiple questions critiquing the success and the legacy of the British colonial project. How did one of the most intense geopolitical conflicts in the late 20th century create an unstable and discordant nation-state with only the presence of democratic nations and Western intervention? Do the lingering ties to colonialism through Westernization

and modernization diminish the autonomy of postcolonial states? How can we solve postcolonial violence that does not replicate colonial power dynamics? These questions seemingly connect this rise in nationalism to colonialism and its perpetuated Western ideals in the imperialist-centered international system. With that said, the main question proposed is, *what is the relationship between Cyprus' nationalist violence and its geostrategic location within the imperialist world system?*

This question is significant to contemporary studies in international relations and politics because there is a pattern of postcolonial states inspiring extreme nationalist groups that incited human rights violations. Also, the case of Cyprus has been overlooked in discourse on British colonial and neo-colonial efforts, and this thesis brings Cyprus to the forefront. This study aims to expose why and how a former colonial power maintained control in its former colony by examining the Cyprus Problem, an ongoing conflict rooted in the colonial struggle. Not only did British colonialism contribute to rising nationalist tensions within postcolonial states, but also, the perpetuation of colonial ideals in the form of neo-colonialism during the transition to independence impacted the outcome of nationalist violence. This case study highlighted the dangers of using imperialist efforts and colonial tactics as adequate solutions to solve postcolonial conflicts. This research shows how British colonial platforms influenced the rise of nationalism in postcolonial states in an imperialist world system. This question pairs with an international order that is dictated by the former imperialist powers and their agendas to maintain influence in the Eastern hemisphere and former colonies. Also, the imperialist world system prioritizes the goals of the former imperialist powers while diminishing the autonomy and self-determination of non-Western and former colonial populations. These types of examples regarding nationalist violence in postcolonial states were seen across three continents within the

British colonial Empire, featuring the cases of India, Somalia, and Cyprus. This historical analysis of Cyprus under Ottoman and British rule delineates the linkage of events during Cyprus' transition to a postcolonial state. This thesis affirms the notion that Great Britain's policies and actions were intended to maintain its power and influence in the postcolonial world.

This study also has two key objectives. First, identifying how British neo-colonialism operates in Cyprus. Other theorists approach this topic of neo-colonialism by ascertaining a way to holistically apply a certain framework to all former colonial powers seeking to gain control over independent states. This thesis diverges from this line of thinking by arguing that different colonial and neo-colonial powers conduct these exhibitions differently depending on the relationship to the independent state, and in this case, the relationship between a former colonial power and its former colony. The second objective is to illustrate that there is a correlation between British motivations to maintain authority in Cyprus, the geostrategic location of the island in the Mediterranean Sea, and the rise in nationalist violence on the island. This thesis will argue that the outlined relationship between these motivations and the nationalist violence in Cyprus is connected to British neo-colonialism.

1.2. Methodology

Utilizing the Cyprus Problem as a case study for this research draws attention to the complexities of colonial powers, ethnic tension, and nationalist violence that are present in postcolonial states. Case studies are characterized as “an instance of something else, of a theoretically defined class of events.”⁴ This case is an ongoing conflict in which the international system has failed to provide practical solutions. The Cyprus Problem is a

⁴ Jack S. Levy, “Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logics of Inference.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25, no. 1 (February 2008): 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07388940701860318>, p. 2.

geopolitical situation that directly results from nationalism and the British colonial project. This thesis notes the years from 1955 to 1974 as the transitional period to a nation-state, beginning five years prior to independence from England to the Turkish military invasion of 1974. 1955 proves to be an important year in this case study because it highlights when the negotiations began for an independent Republic of Cyprus. Thus, the years of 1955 to 1974 work to understand the transition of Cyprus to an independent state, and how it struggled to become sovereign. This case study allows this research to explore how British colonialism has led to the rise of nationalism in the postcolonial state of Cyprus.

The qualitative data sources used in this study are primary documents, in the form of archives, and secondary sources. The University of Louisville defines primary documents as “an original object or document,” such as “historical and legal documents, eyewitness accounts, art objects, and statistical data.”⁵ These primary documents help formulate the historical happenings of the studied transitional period, 1955 to 1974. Archival research is vital to this study because it contains unpublished accounts of the events analyzed in this field of research. This provides a new perspective on the Cyprus Problem that can better characterize the effect of neo-colonialism on nationalist tensions in modern postcolonial states. Even though the archival reports may be biased, understanding the potential source and nature of the biases can be significant to this case study. Books and articles providing historical narratives of the Cyprus Problem can present differing interpretations of these events that could broaden the overall understanding of the situation in Cyprus as a whole.

⁵ University of Louisville (n.d.). *Primary sources: Definitions & examples*. University Libraries: William F. Ekstrom Library. <https://library.louisville.edu/ekstrom/primary-sources/definition>

The main observational techniques used in this study are process tracing and counterfactuals. The research is based on historical events and proceedings that can contribute to the greater narrative of neo-colonization and nationalism in postcolonial nation-states. Therefore, linking the crucial events that define the Cypriot transition to a state can allow for causal inferences about the role of the British colonial power.

The technique of counterfactuals or potential outcomes either backs up or discredits the hypothesis. The counterfactual is a constructed modification to the study that interprets whether the predicted outcome would still occur even without the presence of the independent variable. The counterfactuals assume the alternate reality, in which there were no guarantor powers, more Cypriot involvement in the foundational structure for their postcolonial state, and no instigating conflict between ethnic groups through British ‘divide and rule’ policies. Therefore, this technique legitimizes or delegitimizes the inferences drawn from the process tracing. These techniques align with the case study and are vital in ascertaining how the data defends or refutes this argument.

This study has four main limitations, mainly regarding the data sources. The first is the language of the sources. Some sources could be in Greek, Farsi, or Turkish, which would need to be translated. This limitation was mostly circumvented by the innovative applications that can translate sites into English. With that said, there could have been mistranslations. A second constraint is that there are more documented sources about Greek Cypriots than Turkish Cypriots, which could skew the results since these sources are mainly focused on one perspective. Another drawback of the relevant literature is a lack of scholarly sources for the on-the-ground points of view or accounts told by people who actually experienced these historical events. The primary sources and archives offer these viewpoints. Lastly, there is a lack of access

to primary sources that feature British neo-colonial efforts after the nationalist conflict in 1974. With that said, the theories of neo-colonialism, the secondary sources from this era, and the patterns of inaction from the British government work to correct this limitation.

1955 to 1974 are the critical years of Cyprus' transitional period to an independent state. This timeline showcases how British colonialism interacted with new postcolonial states, the rise in nationalist groups in Cyprus, and the lead-up to the crisis in 1974. Thus, this period highlights the legacy of colonialism and neo-colonialism that gave rise to rivaling national identities, leading to a discordant postcolonial state. At the heart of the matter, decolonization is a radical process that strives to eradicate all ties to colonialism. The legacy and lingering ties to colonialism were still prevalent during the Age of Decolonization. These postcolonial states are the newly emerged sovereign countries during or after the Age of Decolonization that aim to cultivate a new collective national identity and government that adheres to the world order run by the 'West.' The problem arises when conflicting national identities and intervening Western powers have different outlooks for the future of the postcolonial states. As seen in Cyprus, the transition to a postcolonial state featured the rise of two opposing nationalist groups that led to violent repercussions. The rise of nationalism in postcolonial states has dominated the discourse on decolonization and its effects on current international affairs.

This thesis incorporates two theoretical approaches to the Cyprus Problem: Frantz Fanon's decolonization theory and the theory of neo-colonialism. Frantz Fanon's theory of decolonization is leveraged in the discussion of rising nationalist tensions in Cyprus. In this thesis, Fanon's theoretical approach to decolonization showcases how the rise of nationalist groups stems from the decolonization period of the British Empire as anti-colonial movements to dismantle ties to the colonizer. Furthermore, the theory of decolonization covers the motivations

for anti-colonial groups and the rise of nationalist ideologies. The theory of neo-colonialism helps to explain the failure in the complete dismantling from the former colonial power and the shortcomings of the application of the decolonization theory to the case of Cyprus. As outlined in the decolonization theory, violent decolonization breaks off all ties to the colonial power. This did not happen in Cyprus, and the neo-colonialism theory works to identify why and how the British maintained control in the postcolonial state. The theory of neo-colonialism is a centerpiece of this thesis because the neo-colonial theoretical approach unmask the British motivations for their involvement in Cyprus' transitional period to a state. This study operationalizes neo-colonialism within the context of former colonizers continuing their authority over their former colonies that are now recognized as sovereign independent states in the international system through political and military power. By contextualizing the Cyprus Conflict into the theories of Frantz Fanon's decolonization and neo-colonialism, this research examines how Cyprus' geostrategic location motivated colonial powers to gain and maintain influence within this region. By incorporating the decolonization and neo-colonialism theoretical approaches, this single case study of British neo-colonialism in Cyprus draws attention to the intricacies of British colonial and neo-colonial policies, nationalist violence, and Cyprus' geostrategic location.

1.3. Organizational Framework

This thesis outlines its aforementioned argument into 5 sections and a chapter on concluding remarks on the situation in Cyprus post-1974. These sections provide the context and historical events behind British colonial and neo-colonial efforts in Cyprus, which led to the partitioning of the land. This case study first provides a historical analysis of the comparison between the Ottoman and British Empires as sequential ruling authorities in Cyprus. By

chronologically process tracing the events during the transitional period from 1955 to 1974 guided by the theories of decolonization and neocolonialism, this thesis unmask the geostrategic motivations for the British government to maintain control in the Republic of Cyprus and its connection to rising nationalist groups on the island.

Chapter 2 clarifies the comparative theoretical approaches used in this case study. This section summarizes the main points from Frantz Fanon's decolonization theory and Kwame Nkrumah's neo-colonialism. This chapter provides a theoretical framework for the historical analysis of the Cyprus Problem. Also, this section points out a key objective of this study by emphasizing the differences in neo-colonial tactics and motivations between different former colonial powers. This works to better understand the singularity of British neo-colonialism in Cyprus.

Chapter 3 follows the Ottoman conquest of Cyprus. Investigating the motivations and political system implemented in Cyprus under the Ottoman Empire provides a direct comparison to British rule on the island. The goal of this chapter is to point out the differences between Ottoman rule and British colonialism in Cyprus to further the argument that the Cyprus Problem is a direct consequence of British colonialism. It also examines the British Empire's colonization of Cyprus in 1878, and the key features of British colonial tactics used in Cyprus. The most notable tactic used during both the colonial and neo-colonial eras in Cyprus was known as 'divide and rule'. 'Divide and rule' is elucidated through the patterns of British colonial rule in subjugating populations by pitting communities against each other, so that they divert their attention from the real root of their problems, the oppressor. In the case of colonial and postcolonial Cyprus, the British Empire weaponized ethnicity and religion to cleave the Cypriot polity into Turkish and Greek Cypriots. This section also highlights the British institutions and policies that systematically enforced dichotomy. By examining British archived telegrams,

customs, and policies during the colonial period, this chapter uncovers how the British Empire's colonial tactics were the main contributors to the rise of nationalist groups that led to ethnic strife.

Chapter 4 defines nationalism within the context of decolonization movements. By comparing the dichotomous historical processes of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot nationalist groups, this chapter creates a clear understanding of the rising ethnopolitics in Cyprus. The role of the British in weaponizing the anti-colonial nationalist movement, *enosis*, illustrates how Great Britain, the colonial power, exacerbated the ethnic divide between the Turkish and Greek Cypriots.

Chapter 5 analyzes the chronology of events following Cyprus' independence in 1960. This section offers insight into the escalating tensions between Turkish and Greek Cypriots under President Makarios's leadership. This chapter also uncovers the role of Western states as the guarantor powers during Cyprus' transition from a colony to a sovereign postcolonial state. Overall, this chapter highlights a sequence of events that details how Western intervention exacerbated the key crises seen from 1963 to 1967 and directly motivated the invasion of 1974.

Chapter 6 traces the events of 1974 in Cyprus while exposing how British neo-colonial policies drove this nationalist conflict. By inserting the 'divide and rule' tactic into British neo-colonial ploys to maintain influence in Cypriot internal affairs, Great Britain imposes this tactic on the countries of Greece and Turkey to diminish other foreign authorities in Cyprus. This chapter also looks at the current impacts of British neo-colonialism in Cyprus during the Turkish invasion.

Chapter 7 ventures towards the Cyprus Problem post-1974 and examines the British role in resolution discourse and comprehensive solutions. It also provides concluding remarks on the

analysis of the Cyprus Problem outlined in this research thesis and looks toward the lasting impacts of British neo-colonialism in the region.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Perspectives

“The neo-colonialism of today represents imperialism in its final and perhaps its most dangerous stage.”⁶

-Kwame Nkrumah 1965

Chapter 2 coalesces the theoretical perspectives of decolonization and neo-colonialism with the Cyprus Conflict. Frantz Fanon, a revered theorist of decolonization studies, focuses on the historical process of decolonization and the relationship between the colonizer and the dehumanized subject. This section focuses on Fanon’s assertions on colonial power, identity, nationalism, and the peasant revolution. Concerning neocolonialism, this section looks at the foundational texts for this theoretical framework to explain how and why former colonial powers seek to maintain influence in postcolonial states.

2.1. Decolonization

Frantz Fanon’s theory of decolonization highlights the necessity of nationalism to rise in postcolonial states as a way to establish a common identity.⁷ The colonized person does not have an identity; they are only tied to their labor or whatever product they provide to benefit the colonizer. This prompts the colonizers to enact practices that suppress this individuality and any rebellious ideologies to create the ideal colonized body that only answers to their colonizer. In rediscovering their individuality, these colonized subjects can form a new identity that is outside the influence of colonization. In other words, once the colonized population uncovers their individuality and personal desires for freedom, they are no longer solely tied to the oppressor. This incites the desire for personal rule and to create a new state that excludes the colonizer.

⁶ Kwame Nkrumah, *Neocolonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*, Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd., London, 1965, p. 4.

⁷ Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 2004.

Fanon's decolonization also tackles the notion of unification "on the grounds of nation and sometimes race."⁸ This unification is achieved by a national consciousness that creates a shared identity in the anti-colonial solidarity, as it is the "highest form of culture."⁹ This national consciousness works to reclaim identity, restore national sovereignty, and unify a population in its anti-colonial struggle. In gaining a national consciousness, "the liberation struggle does not restore to national culture its former values and configurations," but opens up endless possibilities for culture and identity.¹⁰ This creates a new mode of identity that implores the liberation struggle and the humanist motivations for independence.

Fanon famously argued that "decolonization is always a violent event."¹¹ The whole notion of decolonization is a disruptive act that is predicated on the idea of achieving independence and personal freedoms through violence. Within colonial states, violence and oppression coincide with power. Thus, the colonizer held all the power over the colonized subjects. If the colonizer only responds to conflict with violence and has risen to power by dominating their opponents, then, through this process, it is inadvertently taught to the colonized subjects that violence is the answer to obtain power. The only way, then, to regain their humanity and their right to self-determination is to violently revolt against their oppressors and eliminate any remnants of colonialism. While this complete deposition of colonialism within decolonization concedes to the greater notion of freedom from the oppressor, this contention does not hold concrete, realistic applications to modern postcolonial states. In this assertion about decolonization, the only successful way to dismantle all ties to the colonial empire is through brutal violence that ends in the elimination of the colonizer and its power vacuum. The

⁸ Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 2004, p. 10.

⁹ Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 2004, p. 179.

¹⁰ Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 2004, p. 178.

¹¹ Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth* (R. Philcox, Trans.), 2004.

reality of this complete dismantling of colonial empires was not present in Cypriot history. However, most postcolonial states have not and cannot completely expel every aspect of colonialism through decolonization. The lack of violent revolutions can lead to the use of postcolonial violence that echoes the oppressive tactics seen in colonial societies.

According to Fanon, decolonization functions as a disorderly approach based on historical processes that proposes the liberation of the dehumanized colonized subject and the complete dismantling of all ties to colonialism with the peasants as the centerpiece of the revolution.¹² The physical and metaphysical allusions within this theory are pivotal to, literally, creating a space that excludes and subverts the colonizer and, figuratively, rehabilitating the psychological turmoil and disillusionment experienced during colonialism. Regarding the focus on the peasant as the brute force that advocates for individualism, Fanon inquires that the success of dismantling colonialism revolves around peasant leadership.¹³ In other words, to conform to Fanon's ideal decolonization methods, the forefront of the revolution must be the individualized peasants because they have nothing to lose and everything to gain. This line of reasoning contributes to the disorder and violence that are needed to overthrow the entire structural integrity of colonialism. Fanon's peasant-led revolution, while notably unsuccessful in historical analysis, is pivotal to the discussion of nationalism within the Turkish and Greek Cypriots. In all, Fanon's work provides a vital perspective of decolonization that refers to the violent nature of colonialism's lingering ties to postcolonial states.

2.2. *Neo-colonialism*

The theory of neo-colonialism works to explain how and why the theory of decolonization did not effectively account for the complete dismantling of all ties between the

¹² Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 2004.

¹³ Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 2004.

postcolonial state and the former colonial power. Kwame Nkrumah, former President of Ghana, has provided the foundations for the theory of neo-colonialism in his work, *Neocolonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. Nkrumah's text focuses on who engages in neo-colonialism and how it functions within the imperialist world system after the end of World War II. While Nkrumah's framework revolves around economic power, his contribution to this theory is paramount to the case study of British neo-colonialism in Cyprus. While the historical analysis focuses on African countries, Nkrumah asserts that Cyprus is a case of British neo-colonialism. In Cyprus, the external authority is the former colonial power, Great Britain. The theory of neo-colonialism also adheres to the imperialist world system through the implementation of cultural imperialism from the former colonial powers and their effort to shift cultural values and historical narratives to align with those of the West.

Nkrumah defines neo-colonialism as an independent state with recognized sovereignty from the international community, but "its economic system and thus its political policy is directed from outside."¹⁴ Neo-colonialism operates in the modern world system through economic dependency, political influence, and cultural imperialism. The most common cases of neo-colonialism, as featured in Cyprus, involve the former ruler of a territory exercising control over a newly sovereign state that used to be a colony.¹⁵ This line of thinking makes sense because the former colonial power already understands these postcolonial states and has motivations to continue its influence in the region. Economic dependency explains how the neo-colonial powers and the newly independent states engage in core-periphery relationships in which one state (the core) exploits the less developed state (the periphery). This symbiotic

¹⁴ Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*, 1965, p. ix.

¹⁵ Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*, 1965.

relationship creates a newly postcolonial state “incapable of independent development and must rely upon the former imperial power for defence and even internal security.”¹⁶

The political influence of a neo-colonial power on a newly independent state rivals any inkling of resistance that would challenge its authority. These neo-colonial suppression tactics in the political sphere disregard developing efforts in education and capitalize on the industries within a postcolonial state to the detriment of the working class.¹⁷ The neo-colonial powers also exert political influence by installing military bases and assimilating governments to Western interests. For example, military bases, most predominantly along the Suez Canal, align with British commitments in Middle Eastern Affairs.¹⁸ Nkrumah highlights a cornerstone of this thesis by displaying how British motivations for colonizing and ‘neo-colonizing’ in the Mediterranean and along the Suez Canal trace back to the idea of geostrategic locations. Nkrumah argues that “military aid in fact marks the last stage of neo-colonialism and its effect is self-destructive” because proliferating a neo-colonial state with weapons would increase the likelihood of resistance and all-out war.¹⁹

Cultural imperialism encapsulates the turn to Westernization and cultural homogenization while mirroring the identity crisis seen in Fanon’s text. Westernization, in a neo-colonial sense, applies to the shifting in values that align with the West, such as capitalism and individualism. Cultural homogenization ties to imperialist efforts that aim to make non-Western states adapt to Western values while diminishing their cultural identity and history. Neo-colonialism revitalizes the tactics and suppression efforts that were seen during the colonial period in these newly formed independent states. For example, the people in postcolonial Cyprus still drive on the left

¹⁶ Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*, 1965, p. 7.

¹⁷ Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*, 1965.

¹⁸ Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*, 1965.

¹⁹ Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*, 1965, p. 9.

side of the road as taught by the British Empire during the colonial period. Driving on the left side of the road may be viewed as a trivial matter, but within the context of decolonization, this showcases that not all ties to the former colonial empire have been subverted.

In “British Neo-colonialism in Malaya and Singapore, and the US Empire in the Pacific,” Wen-Qing Ngoei contributes to the theory of neo-colonialism by outlining the British practices in Southeast Asia in the 1950s and 1960s. Since this thesis argues that different neo-colonial powers’ operations differ depending on the former colony, it is important to note how the British government conducted neo-colonial efforts prior to Cyprus’ independence. This contrasts with the argument Ngoei poses in this article by stating that “British neo-colonialism was not unique. All western powers that possessed colonies in Southeast Asia harbored similar aspirations.”²⁰ While the British neocolonial efforts seem to fall into the military, political, and economic realms, how they conduct neocolonialism in their former colonies must differ. Neocolonialism is motivated by national interests whether it is in the form of political, military, or economic. Neo-colonial tactics in one region might benefit British interests while the same cannot be said for the United States (US). Therefore, British neocolonialism *is* unique because it promotes British interests and influence and cannot be an all-encompassing practice that adheres to all Western platforms. To make sweeping remarks about neo-colonialism heeding to all Western states negates the particular purposes and motivations for former colonial powers to engage in neo-colonial exhibitions.

Ngoei mainly focuses on British causes for neo-colonialism in Singapore and Malaya after WWII through political and military power. The British neo-colonial efforts Ngoei discusses in his work contend that “Britain sought to retain control of its strategic resources in

²⁰ Wen-Qing Ngoei, “British Neo-colonialism in Malaya and Singapore, and U.S. Empire in the Pacific.” In *The Vietnam War in the Pacific World* (2022): 16-30. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Southeast Asia, the most important being the military bases in Singapore that enabled London to still crow its world power status and support SEATO and other US goals in the region.”²¹ From a political perspective, a US hegemony in Southeast Asia would rival British authority in the region, so neo-colonialism worked to alleviate the threat of losing its position as a global power. Ultimately, the British Empire fell off as a global superpower following WWII while the US’s influence grew rapidly across the international system. The motivation to maintain military power is also seen in this historical analysis of British neo-colonialism. The military motivations worked in tandem with the political goals in Singapore because these military bases allowed Great Britain access to Southeast Asian affairs. This would allow them to maintain authority in Western intervention and the international organization’s agenda for the region.

In the early 1970s, Great Britain had to relinquish their Singaporean bases to the US and demilitarize their presence in the Southeastern region.²² Reluctantly, Great Britain dragged on the withdrawal process and was forced to yield their authority to the US. This emphasizes that Great Britain lost its former colony to the US’s neo-colonial efforts in the 1960s and did not want to make the same mistake in Cyprus. This helps to explain Great Britain’s refusal of American intervention in Cyprus and its steadfast mission to maintain control in the former colony of Cyprus.

The way that this study understands neo-colonialism aligns with Adamantia Pollis’s assertion that different *colonial* powers act differently in their *colonial* tactics.²³ This thesis reenergizes this notion into different *neo-colonial* powers act differently in their *neo-colonial* tactics depending on the complexity of the cultural, historical, and motivational relationship

²¹ Ngoei, “British Neo-colonialism in Malaya and Singapore, and U.S. Empire in the Pacific,” 2022, p. 23.

²² Ngoei, “British Neo-colonialism in Malaya and Singapore, and U.S. Empire in the Pacific,” 2022.

²³ Pollis, “Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus,” 1973.

between the former colonial power and the postcolonial state. For example, French neo-colonialism in sub-Saharan Africa heavily relies on the former colony maintaining an economic dependency on the former colonial power, which is not a key element of British neo-colonialism in Cyprus. ²⁴ French neo-colonialism, then, is founded on the exploitation of developing countries to pillage their resources. While the concept of geostrategic positioning might come into play in French neo-colonialism, it is subservient to economic and cultural power rather than military and political power as seen in the case of British neo-colonialism in Cyprus. French neo-colonialism in African countries can be identified through international development and economic aid that works to assimilate the Global South to Western notions of development. ²⁵ This aligns with the idea that French colonialism, and subsequently, neo-colonialism, focuses on a direct rather than indirect engagement in these colonizing exhibitions. Assimilation also works in the neo-colonial effort to sustain continuity in a Franco-African relationship. ²⁶ Through assimilation and a focus on economic power, France has been able to directly engage in the affairs of their former colonies.

While many theorists of neo-realism focus on economic policies and dependency, the case of Cyprus poses a differing view of neocolonialism. A defining characteristic of this thesis emphasizes that different colonial and de facto neo-colonial powers operate differently in varying colonial and postcolonial entities. There is not a singular all-encompassing approach that can be applied to every situation featuring neo-colonialism. Such as British and French colonialism differed, British neo-colonialism in Cyprus must be understood in conjunction with

²⁴ Rajen Harshe, (1980), "French Neo-Colonialism in Sub-Saharan Africa," *India Quarterly*, 36(2), 159-178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097492848003600202>.

²⁵ Rajen Harshe, (1980), "French Neo-Colonialism in Sub-Saharan Africa," *India Quarterly*, 36(2), 159-178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097492848003600202>.

²⁶ Rajen Harshe, (1980), "French Neo-Colonialism in Sub-Saharan Africa," *India Quarterly*, 36(2), 159-178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097492848003600202>.

its complex history of conquest, colonization, and nationalism, and not by framing these concepts into a broad theory of neo-colonialism.

Chapter 3: Comparing the Ottoman System and British Colonialism

“The Mediterranean, by its profound influence over southern Europe, has contributed in no small measure to prevent the unity of that Europe, which it has attracted towards its shores and then divided to its own advantage.”²⁷

-Fernand Braudel 1972

Chapter 3 uncovers how the historical proceedings of Ottoman rule from 1571 to 1878 in Cyprus differ from the British Empire (1878-1960), and how the geostrategic location of the island became the defining factor in Cypriot history. It is important to understand how the Turkish Cypriots fit into the Cyprus Problem. The Turkish Cypriot community was a more recent development than the Greek Cypriots with the Turkish as the minority ethnic group making up about eighteen percent of the island.²⁸ By investigating the arrival of the Ottomans as well as the class and political structures, this thesis differentiates Ottoman rule from British rule in Cyprus.

This section also highlights how the geostrategic location of Cyprus made it the ideal location for the Ottomans and British Empires to set up military bases and trade routes as “Cyprus is poised, politically and strategically, between the Middle East and Europe.”²⁹ This affirms the idea that Cyprus, bordering Africa, Asia, and Europe, while having a direct link to the Suez Canal, played a pivotal role in the Ottoman and British motivations in gaining control over the island of Cyprus.

²⁷ Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, vol. 1 (Sian Reynolds, trans.), Wm Collins Sons Ltd and Harper & Row Publishers Inc., 1972, p. 188.

²⁸ James Ker-Lindsay, *The Cyprus Problem: What Everyone Needs to Know*, Oxford University Press, 2011.

²⁹ David Souter, “An Island Apart: A Review of the Cyprus Problem.” In *Third World Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (1984): 657–74, p. 657.

This chapter historically links the British motivations and suppression tactics in colonial Cyprus to the rise in nationalist groups. The key colonial tactic used by the British Empire is known as ‘divide and rule’. The realist notion of ‘divide and rule’ highlights the historical process and power politics between Great Britain, Greece, Turkey, the United States, and Cyprus during Cyprus’ transitional period to an independent state. This section shows the negotiations for a Cyprus constitution and how the British aimed to maintain Cyprus as a geostrategic satellite in the Mediterranean.

3.1. The Ottoman Conquest in Cyprus

In 1571, the Turks captured the island of Cyprus from the Venetians.³⁰ This led to many new changes to Cypriot class structures and social lifestyles. Moreover, the Ottomans' conquest of Cyprus unleashed a social revolution because it eliminated the Venetian aristocracy and exponentially increased the island’s population.³¹ At the time of the Ottoman conquest of Cyprus, the rest of the territory surrounding the Mediterranean Sea was under the Ottoman Empire, and, subsequently, the conquest of Cyprus seemed like a logical path for maintaining control in this region.³² It would have been detrimental to the politics of the Ottoman Empire if another foreign power had laid claim to Cyprus because of its geostrategic location. With the oppositional relationship between the Ottomans and the Venetians, “there was no doubt that one day Cyprus had to be seized ... Since the conquest of Cyprus, located between Egypt, Syria and Anatolia and of strategic importance, was particularly desirable, war with Venice was decided on

³⁰ Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II* (Sian Reynolds, trans.), 1972.

³¹ Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II* (Sian Reynolds, trans.), 1972.

³² Strauß, J, “How Cyprus Came under Turkish Rule: A Conquest and the Historians.” *Wiener Zeitschrift Für Die Kunde Des Morgenlandes* 82 (1992): 325–34. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23865914>.

[by the sultan].”³³ These outlined motivations for the Ottoman conquest of Cyprus revolved around the island’s geostrategic location within the Mediterranean Sea.

In the era of Western conquest in the sixteenth century, the geostrategic location of Mediterranean islands, such as Cyprus, proved that “the role they played in the forefront of history far exceeds what might be expected from such poor territories.”³⁴ The placement of Cyprus in the Mediterranean set the course for the Cypriot history of conquest and colonization. Therefore, Cyprus’ geographic positioning posited the island as the ideal location to annex into both the Ottoman and British Empires for military and political reasons.

Investigating the Ottoman and British empires through a historical lens highlights the differing methods of sovereign authority in modern Cypriot history. This emphasizes how Great Britain’s colonial tactics contrast with those of the Ottoman system. In pointing out these differences, this historical analysis illustrates how British colonization in Cyprus was the catalyst and driver for the emergence of nationalist political ideologies.

3.2. Class Structure and Multiethnic Empire

The key element of the Ottoman conquest was the mass deportation of Native dynasties through military force.³⁵ This was a means to assert control over the subjugated population and promote the influence of the Sultan. The role of Sultan Selim II in the Ottoman Empire was paramount to the Ottoman political structure in Cyprus. Even though the Ottoman Empire forcibly replaced the Venetian native dynasty with the absolute authority of Sultan Selim II, this system “did not necessarily mean a revolutionary change in the former social and economic

³³ Strauß, J, “How Cyprus Came under Turkish Rule,” 1992, p. 331.

³⁴ Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II* (Sian Reynolds, trans.), 1972, p. 154.

³⁵ Halil Inalcik. “Ottoman Methods of Conquest.” In *Studia Islamica*, no. 2 (1954).

order.”³⁶ This excerpt emphasizes that the subjects in Ottoman Cyprus had autonomy in political, cultural, and religious affairs. Under Ottoman rule, there were two classes: the military ruling class (exempt from taxes) known as the askeri, and the subjects, the reaya.³⁷ The tax exemption incentive inspired Cypriots to become Ottoman soldiers, while the subjects had to continue paying taxes. Moreover, Ottoman subjects did not have to convert to Islam to become Ottoman soldiers and be a part of the askeri class.³⁸ The Ottoman Empire incentivized the population to join their military efforts and aimed to inspire Islamic conversion while still preserving the Orthodox Christian faith.

The analysis of the political and class structures under Ottoman rule points out the vital differences in subjugation from the British Empire. For example, “there is no evidence that Turkish rule led to a fall in living standards for the inhabitants of the island,”³⁹ which cannot be said for the British colonization of Cyprus. While there were certainly hardships and forms of oppression faced during the Ottoman conquest of Cyprus, they varied from British rule because they did not structurally and institutionally divide the population based on religion or ethnicity. Furthermore, the political structure during Ottoman rule promoted the cultural autonomy of legal practices and languages while maintaining a strong central government.⁴⁰

The platforms of the Ottoman Empire detailed the uniqueness of Ottoman rule as a non-Christian empire motivated by greed and the influence of Islam, not forceful religious conversion.⁴¹ This alludes to the idea that the Ottoman Empire did not conquer Cyprus to

³⁶ Inalcik, “Ottoman Methods of Conquest,” 1954, p. 103.

³⁷ Inalcik, “Ottoman Methods of Conquest,” 1954.

³⁸ Inalcik, “Ottoman Methods of Conquest,” 1954.

³⁹ Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, vol. 1 (Sian Reynolds, trans.), 1972, p. 156.

⁴⁰ Krishan Kumar, “The Ottoman Empire.” In *Visions of Empire: How Five Imperial Regimes Shaped the World*, 74–144. Princeton University Press, 2017.

⁴¹ Kumar, “The Ottoman Empire,” 2017.

persecute Christians and forcibly coerce the population to assimilate into their way of life. As a multinational empire, the Sultan was inclined to implement tolerant policies “allowing for the intermingling between Muslims and Christians and leading to the formation of a syncretic culture.”⁴² Permitting coexistence between ethnic groups under Ottoman rule emphasizes how the ethnic cleavages between Turkish and Greek Cypriots would not be predominant until British colonization in Cyprus.

Unlike the empires seen throughout Europe, the Ottoman nobility was not hereditary but was “a purely functional ruling class, defined not by ethnicity, language, or religion, but by its role in the running of the state” and unwavering loyalty to the Sultan.⁴³ Moreover, under the Ottoman Empire, the elite differed from the British or French Empire. The nobility in the Ottoman Empire was not linked to bureaucracy or discriminatory characteristics, but instead, they practiced tolerance even among these elites. This tolerance towards religion turns the motivations for conflicts during this period as being reliant upon class divisions.⁴⁴ In all, the Ottoman Empire granted the multiethnic subjugated populations the right to exercise their own cultural autonomy without forced assimilation or creating ethnic divisions.

3.3. Features of British Colonialism

The British reasoning for colonizing Cyprus is based on its geostrategic location. The British Empire sought Cyprus as a colony in 1878 to “protect the Ottoman Empire, Suez and, ultimately, Britain's Indian possessions from Russian expansion.”⁴⁵ More specifically, the British Empire colonized Cyprus to maintain its political and military influence in the Middle

⁴² Kumar, “The Ottoman Empire,” 2017, p. 86.

⁴³ Kumar, “The Ottoman Empire,” 2017, p. 96.

⁴⁴ Stefanos P. Papageorgiou, “The Genesis of the Greek and Turkish Nationalism in Cyprus, 1878-1914: A Common March at a Different Pace”. 2018. *Cyprus Review* 9 (1): 56-65. <https://cyprusreview.org/index.php/cr/article/view/510>.

⁴⁵ Souter, “An Island Apart,” 1984, p. 658.

East. With this in mind, the recount of an address from the Minister of State for Colonial Affairs, Henry Hopkinson, in 1954, said that Cyprus would never become fully independent because of British commitments to geopolitics in the region.⁴⁶ The geostrategic location of Cyprus as a military base and policy safeguard proved to be vital to understanding why the British colonized Cyprus and why it has continued to implement neo-colonial tactics in Cyprus' postcolonial era.

The initial British colonization of the island was met with great dissent from the Cypriot population. The different colonial policies of the British Empire, as outlined in this chapter, changed the political and social structures of Cypriot life. This led to the reframing of Cypriot subjects "as 'uncivilised and lazy natives' – and this was used to explain their objection to British administration of Cyprus."⁴⁷ Therefore, the British Empire claimed that the opposition to their rule was due to the 'backwardness' and 'primitive' Cypriot lifestyles compared to the modern imperialist world system defined by the Western hemisphere.

Before investigating the transitional years, understanding the foundations and implications of British colonialism on the rising tensions in Cyprus enhances the overall examination of this conflict. The tactic of 'divide and rule' has been noted as a cornerstone of British colonial and neo-colonial policies. The British policy of 'divide and rule' "produced stark inequalities in group representation in the top ranks of colonial state institutions, which, in turn, aroused resentment among the excluded groups after independence, and subsequently, inter-group violence."⁴⁸ These purposeful divisive practices from the British government created an ethnic divide between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots and can be understood as an oppression

⁴⁶ Souter, "An Island Apart," 1984.

⁴⁷ Charlotte Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence: Militancy, International Politics, Killing in the Name*, Routledge, 2013, p. 28.

⁴⁸ Suhasiah Ray, "Beyond Divide and Rule: Explaining the Link between British Colonialism and Ethnic Violence." In *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 24, no. 4 (2018): 367–88, p. 368.

tactic to suppress anti-colonial sentiments. Furthermore, the ‘divide and rule’ mechanism draws focus away from the colonial power and shifts the hostility towards inter-communal cleavages. This realist approach to British colonial policies pervaded the Cypriot colonial and neo-colonial eras. Correspondingly, the ‘divide and rule’ policy retained British sovereignty in Cyprus while providing an alternative focal point for nationalist aggression. This shift from class conflict to ethnic conflict would become prevalent in how the nationalist groups in Cyprus were formed and how they worked against their own interests by neglecting these class interests that are centered in Fanon’s peasant revolution.

In a cross-national study on the legacy of British colonial rule, an academic researcher from Singapore argued that British colonization made former colonies more “prone to inter-communal violence after independence” due to the tactics of ‘divide and rule’ and pre-colonial political centralization of ethnic groups.⁴⁹ The impact of institutional changes in the colonial era is connected to the political participation of ethnic groups in the pre-colonial era. This framework is important to the historical analysis of Cyprus during the Ottoman Empire versus the British colonial period. Moreover, the inequalities of representation among ethnic groups during British colonial rule have led to a pattern of resentment from excluded groups and nationalist violence.⁵⁰ These assertions on ‘divide and rule’ underscored the British tactics of pitting ethnic groups against each other as a form of oppression and subjugation.

Geographical partitions were the ultimate solution to British postcolonial struggles for power and influence.⁵¹ These geographical partitions were present in British former colonies of Cyprus, India, and Somalia. The postcolonial crises “all derive in no small measure many of their

⁴⁹ Ray, “Beyond Divide and Rule: Explaining the Link between British Colonialism and Ethnic Violence,” 2018, p. 367.

⁵⁰ Ray, “Beyond Divide and Rule: Explaining the Link between British Colonialism and Ethnic Violence,” 2018.

⁵¹ A.J. Christopher, “‘Divide and Rule’: The Impress of British Separation Policies.” *Area* 20, no. 3 (1988): 233–40.

problems from the British colonial attempt to divide the population into distinct groups.”⁵² Thus, the prominent colonial and postcolonial British policy of ‘divide and rule’ is marked as a method of maintaining influence over a population by exacerbating ethnic cleavages. This escalates a rise in nationalist groups and inter-communal violence, as seen in the case of Cyprus.

3.4. Colonial Institutions and British Policies

Retrieved contents of the 1977 archives and research facilities in Cyprus focused on the Turkish Cypriot relations with the British Empire. The British court records explain how the British government “usurped the judicial functions in its colony” and imposed its structure of law onto the Cypriot community.⁵³ The implementation of British authority in the Cypriot legal system contends with the Ottoman Empire’s permission of agency in legal matters that allowed for cultural autonomy within ethnic groups. The analyzed correspondence between the Kadi of Cyprus, who was the “chief spokesman for the Turkish Cypriot community”, and the Chief Secretary of Government admitted the willing collaboration between the British government to centralize their authority and influence over Turkish Cypriot institutions.⁵⁴ This archive indicates that the heads of the Turkish Cypriot community became pawns for the British government in its pursuit of subjugating the Cypriot people and preserving their influence over the island. Furthermore, this analysis of the recovered archives from British rule in Cyprus allows for a better understanding of British tactics in the oppression of its colonized subjects and the British relationship with the Turkish Cypriots. The literature about British colonial rule in

⁵² Christopher, “‘Divide and Rule’: The Impress of British Separation Policies,” 1988, p. 239.

⁵³ Mustafa Hasim Altan, James A. McHenry, and Ronald C. Jennings. “Archival Materials and Research Facilities in the Cyprus Turkish Federated State: Ottoman Empire, British Empire, Cyprus Republic.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 8, no. 1 (1977): 29–42, p. 31.

⁵⁴ Altan et al., “Archival Materials and Research Facilities in the Cyprus Turkish Federated State: Ottoman Empire, British Empire, Cyprus Republic,” 1977, p. 31.

Cyprus emphasizes how it differs from other types of colonization and how the British actively created the foundations for nationalism to develop in Cyprus.

The Cypriot education system implemented by the British government caused an uproar among the Greek Cypriots. With the ‘divide and rule’ notion in play, the schools on the island were divided into Turkish and Greek institutions. This worked to the advantage of the British government by allowing them to target the Greek Cypriot schools to prevent further nationalist ideologies from permeating across the island.⁵⁵ Furthermore, British policies dictated Cypriot education and how the upcoming generation was coerced to view their history. A former leader from the Greek Cypriot nationalist movement, Ioannis Kassinis, verified that images and posters of revolutionary Greek heroes and anti-colonial sentiments were not permitted in classrooms.⁵⁶ This policy posed as a method to steer Greek Cypriots away from nationalist tendencies. On that note, the British appeal to ‘modern’ education and propaganda of the colonial power directly opposed the Orthodox Church’s education project to promote “Hellenic identity” and nationalist sentiments.⁵⁷ Through policy, the British government was able to gauge control over nationalist sentiment in educational sectors.

The rising protests of Greek Cypriot groups against British governmentality of the Cypriot education system led to the riots in 1931 that aimed to call out British forces for implicating the Cypriot population as a chess piece in their imperial exhibition.⁵⁸ While these assumptions are arguably in line with the goals of the British presence on the island, the British had to mask their intentions for militaristic domination in the region. Archival evidence suggested that the British governors’ reactions to the riots in 1931 deemed the Cypriot

⁵⁵ Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence: Militancy, International Politics, Killing in the Name*, 2013.

⁵⁶ Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence*, 2013.

⁵⁷ Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence*, 2013.

⁵⁸ Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence*, 2013.

population “unfit to take any responsible part in the Government of its native country” and would require a “considerable period of training in Western civilization before any kind of representative government could be reintroduced.”⁵⁹ In other words, the British government doubled down on its argument against Cypriot independence by implying that the population would have to undergo a complete remodeling into the liberal democratic image in order to be a part of the modern international system. This objective, while rational to British imperialist movements, did not fully encompass the motivations for remaining in control of Cyprus. Cyprus was a militarized hegemon in the British Empire and was colonized to maintain power in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. The 1931 riots and pushback from Greek Cypriots in the education sector were classified as counter-governance measures by the British Empire because these situations directly opposed their sovereign authority over Cyprus.⁶⁰ The British policies and reactions to Cypriot independence showcase their inclination to remain a sovereign actor in Cyprus.

3.5. The Onset of Sovereignty

In the second prong of the timeline studied in this thesis, 1955 to 1974, there is a shift to the neo-colonial instead of colonial approach in British politics in Cyprus. During the Age of Decolonization in the mid-twentieth century, the potentiality for an independent Cyprus became more and more absolute until it was finally realized in 1960. In the inevitability of granting Cyprus its independence because of the outside pressures from the international community, by adhering to the pattern of decolonization, Great Britain was aware that it would lose its best agent in conducting military and political operations in the Middle East. With Cyprus’ location

⁵⁹ Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence*, 2013, p. 27. This quote comes from Alexis Rappas’s archival research on British governmentality in Cyprus.

⁶⁰ Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence*, 2013.

being centered in Eastern European and Middle Eastern affairs, while also having close access to the Suez Canal, Great Britain still had geostrategic interests in keeping a foothold in Cyprus. In the rising ethnic cleavages that emerged during British rule, Great Britain played on this dichotomy to further weaken Cypriot internal affairs, so that they would have to rely on external nations for security. This is achieved through the Zurich London Accords of 1959-1960, which established Great Britain, Turkey, and Greece as the guarantor powers in Cyprus. Before this goal of the British foreign policy agenda was actualized, Great Britain worked to negotiate a path for independence for the Cypriot polity that would not lead to complete sovereignty and autonomy in their internal affairs.

In 1955, five years before the enactment of Cypriot independence in 1960, the British government began negotiations with Greece and Turkey to propose a plan to reduce ethnic tensions through a constitutional framework. The extensive correspondence between the British and Turkish governments during the years preceding Cypriot independence highlights a narrative emphasizing their shared goals for Cyprus. Archival evidence underscores that Turkey firmly supported British sovereignty over Cyprus.⁶¹ Both the British and Turkish governments opposed the notion of a sovereign Cyprus because it would allow for self-determination. This notion of self-determination could lead to the possibility of reunification with Greece, which was a detrimental outcome for both Great Britain and Turkey. Consequently, the British and Turkish governments were aligned in their opposition toward Cypriot self-determination and agreed that the British should lead the negotiations for a potential Cypriot constitution. This position was further supported by a recorded conversation between the British Secretary of State, Harold

⁶¹ Conversation Between the Secretary of State and the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs on August 27, 1955, 31 August 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew.
<https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>.

Macmillan, and the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Fatin Rüştü Zorlu. Even though Macmillan was known to dispute that the Cyprus Problem was not due to colonialism, this thesis contradicts his argument by highlighting the explicit archival evidence that suggests the opposite. During the conversation with Macmillan, Zorlu contended that “Cyprus could not be regarded as an ordinary territory for normal constitutional development” because of its tripartite status with Greece, Turkey, and Great Britain.⁶² Thus, self-determination and sovereignty were not at the forefront of Cypriot constitutional frameworks because the British, with the support of Turkey, would not advocate for a fully autonomous Cyprus.

The 75th telegram from the British Foreign Office to Istanbul in 1955 confirms the role of Great Britain as the authoritative actor on the island of Cyprus by stating that the “Turkish Government would be assured that we contemplate no change of sovereignty in the foreseeable future and that we intend to remain in Cyprus as long as the world situation continued to make this necessary.”⁶³ Since Turkey was known to be a supporter of Western intervention in the Middle East and is classified as a democratic state, this alliance between Turkey and Great Britain worked to meet both countries’ goals in the region. This solidifies the strategic relationship between the British and the Turkish governments in retaining British sovereignty in Cyprus to oppose any potential reunification with Greece. Archives, such as the excerpt above, contradict the popular narrative of the British Empire as a helping hand during the postcolonial transition and instead posit the British government as the driver of Cypriot independence on their terms and not that of the Cypriot leadership. The British foreign policy priorities of securing military and political influence in the Mediterranean led the discussions on the future of Cyprus.

⁶² Conversation Between the Secretary of State and the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs on August 27, 1955, 31 August 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew.

⁶³ Telegram No.75, Foreign Office to Istanbul, 21 June 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew. <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>.

In the following telegram, No. 76, from the British Foreign Office to Istanbul in 1955 (five years before the passage of the Cyprus Constitution in 1960), the British government outlined a roadmap for a Cypriot constitution. The recovered archive concludes that the British proposal for a Cypriot Constitution was founded on the need to safeguard Turkish interests as a minority while implying “no commitment to self-determination.”⁶⁴ This suggests that the British government did not intend to relinquish sovereignty and autonomy to the people of Cyprus. Thus, the 1960 Constitution of Cyprus was not meant to provide a self-governing framework or yield British authority to the newly formulated Cypriot government. The disproportionate power dynamics in Cyprus can be drawn back to British prerogatives for maintaining a satellite because of the island’s geostrategic location.

Once it was known that the Greek government and Greek Cypriot nationalist group would not acquiesce to the British and Turkish proposal without the potentiality for a sovereign and self-governing Cyprus, the British Foreign Office was directed to imply that self-determination could be an outcome of the constitution.⁶⁵ The support of Archbishop Makarios of Cyprus would be vital in establishing a constitution, so the British had to reframe their position to gain his compliance. With that said, the archival evidence suggests that the British stance on a self-determining Cyprus did not change, instead, their goal to remain an authoritative figure on the island was masked by the onset of a potential sovereign Cyprus. Furthermore, the dominating force of Great Britain in these negotiations and the transitional period for Cypriot independence

⁶⁴ Telegram No. 76, Foreign Office to Istanbul, 21 June 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew. <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>.

⁶⁵ Telegram No. 532, From Foreign Office to Geneva (United Kingdom Delegation to the Meeting of Foreign Ministers), 9 November 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew. <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>. This telegram was sent based on Her Majesty’s instructions for the Ambassador Ankara.

conflates with their self-interest to remain a sovereign entity on the island because of its location in the Mediterranean Sea.

Chapter 4: Nationalism in Cyprus

“Nationalism, having attained its first objective in the form of national unity and independence, develops almost automatically into imperialism.” ⁶⁶

-E.H. Carr 1946

This chapter integrates a theoretical analysis of Frantz Fanon’s theory of decolonization into the case study of British neo-colonialism in Cyprus within the imperialist world system. Through process tracing of the British ‘divide and rule’ policies and the colonial power’s opposition to an independent Cyprus, the need for national unity arose among the Turkish and Greek Cypriots. It is illustrated that the nationalist groups in Cyprus are a direct result of British colonialism and perpetuated colonial tactics in the form of neo-colonialism. Furthermore, the British Empire’s reactions to the rising Greek Cypriot anti-colonial movement led to the British weaponization of national unity to further divide the main ethnic communities on the island. More importantly, these calls for nationalism on the island also directly tie to Cyprus’ location within the Mediterranean Sea since it is not directly bordered by Greece and Turkey. The national consciousness, the ethnic conflicts, and the geopolitical relations are all subject to the island’s geostrategic location.

4.1. The Intersection of Decolonization and the Nationalist Rise

In opening up boundless possibilities for identity, the Turkish and Greek Cypriot nationalist groups embody how a national culture is formed. The Greek and Turkish Cypriots both engage in Fanon’s national consciousness, but there is a divergent focus for a national identity. In discovering the endless potential for creating a national consciousness in the anti-colonial liberation, the Greek Cypriots focus on an identity related to their religion and the

⁶⁶ E.H. Carr, *The Twenty Years Crisis: 1919-1939*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan & Co. LTD, 1946, p. 112.

Motherland, Greece. While Turkish Cypriots also engaged in this type of national consciousness, the goals of these two communities in Cyprus deviated from the other. Thus, national consciousness in the liberation struggle in Cyprus created opposing national identities that both aimed to restore sovereignty. In this dichotomy, the national consciousness was unable to transform into “a social and political consciousness” that unifies the masses to dismantle ties to the oppressor and led the anti-colonial movement to a stalemate between the Turkish and Greek Cypriots.⁶⁷

To understand the relationship between colonialism and nationalism, it is necessary to investigate the modern notion of nationality as a Western concept. Adamantia Pollis, a distinguished academic and steadfast researcher of the Cyprus Problem, claimed:

“It was only as Westernized elites in colonial areas assimilated nationalist doctrines that they began not only to view themselves in terms of nationality but also to define the boundaries of the emerging nationalities as defined, at least in part, by British perception of group cleavage.”⁶⁸

In other words, the existence of a Western state as a colonial power in Cyprus introduced the notion of nationality to the Cypriot population. This nation-forming attitude permeated throughout Cyprus, coinciding with the British Empire bolstering the ethnic divide on the island. Thus, as these ethnic divides between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots were forming, the British Empire introduced the Western notion of a ‘nation’ that aimed to create communities based on a common identity, shared history, and cultural affiliation.

⁶⁷ Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 2004, p. 142.

⁶⁸ Pollis, “Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus,” 1973, p. 579.

The conflict in Cyprus directly corresponds to the rise in nationalism and the impact of colonialism on the discordant nation. Analyzing the origins of nationalism and its functions within the international system further conceptualizes the use of nationalist violence in the context of the Cyprus Problem. Nationalism stems from the idea of a ‘nation,’ “a community tied by culture, ethnicity, language, religion” or shared history that seeks a form of autonomous government even if it is not a recognized sovereign state.⁶⁹ Since the Greek and Turkish Cypriots sought to cultivate their own government and find commonalities within these categories, they would be considered ‘nations.’ As seen in Fanon’s theory of decolonization, nationalism begins as an anti-colonial concept aimed to cultivate an identity. This goes hand in hand with the analysis of the Greek and Turkish Cypriots’ first stages of nationalism because they were rooted in the anti-colonial movement to dismantle ties to the colonizer and establish their own identity outside of being subjugated bodies. Nationalism, in this sense, operates as a humanist ideal that aims to form a community that challenges the authority of the oppressor.

Nationalism is inspired by a “strong enemy” or “foreign interventions.”⁷⁰ The strong enemies in this context would be the instituted dichotomy of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, and the foreign interventions would be the influence of Great Britain, the US, Greece, and Turkey on Cyprus’ political and social climate. The notion of ‘foreign intervention’ inciting nationalism can be directly tied to colonialism because the empire controlling a colony becomes the permanent enemy of a nation that fights for its ability to govern itself.

Historically, empires aimed to undermine nationalist movements to suppress notions of self-determination.⁷¹ This was apparent in the negotiations between Great Britain, Turkey, and

⁶⁹ Walter G. Moss, “Imperialism, Nationalism, and Globalization.” In *An Age of Progress?: Clashing Twentieth-Century Global Forces*, 91–122. Anthem Press, 2008, p. 97.

⁷⁰ Moss, “Imperialism, Nationalism, and Globalization,” 2008, p. 99.

⁷¹ Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence*, 2013, p. 37.

Cyprus in drafting a constitution. Self-determination functions as a way to legitimize an external authority and leads to the ideologies of the Cypriot nationalist groups. This evolution of nationalism and its relationship to violence is built on positing politics into the nationalist platforms. These assertions on nationalism and decolonization as outlined by Fanon, coincide with the historical analysis of Cypriot nationalist cleavages. The acceptance of the Western notion of 'nation' in the colonial sphere can be a non-violent endeavor, but most cases point to nationalism as a political rallying cry. Charlotte Heath-Kelly furthers this connection to Fanon's assertions by arguing that "resistance plays the same game as a hegemonic power and, if victorious, metamorphoses into it."⁷² Moreover, the learned acts of violence from the colonizer can be exploited by the anti-colonial resistance to dismantle all ties to the colonial power. Nationalism, in this case, finds its origins in the violence and political tactics of the former colonizer. The British 'divide and rule' policies created ethnic cleavages and instilled the notion of Western conceptualization of 'nation' into the Cypriot polity. The British colonial policies and violence seen during the colonial period contributed to this form of nationalism in Cyprus. Therefore, the British colonial presence on the island can be tied to the formation of Greek and Turkish Cypriot nationalist ideologies out of the group cleavages engendered by the British 'divide and rule.'

The prominent discourse on nationalism focuses on the need for a nation to form a collective identity and the desire for self-determination and agency. This examination of nationalism and its manifestation of political violence offers insight into the evolution from nationalism as a way to create a collective identity to inciting violence against political

⁷² Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence*, 2013, p. 15.

adversaries. Thus, this research analyzes literature that examines the rise of both Greek and Turkish Cypriot nationalist groups at the behest of British colonial and neo-colonial policies.

4.2. Rise of EOKA A and the Call for Enosis

With the domineering oppression of the Cypriot population by the British Empire, anti-colonial sentiments rose out of the Greek Cypriot community. Furthermore, the Greek Cypriots wanted to divorce from British rule and its divisive colonial tactics. This animosity towards British dominion spurred the notion of *enosis*, which advocated for Cypriot reunification with Greece. While this creed was founded on an anti-colonial philosophy that aimed to unify the Greek Cypriots against Great Britain, Greek Cypriot nationalism also has ties to Greek fanaticism. The sparks of nationalist ideologies in Greek Cypriots were inspired by the “national-liberating struggle of 1821” carried out by Greece to fulfill the *Meghali Idhea*.⁷³ The Greek *Meghali Idhea* (*Great Idea*) was a nationalist foreign policy that expanded greatly in the twentieth century and advocated to “restore a state akin to the Byzantine Empire in the Balkans and on both sides of the Aegean”, which could be naturally translated into the Greek Cypriot *enosis*.⁷⁴ Thus, the call for *enosis* aligned with the Greek *Meghali Idhea* and strengthened the relationship between Greece and the Greek Cypriots. The combination of the oppressive British policies during the colonial period and the support of Greek nationalists contributed to the inevitable violent turn in Greek Cypriot nationalism. The advocacy for *enosis* created discord between the coexisting entities.⁷⁵ The EOKA (translated to English as the ‘National

⁷³ Stefanos P. Papageorgiou, “The Genesis of the Greek and Turkish Nationalism in Cyprus, 1878-1914: A Common March at a Different Pace”. 2018. *Cyprus Review* 9 (1): 56-65. <https://cyprusreview.org/index.php/cr/article/view/510>.

⁷⁴ Andrew R. Novo. *The EOKA Cause: Nationalism and the Failure of Cypriot Enosis*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2022, p. 8.

⁷⁵ Christos Ioannides, “Cyprus, British Colonialism and the Seeds of Partition: From Coexistence to Communal Strife.” In *The Journal of Modern Hellenism*, no. 30 (2014): 41-72.

Organization of Cypriot Fighters’) movement functioned as a Greek Cypriot freedom and self-determination group that opposed the British colonial constraints on their culture and identity.⁷⁶ For this reason, the Greek Cypriot nationalist sentiment derived from British colonialism on the island.

This desire to reunify with Greece and take charge of forming their own identity before and after the transition to a postcolonial state highlights the idea that the lack of autonomy permitted by the colonial power incited nationalist violence. Also, the colonized experience under repressive measures and violent political tactics coalesces with Fanon’s argument that “the last becomes the first.”⁷⁷ This encapsulates the assertions that the colonized individuals take on the learned behaviors of the colonizers in their attempt to gain independence and autonomy. In other words, this once humanist and liberation platform for the Greek Cypriots became a justification for political violence because of the imposition of the British Empire to diminish the Greek Cypriot agency and rally the support of Greek nationalists.

The Greek Cypriot decolonization project, *enosis*, rose from the transition of the Ottoman Empire to the British Empire because of the imposed disenfranchisement and responsibilities of the Greek Orthodox Church on the island, which had been upheld during Ottoman rule.⁷⁸ The mistreatment and neglect of the Greek Orthodox Church in Greek Cypriot society incited the advocacy for anti-colonial rhetoric and civil unrest. While *enosis* aimed to alleviate the colonial struggle, it also drew upon the Greek Cypriot ties to the “immorality of Hellenism” that sought to inspire younger generations to become freedom fighters.⁷⁹ The shift from the Ottoman Empire

⁷⁶ Andrekos Varnava, *Assassination in Colonial Cyprus in 1934 and the Origins of the EOKA: Reading the Archives Against the Grain*, Anthem Press, 2021. All translations from this book from Greek to English were checked by the Republic of Cyprus’ government or were Varnava’s own translations.

⁷⁷ Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 2004, p. 10.

⁷⁸ Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence*, 2013, p. 26.

⁷⁹ Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence*, 2013, p. 28.

to the British Empire provoked these nationalist ideals through the ‘divide and rule’ that explicitly displayed the ethnic and cultural differences between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots. It can be argued that the British campaign of ‘divide and rule’ laid the foundation that was needed to spur *enosis* and nationalist violence.

4.3. Revitalization of *Enosis* in EOKA B

The EOKA nationalist group was re-energized in the early twentieth century with the onset of the mass decolonization movements in the region. The causes of this rising nationalism are in response to many British intentional missteps in how they handled the prospect of Cypriot sovereignty. During World War II, the Greek Cypriot nationalists’ call for *enosis* was put on hold to focus on the war effort in hopes that it would inspire the British Empire to grant Cyprus independence and rejoin Greece.⁸⁰ Winston Churchill had proposed to the Greek Cypriots that he would grant them their independence if they sent troops and helped fight in the war, which he ultimately failed to follow through with.⁸¹ This created a mass dissent against the British colonial power because other colonies had gained their independence during the Age of Decolonization but the British Empire neglected the right to self-determination for the Cypriot community. This situation fueled their antagonism towards the British Empire and marked a turning point in Cyprus’ anti-colonialism movement that would inspire the violent turn to a reunion with Greece.

After World War II ended and the repressive measures by the British remained with no fulfillment of Cypriot independence in sight, EOKA dissipated its non-violent means for liberation and began the promotion of asserting Greek Cypriot political rights as the majority

⁸⁰ Novo. *The EOKA Cause*, 2022.

⁸¹ Panayiotopoulos, “The Emergent Post-colonial State in Cyprus,” 1999.

ethnic group on the island.⁸² With Greek Cypriots making up about eighty percent of the island's population, this foreboding shift in the EOKA movement raised cause for alarm for the Turkish Cypriots.

The British government aimed to find a way to silence Makarios III and his advocacy of *enosis* because he had gained the backing of both Greece and the EOKA movement. In July 1956, the spiritual and political leader of the Greek Cypriots, Makarios III, was exiled to Seychelles by the British colonial police to suppress *enosis*.⁸³ The exile of Makarios showed the British anxiety surrounding the anti-colonial sentiments and potential partitioning of the island and that the British government would intervene when its authority in Cyprus was threatened.

4.4. Turkish Cypriot Nationalism

Before Turkey was formally established in 1923, the Turkish Cypriots were mainly compliant with political obedience towards the British government.⁸⁴ In the years following Turkish independence, combined with the alienation of Turkish Cypriots from the Greek Cypriot nationalism, the notion of a Turkish Cypriot nationalism became part of Cypriot politics.

The Turkish Cypriot nationalist movement formed more than half a century after the Greek Cypriots' call for *enosis*. The Turkish Cypriots centralized their focus on the happenings within their localities and Islam. The conglomeration of the British policy of 'divide and rule', the foreign involvement from Turkey, and the militant stage of Greek Cypriot *enosis* triggered the turn to Turkish Cypriot nationalism.

⁸² Ioannides, "Cyprus, British Colonialism and the Seeds of Partition," 2014: 41-72.

⁸³ Kıralp, Şevki, and Ahmet Güneşli, "Ousting the Cypriot *Ethnarch*: President Makarios' Struggle against the Greek Junta, Cypriot Bishops, and Terrorism" *Religions* 12 (2021), no. 11: 944.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12110944>.

⁸⁴ Stefanos P. Papageorgiou, "The Genesis of the Greek and Turkish Nationalism in Cyprus, 1878-1914: A Common March at a Different Pace". 2018. *Cyprus Review* 9 (1): 56-65. <https://cyprusreview.org/index.php/cr/article/view/510>.

With the onset of decolonization in Cyprus, the Turkish Cypriot nationalist group backed the notion of *taksim*, which called for a partition of Cyprus that would reunite them with Turkey.⁸⁵ Before the beginning of the EOKA violent campaign in April 1955, the ‘Cyprus is Turkish Society’, which was later formed into the political entity known as the ‘Cyprus is Turkish Party’ (CTP), formally organized a Turkish nationalist party with Cyprus as its “rallying cry.”⁸⁶ This emphasizes that the Turkish Cypriot nationalist group had full backing from government organizations on the Turkish mainland. The CTP’s anti-Greek riots were under the impression that “Cyprus is a Turkish island, and if the British gave up the island it should be given back to Turkey.”⁸⁷ Moreover, the Turkish Cypriot nationalist group actively called for the separation of the two ethnic groups on the island and deemed the Turkish Cypriots the rightful proprietors of the island. This posed a perplexing dynamic between EOKA’s advocacy to reunite with Greece and the CTP’s call to action that would make Cyprus a solely Turkish nation.

The Turkish Cypriot nationalism offered an interesting take on the decolonization process and nationalism seen in Fanon. Fanon’s theory of decolonization involved a peasant-led revolution that fractured the fabric of colonial societies through violent tactics.⁸⁸ Most of the Muslim community in Cyprus lived in rural areas as farmers and worked within a semi-feudal framework without a middle class.⁸⁹ An interesting aspect of peasantry in the Cypriot colony during the era of British rule underscores the notion that focuses on “the civilizing process of the peasant’ as the feature of correct behavior in modern developed societies.”⁹⁰ The civilizing

⁸⁵ Neophytos Loizides. “The Ottoman Empire.” In *Visions of Empire: How Five Imperial Regimes Shaped the World*, 74–144. Princeton University Press, 2017.

⁸⁶ Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence*, 2013, p. 52.

⁸⁷ Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence*, 2013, p. 53.

⁸⁸ Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 2004.

⁸⁹ Eleni Apeyitou, “The Turkish-Cypriot Nationalism: Its History and Development (1571-1960).” In *The Cyprus Review* 15, no.1 (2003): 67-98.

⁹⁰ Costas Constantinou, “Transgressing the Nation: In Defence of Cypriot Peasantry and Rustic Politics”. 2020. *Cyprus Review* 31 (1): 73-98. <https://cyprusreview.org/index.php/cr/article/view/630>.

tactic in this context works to oppress a foreign population by degrading the peasant in a colonial society. With that said, the Turkish Cypriot nationalism was not an anti-colonial movement that resisted the Western metropolitan culture as outlined in Partha Chatterjee's understanding of nationalism and peasantry.⁹¹ The Turkish Cypriot nationalism was utilized as a weapon against the Greek Cypriot nationalism, founded on anti-colonialism. This introduces a dialectical formation of the peasant question in rising nationalism in Cyprus because it did not work against the Western metropole and functioned as a way for the colonial power to maintain control in Cyprus without ceding sovereignty to the polity. Moreover, the CTP was under the impression that the anti-colonial nationalism seen from the Greek Cypriots would not work against the Turkish Cypriot representation on the island, aligning them in favor of maintaining British authority on the island. This would limit the external control of Greece over Cypriot affairs and would work to benefit an increase of Turkish and Turkish Cypriot representation in Cypriot internal governance. This situation is personified in the alliance that was formed between Turkey and Great Britain to reject the possibility of *enosis*.

With the rise of the CTP, the main Turkish Cypriot political parties promoted the partitioning of the island between the two ethnic communities.⁹² This ethnonationalism stems from the political landscape that was molded by the British Empire's 'divide and rule' objective to isolate the communities. Consequently, a key element of Greek Cypriot nationalism mirrored in Turkish Cypriot nationalism is that both entities accuse the other of being heavily influenced by their 'Motherland'.⁹³ Thus, Turkish and Greek authority over Cypriot affairs created a dualism of the Cypriot identity while diminishing the autonomy of the Cypriot citizens. This led

⁹¹ Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*, Princeton University Press, 1993.

⁹² Joseph S. Joseph, *Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics*, 1997th Edition, Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.

⁹³ Ker-Lindsay, *The Cyprus Problem: What Everyone Needs to Know*, 2011.

to Great Britain becoming heavily involved in the transitional period as a way to take advantage of the ethnic cleavage formed from the ‘divide and rule’ policies.

4.5. *Great Britain's Weaponization of Enosis*

The British Empire’s involvement in the *enosis* movement demonstrated how it leveraged the rising Turkish nationalist group and alienated the Greek Cypriots to keep its influence over the island. The British Empire outwardly opposed EOKA A and *enosis* by exploiting their Cypriot subjects into believing they were not civilized enough to take part in a government that adhered to the ‘West’. ⁹⁴ Following Fanon’s theory of decolonization, colonialism relies on the colonized subjects viewing themselves as inferior and their ‘barbarous’ predisposition towards Western notions of progress. ⁹⁵ The British Empire instilled this divisive and ‘medieval’ interpretation of the contemporary populace of Cyprus to further oppress any inkling of resistance.

With the growing threat of partition and radical nationalism, the UN and other states, such as India and Great Britain, advocated against this union between the Greek Cypriots and Greece, and thus, gave the Turkish Cypriot population veto power in the new constitution over the “executive and legislative decisions.” ⁹⁶ The majority of the island was populated by Greek Cypriots, but granting the Turkish Cypriots this veto caused a power shift and augmented the mistrust between the two communities during their transitional years to a state. This relates to the discourse about how Great Britain intensified the ethnic tension that prompted Greek Cypriot nationalism.

⁹⁴ Heath-Kelly, *Politics of Violence*, 2013.

⁹⁵ Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 2004.

⁹⁶ Ioannides, “Cyprus, British Colonialism and the Seeds of Partition: From Coexistence to Communal Strife,” 2014, p. 65.

An intentionally silenced narrative relating to the British-EOKA relations revolves around the assassination in 1934 of Antonios Triantafyllides, a lawyer and trusted advisor to the Greek Prime Minister, which set the EOKA B movement into motion. In an interview in 2002 with Triantafyllides's son, Michalakis A. Triantafyllides, shed light on new revelations regarding the importance of this assassination to the EOKA movement. Antonios Triantafyllides was a prominent advocate for *enosis*. When he decided to follow the Greek Prime Minister's plan to cooperate with the British Empire to reunite Cyprus with Greece, the fanatical group for *enosis* feared the British intervention and staged the assassination in retaliation.⁹⁷ The distrust between the Greek Cypriots and the British colonial power enflamed the need for violent escalation to decolonize. This noted change in Antonios Triantafyllides's stance on *enosis* tied back to the consequences of the burning of the Government House in the Cypriot city of Nicosia in 1931, which included "the suspension of the constitution, abolition of the legislative council, the imposition of press censorship and deporting of leading nationalists."⁹⁸ These violent acts of resistance follow Fanon's violent understanding of decolonization. The assassination of a fellow Greek Cypriot by the nationalists illustrated the internal divisions that shifted focus from anti-colonial movements to infighting and echoes the oppressive 'divide and rule' policies of the British Empire.

Turning to the role of the British Empire in the struggle between nationalist identities in Cyprus, the opposing nationalist group represented within the Turkish Cypriots was used to the advantage of the colonial power to suppress Greek Cypriot decolonization efforts. Greek and Turkish Cypriots had maintained ties and advocated for reunification with Greece and Turkey.

⁹⁷ Varnava, *Assassination in Colonial Cyprus in 1934 and the Origins of the EOKA: Reading the Archives Against the Grain*, 2021.

⁹⁸ Varnava, *Assassination in Colonial Cyprus in 1934 and the Origins of the EOKA: Reading the Archives Against the Grain*, 2021, p. 2.

This advocacy manifested in nationalist movements due to the intervention of Western hegemonies, more specifically, the British Empire.

The rise of Greek Cypriot nationalism in the early twentieth century also perpetuated Turkish Cypriot oppression.⁹⁹ Once the EOKA group directly excluded the Turkish Cypriots from the narrative of the Cypriot colonial struggles, the British Empire swooped in and “offered incentives to the Turkish Cypriots to counter Greek Cypriot demands.”¹⁰⁰ The former colonial power bolstered these differing political ideologies between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots power through tactics that diminished their autonomy. This, in turn, furthered the ethnic cleavage between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

The most incriminating evidence that ties the British weaponization of *enosis* to its neo-colonial agenda of retaining authority in Cyprus’ geostrategic location during the transition era relates to the telegram from the British Foreign Office to Ambassador Menderes on November 9, 1955. The telegram details the plan of the British Foreign Office to maintain Cyprus as a military base to carry out their political affairs in the Middle East while confessing the British alliance with Turkey. The telegram from the British Foreign Office stated Great Britain’s stance on the Cyprus Problem:

“Meanwhile we have given a firm demonstration of the will and ability to maintain our authority. But as a base, Cyprus can never be fully effective so long as our troops are tied down to local security. We must therefore not neglect any political opportunity to improve our position. Such an opportunity may now exist.....Our

⁹⁹ Prodromos Panayiotopoulos, “The Emergent Post-colonial State in Cyprus.” In *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 37, no. 1 (1999): 31–55.

¹⁰⁰ Loizides, “The Ottoman Empire,” 2007, p. 176.

purpose is to create conditions in Cyprus where the base will be fully effective as a vital instrument of all our policies in the Middle East, in which the Turkish Government and people are playing so eminent a part.”¹⁰¹

This excerpt from the British Foreign Office’s telegram compromised its neutrality on the constructed ethnic cleavages and implied that the rise in nationalism on the island could work to meet their goals of a proxy military base in the range of Middle Eastern conflicts. The Top-Secret telegram from the British Foreign Office professed the key motivations for remaining in Cyprus. The incentives for imposing on Cypriot affairs concerned proliferating military bases and furthering the British foreign policy in Middle Eastern affairs. Furthermore, the alliance between the British government and Turkey before the establishment of the Cyprus Constitution in 1960 introduced another layer to British involvement in the nationalist conflicts and argued in favor of the British weaponization of *enosis*. It also positioned a unilateral proclivity towards the Turkish Cypriots in the founding documents for the Cypriot postcolonial state. This alliance relates to the British policy failings during the Suez crisis in the 1950s, which led them to shift gears and realize that “they no longer needed to maintain control over the *whole* of Cyprus.”¹⁰² Gaining influence over the region that encapsulated the Suez Canal was a geostrategic motivation for the British colonial efforts in Cyprus to be at the forefront of the Middle Eastern oil trade and suppress any anti-British propaganda.¹⁰³ In the summer of 1955, the British

¹⁰¹ Telegram No. 532, From Foreign Office to Geneva (United Kingdom Delegation to the Meeting of Foreign Ministers), 9 November 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew. <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>.

¹⁰² Cemal Yorgancıoğlu and Şevki Kıralp, “Turco-British Relations, Cold War and Reshaping the Middle East: Egypt, Greece and Cyprus (1954—1958).” *Middle Eastern Studies* 55, no. 6 (2019): 914–31, p. 914. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48543905>.

¹⁰³ Yorgancıoğlu and Kıralp, “Turco-British Relations, Cold War and Reshaping the Middle East: Egypt, Greece and Cyprus (1954—1958),” 2019.

government feared the potential alliance between the nationalists in Egypt and Cyprus because they would work in tandem to oppose Western intervention in the Middle East and threaten regional stability.¹⁰⁴ This led to the British government dissolving the Suez Treaty and withdrawing forces from Egypt to protect its authority and ally, Turkey, in Middle Eastern affairs.¹⁰⁵ Therefore, the heavy anti-colonial sentiment from the Greek Cypriots and failings in Middle Eastern affairs emphasized the continued alliance between Great Britain and Turkey. This situation, combined with Telegram No. 532, offers a shift in British foreign policy that finds an alliance with Turkey as a way to maintain control in Cyprus. By joining forces with Turkey, Great Britain was able to aid in furthering the ‘divide and rule’ tactic in Cyprus as well as between the countries of Greece and Turkey.

Indeed, tensions existed between these two ethnic groups, but this rise in nationalism yielded to the intervention of the former colonial power. Both nationalist groups grew out of the anti-colonial struggle against the British Empire and were weaponized to enflame the discord between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots on the island of Cyprus. The British Empire and its everlasting imprint on Cypriot society kept the state from rehabilitating from its colonial past. These examples of the weaponization of *enosis* reconcile how the effects of colonialism and neo-colonialism instigated ethnic differences in a postcolonial state. This analysis differs from previous notions that ethnonationalist conflict was inevitable in multicultural societies.

¹⁰⁴ Yorgancıoğlu and Kıralp, “Turco-British Relations, Cold War and Reshaping the Middle East: Egypt, Greece and Cyprus (1954—1958),” 2019.

¹⁰⁵ Yorgancıoğlu and Kıralp, “Turco-British Relations, Cold War and Reshaping the Middle East: Egypt, Greece and Cyprus (1954—1958),” 2019.

Chapter 5: Independence and the Struggle of a Postcolonial State

“In 1959, the Greek government allegedly gave Mr. Makarios an ultimatum: either he accepted the Agreements as they stood or Greece would abandon him, and Cyprus, still a British colony, would in all probability be partitioned between Greece and Turkey. Consequently, says Mr. Polyviou, Mr. Makarios eventually signed.”¹⁰⁶

-Michael Moran 2001

Chapter 5 conducts a historical inquiry into the role of the former colonial power, Great Britain, during Cyprus’ transitional years as an independent postcolonial state in the imperialist world system. The essential treaties and legislation during this period showcase how the British continued to be greatly involved in Cypriot affairs.

5.1. Zurich-London Accords (1959-1960)

From the very beginning of Cyprus’ transition to an independent state, its security was challenged by the development of Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot nationalism. To keep some semblance of stability in the transitional period to a postcolonial state, the Agreements in the Zurich-London Accords of 1959-1960 provided the groundwork for the Republic of Cyprus as an independent state but decided to withhold the ability to unite with Greece or partition the land without any input from the Turkish or Greek Cypriots.¹⁰⁷

The Treaty of Guarantee within the Zurich-London Accords functioned as a solidifying measure from the West to suppress nationalist agendas and codify the constitution as the indisputable law of the land. As outlined in the Treaty of Guarantee in the Zurich-London Accords, Greece, Turkey, and Britain, all had the right to take control of political conflicts about

¹⁰⁶ Michael Moran, “CYPRUS AND THE 1960 ACCORDS: NATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM.” In *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs* 1, no.2 (June-July 2001). Moran’s paper was orally presented in Nicosia on April 5, 2001 about the Zurich-London Accords of 1959-1960.

¹⁰⁷ Glen D. Camp, “Greek-Turkish Conflict over Cyprus.” In *Political Science Quarterly* 95, no. 1 (1980): 43–70.

enosis and partition. This treaty outlines the constitutional rights of a few selected states that were chosen to redefine and reestablish Cypriot internal affairs. This granted Greece, Turkey, and Great Britain control over the Cyprus Problem. From its conception, Greek Cypriots explicitly opposed the enactment of the Treaty of Guarantee because it diminished the sovereignty and autonomy of the Republic of Cyprus.¹⁰⁸

The Treaty of Guarantee, the Treaty of Establishment, and the Treaty of Alliance emphasized the British Empire's attempts to maintain a foothold in Cypriot political and military affairs. The Treaty of Guarantee enabled Great Britain, Greece, and Turkey the right to establish order within Cyprus and allowed Great Britain to establish Sovereign Base Areas (SBAs).¹⁰⁹ This was ideal for the British government because it allowed them to maintain their influence in the Mediterranean region.

The guarantor powers also functioned as a way to limit American intervention in the Cyprus Problem and dictated terms for a Cypriot state. In a telegram addressed to Washington, the British Foreign Office "firmly discouraged the Americans from putting their noses into the Cyprus affair" and stated that too many intervening powers would not be effective.¹¹⁰ This telegram to Washington in October 1955 illustrates that the negotiations for the postcolonial framework of an independent Cypriot state did not heavily rely on American interference. This is important to note because, in later years, the British government fell back on the United States as a scapegoat for rising tensions in the region even though they were rejected from these pivotal discussions.¹¹¹ The British government has a pattern of utilizing the US as a pawn for

¹⁰⁸ Ker-Lindsay, *The Cyprus Problem: What Everyone Needs to Know*, 2011.

¹⁰⁹ Souter, "An Island Apart: A Review of the Cyprus Problem," 1984.

¹¹⁰ Telegram No. 4465, From Foreign Office to Washington, 1 October 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew. <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>.

¹¹¹ Souter, "An Island Apart: A Review of the Cyprus Problem," 1984.

intelligence and manipulative diplomacy. Therefore, the establishment of the guarantor powers marked a vital development in the Cyprus Problem because it allowed the British government to pave a future for Cyprus that acted on its self-supporting interests in the region.

These steps taken to legitimize the Westernization of Cyprus in the 1960 Constitution and British leadership on the island further proved the discriminatory and suppressive nature of the constitutional tenets imposed on the Cyprus polity. The accords acted as an idealistic pipe dream instead of an actionable roadmap to give autonomy to the Republic of Cyprus. The failure to address these power struggles, opposing political platforms, and cultural differences would perpetuate the nationalist tendencies in Cyprus that ultimately led to the human rights violations seen in 1974. The Zurich-London Accords highlight how British intervention controlled the fate of the Cypriot state without allowing their citizens and government to chart their own course. The lack of agency and control over their own transition to an independent state caused a rift between the rivaling ethnic groups in Cyprus, creating opposing identities manifested in nationalism.

5.2. The 1960 Constitution for the Republic of Cyprus

The transitional period and the Age of Decolonization shed light on the lack of agency in postcolonial states. It is important to call attention to the tendency for decolonial methods to act on “premature transfers of power, sometimes with disastrous consequences.”¹¹² Moreover, this emphasizes that the colonies become independent before being prepared to govern themselves and create a collective national identity. In other words, these postcolonial states were not set up to succeed within the modern imperialist world system; they would need to depend on ‘Western’

¹¹² C. E. Carrington, “Decolonization: The Last Stages.” In *International Affairs* (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-) 38, no. 1 (1962), 29–40, 31.

nations. Therefore, the difficult relationship between the colony and the empire does not end when it becomes an independent state.

The 1960 Constitution that granted Cyprus its independence was designed by the British and the fellow guarantor powers to institutionalize ethnic differences within the Cypriot political system. This was done by having the Greek Cypriots elect the President, Makarios, and the Turkish Cypriots elect the Vice President, Kuquk, but allowing both to exercise veto power over major political decisions.¹¹³ This constitution systemically divided Cyprus into two opposing ethnic communities while simultaneously delegitimizing any calls for *enosis* or *taksim*. While independence was a great feat for the anti-colonial battle cries from the Cypriot communities, the Greek Cypriots approached the Republic of Cyprus as a failure of their *enosis* movement.¹¹⁴ In the negotiations set out in the constitution, the Greek Cypriots lost their long-awaited reunification with Greece and their influence over the island.

The 1960 Constitution gave equal political power to the Turkish Cypriots who made up 18% of the Cypriot population.¹¹⁵ Even though the military was split up by Greek and Turkish Cypriots, the communities could not agree on whether they should be integrated or remain separate units.¹¹⁶ The most debated aspect amongst the Cypriot community involving the 1960 Constitution concerned the local and municipal levels of the Cypriot government. The main towns and cities on the island were meant to be separated by ethnic divisions, but the individuals were spread out across the island, making this impossible to implement.¹¹⁷ The divisive measures taken to bisect the Cypriot population into municipalities based on ethnicity fostered a

¹¹³ Souter, "An Island Apart: A Review of the Cyprus Problem," 1984.

¹¹⁴ Ker-Lindsay, *The Cyprus Problem: What Everyone Needs to Know*, 2011.

¹¹⁵ Ker-Lindsay, *The Cyprus Problem: What Everyone Needs to Know*, 2011.

¹¹⁶ Ker-Lindsay, *The Cyprus Problem: What Everyone Needs to Know*, 2011.

¹¹⁷ Ker-Lindsay, *The Cyprus Problem: What Everyone Needs to Know*, 2011.

deep distrust in the sanctity of the 1960 Constitution. The institutional dichotomy between the Turkish and Greek Cypriots presented in the 1960 Constitution for the Republic of Cyprus would be a leading cause in the ethnic violence of 1974. Thus, granting Cyprus independence acted as a project to combat *enosis* and reunification with Greece because if Cyprus reunited with Greece, then Great Britain would lose control over the island and its access to its geostrategic location.

5.3. President Makarios and the Domestic Ethnic Conflict in 1963

In November 1963, three years following the Republic of Cyprus' Constitution of 1960, the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Makarios III, who was also the archbishop of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus, proposed thirteen amendments to strengthen Greek Cypriot authority on the island. In his proposition, Archbishop Makarios III emphasized the abandonment of the President and Vice President's veto power, unifying municipalities and the administration of justice, and stripping away the representation of Turkish Cypriots in political institutions.¹¹⁸ Even though these amendments were rejected by Turkish Cypriots, Makarios's proposal accentuated the political divisions between the two main ethnic groups on the island that were struggling for control of the state.

1963 also shows a vital moment in the developing hostility between the nationalist groups. On the night of December 21, 1963, Turkish Cypriots were stopped during a Greek Cypriot roadblock in Nicosia, which resulted in a breakout of violent mass protests across the city and, a few days later, across the entire island.¹¹⁹ On Christmas Day 1963, "Turkey ordered three fighter aircraft to fly at low level over Nicosia" while Greek and Turkish Cypriot forces continued the ethnic clash on the ground.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ Ker-Lindsay, *The Cyprus Problem: What Everyone Needs to Know*, 2011.

¹¹⁹ Ker-Lindsay, *The Cyprus Problem: What Everyone Needs to Know*, 2011.

¹²⁰ James Ker-Lindsay, *Britain and the Cyprus Crisis, 1963-1964*, Bibliopolis, 2004, p. 25.

During this crisis, the biggest concern for the British was to protect their Sovereign Base Areas and military forces on the island, but British leadership feared retribution from the other guarantor powers if the other guarantor powers laid siege to the island.¹²¹ After much deliberation, President Makarios agreed to a tripartite intervention, known as the Joint Truce Force (JTF), involving the guarantor powers, Great Britain, Turkey, and Greece, with British authority overtaking this initiative.¹²² This peacekeeping intervention of the guarantor powers follows the agreements established in the Zurich-London Accords. Thus, this task force marked the first documented implementation of all three guarantor powers mediating the onset of a Cypriot civil war. Unfortunately, the JTF was a cooperative effort of all three guarantors in name only, and “the full cooperation of both the Greek and Turkish Army contingents was never realised beyond a superficial level.”¹²³ This acknowledges how the British government took over the authoritative position within the task force. Therefore, the Greek Cypriots were on edge with British involvement in their republic’s affairs. The Greek community in Cyprus outwardly accused the Turkish Cypriot leadership of “being used as a ‘tool’ by the British to ensure partition.”¹²⁴ While the JTF seemed like the ideal ceasefire, the peacekeeping efforts were practically ineffective because of the unrelenting infighting and the Cypriot police physically preventing the JTF from intervening.¹²⁵ This resulted in the inability of the JTF to carry out its mission and instill proper peacemaking actions on the island.

The later months of 1963 marked a turning point in the tensions between Greek and Turkish Cypriots. Ultimately, the altercations and infighting of 1963 led to the dismantling of

¹²¹ Ker-Lindsay, *Britain and the Cyprus Crisis, 1963-1964*, 2004.

¹²² Ker-Lindsay, *Britain and the Cyprus Crisis, 1963-1964*, 2004.

¹²³ Ker-Lindsay, *Britain and the Cyprus Crisis, 1963-1964*, 2004, p.119.

¹²⁴ Ker-Lindsay, *Britain and the Cyprus Crisis, 1963-1964*, 2004, p. 115.

¹²⁵ Ker-Lindsay, *Britain and the Cyprus Crisis, 1963-1964*, 2004.

Turkish Cypriot involvement in state institutions on the island and the creation of Turkish Cypriot Enclaves protected by Turkish and Turkish Cypriot troops.¹²⁶ The violent infighting of 1963 followed the unprecedented involvement of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member states Greece and Turkey in the Cypriot intercommunal violence.¹²⁷

With the increased hostility between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots during the years between 1963 to 1964, Archbishop Makarios expressed deep dissent towards Turkish involvement in Cypriot affairs. The Republic of Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs emphasized a heavily debated quote from Makarios III on a possible Turkish invasion of Cyprus:

“This was in accordance with Makarios' publicized dictum back in August 1964 that ‘If Turkey came to save Turkish Cypriots, Turkey would find no Turkish Cypriots to save.’”¹²⁸

The sanctity and meaning of this quote have been debated by political scientists and scholars of the Cyprus Problem. The presumed interpretation of Makarios III's statement features a threatening tone towards Turkey if they were to forcefully invade Cyprus. This quote has faced serious scrutiny from Turkish Cypriots and Turkish citizens alike. This excerpt puts forth a narrative that showcases the precarious nature of Makarios III's leadership and the escalating division between the two communities on the island. Makarios's disdain for Western values and advocacy for violence put the United States and the UK on high alert of his actions in the following years.

¹²⁶ Ker-Lindsay, *The Cyprus Problem: What Everyone Needs to Know*, 2011.

¹²⁷ Joseph, *Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics*, 1997th Edition, 1997.

¹²⁸ Denktas, Rauf R. “Letter Sent by TRNC President Rauf Denktas to the Greek Cypriot Leader Glafkos Clerides, 22 September 1996.” Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1996. https://www.mfa.gov.tr/letter-sent-by-trnc-president-rauf-denktas-to-the-greek-cypriot-leader-glafkos-clerides_-22-september-1996.en.mfa.

5.4. 1964 Crises

The year of 1964 can be identified as a pivotal turning point in Western involvement in Cypriot affairs. With growing hostilities between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots, foreign interventions were called upon to take control of potential militarized actions from Turkey and Greece in Cyprus. The threat of a Cypriot crisis facing NATO partners led American NATO leaders to spearhead a plan that was “proposed for the restoration of peace and promotion of a political settlement of the problem,” which was rejected by President Makarios.¹²⁹ The rejection of this proposal in early 1964 would be followed by the creation of a UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) to replace the dwindling authority of the JTF. In February 1964, the UN Security Council established UNFICYP through Resolution 186, made up of mainly British and Canadian contingents, as a preemptive measure to prevent further escalation.¹³⁰

The critical altercation in August of 1964 resulted from Turkish air bombardments, which led to the exact outcome NATO feared, the mass military mobilization of Greek and Turkish groups on Cyprus’ borders.¹³¹ It was well documented by the Security Council that the Turkish “air attacks bore NATO markings and were intended for NATO purposes.”¹³² This raises the question of NATO’s motivations in contributing to the air bombardment in 1964 since it resulted in an undesirable outcome of Greek and Turkish mobilization and created a weakened foreign presence and stability in Cyprus. On the other hand, NATO greatly opposed President Makarios’s leadership and rejection of Western proposed resolutions, and a direct attack on Cyprus could weaken Makarios’s influence or make him give in to the Western agenda planned for Cyprus. This instability also mirrored the opposition's goals for its authoritative power. The

¹²⁹ Joseph, *Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics*, 1997th Edition, 1997, p. 82.

¹³⁰ United Nations, “Establishment of UNFICYP.” UNFICYP, August 28, 2020.

<https://unficy.org/unmissions.org/establishment-unficy>.

¹³¹ Joseph, *Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics*, 1997th Edition, 1997.

¹³² Joseph, *Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics*, 1997th Edition, 1997, p.82.

British gained the most from the Turkish air bombardments by delegitimizing NATO's presence in Cyprus and exacerbating ethnic divisions on the island. This situation also points to the inaction of the British government and the alliance between Great Britain and Turkey. British intervention was not highlighted in this crisis because the air bombardments from Turkey and infighting bolstered internal instability, which was to the benefit of Great Britain. The division of the Cypriot polity and attack aimed to weaken President Makarios III's leadership in Cyprus were advantageous endeavors for British neo-colonial goals in Cyprus. The potentiality for Greek and Turkish Cypriot armed hostilities would strengthen the need for a British presence on the island as a guarantor power. Thus, this moment speaks to a key tactic of British neo-colonialism in Cyprus: purposeful inaction.

August 1964 also featured the Geneva Conference where the Acheson Plan was proposed to implement a 'double enosis'. Dean Acheson, the US Secretary of State, called for the dissolution of Cyprus by reuniting Cyprus with Greece while also dividing the island into eight cantons, with Turkey in control of two for military purposes.¹³³ The proposal ultimately failed, but it is important to note the solutions put forth by Western interveners. With the failed plan for double enosis in conjunction with the threat of Makarios's leadership in one of the most crucial geostrategic locations for American foreign policy in the mid-twentieth century, the US Department of State bombed Cyprus in hopes of permanently taking out Makarios.¹³⁴ The State Department's mission failed with the archbishop surviving the attack, which only heightened Makarios's dissent towards Western intervention and British involvement in Cyprus.

¹³³ Joseph, *Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics*, 1997th Edition, 1997.

¹³⁴ Joseph, *Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics*, 1997th Edition, 1997.

5.5. 1967 Crisis and Reactions from Turkish Cypriot Enclaves

Another important event in these transitional years from a colony to an independent state was the crisis of 1967. This incident marks a pivotal turning point in the Cyprus conflict because it presents a physically hostile demonstration related to the rising ethnic tensions between Turkish and Greek Cypriots. The Greek Cypriot nationalists breached the UN protocols for self-defense because the “use of armed force was permissible only in self-defense” or when “all peaceful means of persuasion had failed.”¹³⁵ In other words, the Greek Cypriots instigated a domestic altercation without regard to the UN charter that laid out the rationale for armed conflict within Cyprus. The Greek Cypriots’ explicit disregard for international legality diminished any prospect for reconciliation.

The 1967 incident outlines how both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots acted in tandem to exacerbate the desire for Greek Cypriots to realign with Greece and the Turkish Cypriots to partition the land. This narrative has been absent from discussions leading up to the nationalist violence, but it is important to mention in this literature review because it shows heightened tensions in the community and incited Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots to retaliate against their Greek counterparts. The literature that covers the years following the decolonization of Cyprus demonstrates a historical approach to how the transition from a colony to a republic exacerbated ties between Greek and Turkish Cypriots because the foreign actors held too much power over the circumstances of this transition. Even with the involvement of the US and Western supranational organizations, President Makarios III could not agree on a Cyprus solution. Further, the 1967 crisis reinforced the presumed impossibility of creating a unified

¹³⁵ Esref Aksu, “The UN in the Cyprus Conflict: UNFICYP.” In *The United Nations, Intra-State Peacekeeping and Normative Change*. Manchester University Press, 2003, p. 147.

Cyprus during its decolonization period because of the divisions that the British Empire created during the Cypriot colonial era and then perpetuated with its neo-colonial tactics.

The UN and Great Britain held power and influence over Cyprus during the transitional years to a nation-state but chose not to interfere during the 1967 incident in Kophinou due to the international system's distaste for coercive action.¹³⁶ This inaction raises the question of British motivations as the lead guarantor power. Why would the British government choose not to interfere in the Cypriot domestic conflict that would irreparably cleave the nation and increase the chances for nationalist violence? As a guarantor power, the crisis of 1967 posed a threat to the future of Cyprus as a sovereign state, but as a former colonial power, it opened up an opportunity to implement 'divide and rule' tactics on an independent state.

The transitional period between Cypriot independence in 1960 and the ethnic conflict of 1974 that led to the partition of the island formulates a correlation of events that contributed to the rise of ethnic divisions in Cyprus. As seen in the founding documents and accords of the Republic of Cyprus, the Western intervention and guarantor powers diminished the ability of the Cypriot nation to become a fully sovereign state. The consequences of the Zurich-London Accords and the 1960 Constitution were illustrated in the fallout of the crises in 1963, 1964, and 1967. The leading guarantor power, Great Britain, not only failed to prevent the rising threat of civil war and the numerous violent altercations between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots but also exacerbated these situations through its interventions. Overall, the crucial years during the transition to a sovereign state emphasized the British priorities of keeping Cyprus as a military base and geostrategic proxy.

¹³⁶ Aksu, "The UN in the Cyprus Conflict: UNFICYP," 2003.

Chapter 6: Investigating the Cyprus Problem

“It is with deep anxiety that I am communicating with you to inform you that Turkey has committed an act of aggression and invaded Cyprus, putting in grave danger the independence of the country. I am appealing to you for any assistance possible for safeguarding the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus.”¹³⁷

-Recovered telegram from Archbishop

Makarios to Todor Zhivkov

July 27, 1974

This section outlines the lead-up to the Turkish military invasion of 1974 while emphasizing the role of the British government in intervening efforts. Also, this section underscores how the imperialist world system, defined by the power politics of conflict, nationalism, and globalization, enabled the British neo-colonial tactics seen in Cyprus. In doing this, neo-colonialism has allowed Great Britain to assert itself as the permanent body of power in a foreign land.

6.1. *The Turkish Military Invasion of 1974*

The nationalist violence in Northern Cyprus in 1974 created one of the most complex geopolitical conflicts in the modern era. The ethnic cleavages between the Turkish and Greek Cypriots were at an all-time high due to British neo-colonial tactics of ‘divide and rule’ and alliance with Turkey. President Makarios III was in a perilous position within Cyprus during the 1970s. With his begrudging acquiescence to Western intervention and opposition to the violence caused by EOKA B’s *enosis* efforts jeopardized the safety and legitimacy of President Makarios

¹³⁷ Makarios III, Archbishop of Cyprus. *Telegram from Archbishop Makarios to Todor Zhivkov*. November 20, 2011. *Wilson Center Digital Archive*. Todor Zhivkov was the de-facto leader of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria under communist regime. The recovered telegram was dated seven days after the invasion of Turkey. The telegram was written to rally support from the international community against Turkey’s invasion.

III. In a report from the Central Intelligence Agency, a failed assassination attempt of President Makarios III took place on March 9, 1970.¹³⁸ A memorandum from March 1972 from the Holy Synod of the Church of Cyprus called for the resignation of Makarios III as President of Cyprus because of his waning support for the EOKA B's violence in its *enosis* movement.¹³⁹

The July days leading up to the invasion explained how EOKA B, the Greek Cypriot Nationalist Organization, was prepared to stage a coup d'état to overthrow President Makarios III because he was no longer as radical as the *enosis* supporters wanted and planned to install Nikos Sampson in his place.¹⁴⁰ The coup d'état by the Greeks and Greek Cypriots removed President Makarios III from office and outlined a plan to reunite with Greece.

The Greeks, with the help of EOKA B, first orchestrated an exhibition to forcefully annex the island of Cyprus in early July of 1974, predating the Turkish Cypriot nationalist violence that removed the Greek Cypriots from the North.¹⁴¹ As outlined in the Treaty of Guarantee, Greece, Turkey, and Britain all had the right to take control of political conflicts pertaining to *enosis* and partition, so the Turkish government believed that the treaty would be violated if they acted on these Guarantor powers. Since the tripartite guarantor powers were created to reestablish Cypriot internal affairs and stop the fulfillment of *enosis*, the Turkish government claimed that they had the legal obligation to intervene. The Turkish military invasion occurred in a two-fold effort. On July 20, 1974, Turkish forces landed in Cyprus and captured 3 percent of the island.¹⁴² As the

¹³⁸ Document 531, Central Intelligence Agency, Records of the Directorate of Intelligence, Intelligence Information Cables. Secret; Priority; No Foreign Dissem. Prepared in the CIA and sent to members of the Intelligence Community, 9 March, 1970. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76v29/d407>.

¹³⁹ Document 407, Information Memorandum From the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs (Sisco) to Secretary of State Rogers, National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970-73, POL 15-1 CYP. Secret. Drafted by Boyatt and cleared by Davies, 2 March 1972. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76v29/d407>.

¹⁴⁰ Adamantia Pollis, "Cyprus: Nationalism vs. Human Rights." In *Universal Human Rights* 1, no. 2 (1979): 89-102.

¹⁴¹ Ker-Lindsay, "The Cyprus Problem." In *Frozen Conflicts in Europe*, edited by Anton Bebler, 1st ed., 19-34. Verlag Barbara Budrich, 2015.

¹⁴² Ker-Lindsay, "The Cyprus Problem," 2015.

guarantor powers met to discuss the future of Cyprus during the ceasefire period that lasted from July 22nd to August 12th, the Turkish military troops stealthily moved deeper into Cypriot territory, and on August 13, 1974, they “bombed Nicosia and seized 38 percent of the island.”¹⁴³ It is important to note that while the first phase of the Turkish military invasion can be deemed as a guarantor power legally acting on its responsibility to intervene in Cypriot internal affairs, the second phase has been widely discredited by the international system as a justified act of violence because it claimed occupation over an independent state.

When the Turkish government forcefully invaded Northern Cyprus, it resulted in numerous missing persons that still have not been found, the displacement of 160,000 Greek and Turkish Cypriots, and the division of Cyprus into two parts separated by a UN Buffer Zone.¹⁴⁴ Even after almost 50 years, the Cyprus Problem is still at a stalemate. In short, the Cyprus Problem is the ongoing occupation of Northern Cyprus by the Turks and Turkish Cypriots, which is not recognized as a sovereign state by any country except Turkey, and the permanent presence of the UN buffer zone. The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) has continued to advocate for recognized sovereignty from the international system, which has been strenuously opposed by the Republic of Cyprus. The Republic of Cyprus is now mainly populated by the Greek Cypriots. A precarious development with the notion of sovereignty concerns the formal establishment of the TRNC. The Turkish-occupied territory in Northern Cyprus cannot be recognized as a sovereign nation-state because it could set a precedent that would legitimize forceful military invasions as a legal pathway to create a new state. This would be detrimental to international law and highlights why the international community has been skeptical about a two-state solution, dissolving guarantor powers, or admitting Cyprus into

¹⁴³ Ker-Lindsay, “The Cyprus Problem,” 2015, 58.

¹⁴⁴ Ker-Lindsay, “The Cyprus Problem,” 2015.

international organizations. There have not been any successful strides in finding a solution to this impasse since the establishment of the UN buffer zone. This Turkish military invasion had calamitous effects on the Greek Cypriots and irreparably changed Cypriot society.

Unlike most human rights cases that are seen in postcolonial states, the human rights violations in Cyprus are “intertwined with the very survival of a sovereign, independent” postcolonial state.¹⁴⁵ This offers a perspective on how the Cyprus problem proves to be an extremely fragile and complex situation that must be handled accordingly. Also, this historical analysis notes that Cyprus is an extreme case of postcolonial conflict because the root of this problem ties back to British colonialism. The international system is currently bombarded with new postcolonial states and is not yet fully able to understand the impacts of decolonization on a nation’s psyche. Furthermore, there are no guardrails in place to prevent neo-colonial policies by former colonial powers in their former colonies. This examination of the nationalist conflict in Cyprus highlights the consequences of neo-colonialism in modern nation-states by illustrating how their nationalist tendencies can lead to discordant geopolitical crises.

6.2. Unmasking the Role of the British Government in 1974

Connecting the Turkish military invasion of 1974 back to the No. 532 Telegram from the British Foreign Office to Geneva,¹⁴⁶ the alliance between Great Britain and Turkey was formed to diminish the power of local authorities in Cyprus and bolster the British political agenda in the region. This thesis shifts this narrative onto the role of the British government, examining not only how they acted but also identifying instances where they failed to act. For example, the domineering control of the British as a Cypriot guarantor power has kept Cyprus from joining

¹⁴⁵ Pollis, “Cyprus: Nationalism vs. Human Rights,” 1979, 92.

¹⁴⁶ Telegram No. 532, From Foreign Office to Geneva (United Kingdom Delegation to the Meeting of Foreign Ministers), 9 November 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew. <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>.

NATO because it would diminish its political authority on the island and in the region. Also, Great Britain agreed to the JTF as a preemptive peacekeeping measure to protect their military base. With this in mind, Great Britain intervened in Cypriot affairs when it benefitted their political agenda to maintain a foothold in Middle Eastern affairs and retain a proxy military base on the island. On the other hand, the inaction from the British government during the days prior to the invasion poses the question: how could one of the most inter-connected intelligence networks not know the plans of their allies when its consequences would result in their favor? An article by William Mallinson utilized evidence from the British National Archives that uncovered the answer to this question. According to a record of a meeting between a British intelligence officer and the Private Secretary of the Foreign, Commonwealth, and Development Office (FCDO), formerly known as the Foreign & Commonwealth Office (FCO), the British intelligence network was aware of a likely Turkish invasion.¹⁴⁷ This raises a follow-up question of why the British did not take measures to prevent the Turkish invasion. This can be explained by the fact that the Turkish military invasion of 1974 did not weaken British authority in Cyprus. As stated in the No. 532 Telegram¹⁴⁸, the British government sought to find a way to establish a permanent foothold in Middle Eastern affairs by seizing the opportunity to increase its political position in Cyprus with the help of Turkey. These two pieces of evidence accentuate the British government's motivation to employ Cyprus as a strategic military outpost in the region while also linking this objective to its inaction before and during the Turkish military invasion, ultimately reinforcing its political agenda.

¹⁴⁷ William Mallinson, "US Interests, British Acquiescence and the Invasion of Cyprus." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9, no. 3 (2007), 494-508. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856x.2006.00254.x> This article functions as a secondary source for the Thomson to Private Secretary, 19 July 1974, PRO FCO 9/1894, file WSC 1/10, part E, record of meeting. The primary source can be found in the British National Archives.

¹⁴⁸ Telegram No. 532, From Foreign Office to Geneva (United Kingdom Delegation to the Meeting of Foreign Ministers), 9 November 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew. <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>.

Another way that the British government played a role in the Turkish Invasion of Cyprus regards the absence of President Makarios III. President Makarios was not in Cyprus during the invasion because he was attending a meeting in New York City with the British and American leadership. William Mallinson argued that the British and American governments worked together to make sure Makarios was out of the way so that he could not call in UN troops and avoid a resolution that would negate the British guarantor powers of intervention.¹⁴⁹ In an analysis of a Top-Secret memorandum from the Deputy Under Secretary of State at the FCO, Mallinson summarized that:

“The Ministry of Defence (MOD) thought that it would probably be militarily possible to restore Makarios to power, but that the MOD would probably want to ‘put in a lot more’ as an insurance. Killick also wrote, ominously, ‘that continued support for Makarios in circumstances in which we could not effectively restore him to power would prevent us from establishing the working relations with the regime effectively in control which we would need in order to maintain the SBAs [Sovereign Base Areas]’”¹⁵⁰

This analysis of the memorandum from July 17, 1974, alludes to the idea that the British government purposefully kept Makarios III from returning to Cyprus

¹⁴⁹ Mallinson, “US Interests, British Acquiescence and the Invasion of Cyprus.” *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9, no. 3 (2007), 494-508. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856x.2006.00254.x>. This article provided an analysis of the ‘13 Killick to Goodison, 17 July 1974, PRO FCO 9/1915, file WSC 1/10, part C, memorandum.’

¹⁵⁰ Mallinson, “US Interests, British Acquiescence and the Invasion of Cyprus.” *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9, no. 3 (2007), 494-508. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856x.2006.00254.x>. This article provided an analysis of the ‘11 Killick to Goodison, 17 July 1974, PRO FCO 9/1915, file WSC 1/10, part C, memorandum.’

because his presence on the island could diminish the total authority that Britain claimed after the Turkish Military Invasion. This analysis of the 1974 events highlights the pattern in which Great Britain intervened to promote its political agenda while also making note of its inaction that resulted in favorable outcomes for the British authority in Cyprus.

This chapter has provided an analysis of the Turkish Invasion of 1974 that shifts the focus to the role of the British government. This has allowed the case study to parse through the biases and reformat a narrative that illustrates the realities of the conflict by putting the British government's actions and inactions during the conflict instead of ethnic divisions. By looking at the 1974 Invasion by Turkey and Turkish Cypriots through the lens of neo-colonialism, this conflict has been able to posit British geostrategic motivations for maintaining control in Cyprus as a key element of the damage that ensued from the divided Cypriot population.

Chapter 7: As a Conclusion

“Roots run deeper than we can fathom, connecting us to the past and shaping our future.”¹⁵¹

-Elif Shafak 2021

Chapter 7 analyzes British neo-colonialism in Cyprus after the invasion in 1974 with a focus on the proposed resolutions and military goals for the British Sovereign Base Areas in Cyprus. This section also features concluding remarks of British neo-colonialism and the legacy of the Cyprus Problem as a geopolitical conflict in Middle Eastern affairs.

A feature of neo-colonialism uncovered in this study relates to the preventive actions of the former colonial power in prohibiting the postcolonial state's membership of international organizations and alliances that disrupt their authority. As seen in Cyprus, Great Britain has outwardly opposed Cyprus joining NATO because NATO has become dictated by American foreign policy and Great Britain does not recognize the US as a supreme global power. The leadership of the United States in NATO would rival British authority if Cyprus were to join the alliance. This stance was prominent during the transitional years and is still at the forefront of British negotiations on a solution to the Cyprus Problem.

This thesis argues that the British neo-colonial policy prohibiting Cyprus from joining international institutions and organizations coincides with Immanuel Wallerstein's assertion of reciprocal sovereignty. Within the imperialist world system, “the legitimacy of sovereignty requires reciprocal recognition,” in which all entities respect and acknowledge the de facto realities of power and the self-determining existence of a state.¹⁵² A nation-oriented community wanting sovereignty, such as the TRNC, must be able to claim sovereignty in practice and not

¹⁵¹ Elif Shafak, *The Island of Missing Trees*, Viking Press, 2021. Shafak posits a sensational and considerate narrative based on historical fiction that aims to connect the people of Cyprus instead of driving them apart.

¹⁵² Immanuel Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis*, Duke University Press, Durham and London, 2004, p. 43.

only in name. For this to occur, the international community must recognize the nation's sovereignty in order to be a legitimate nation-state. Just as the international system does not recognize the sovereignty and agency of the TRNC, Great Britain also does not implicitly recognize Cyprus as an independent sovereign nation. This matters because Great Britain has long retained the title of hegemonic and imperialist power in the modern world system. After all, Great Britain was noted as a hegemonic power during the transition of Cyprus to a postcolonial state and worked to "establish the rules of the game in the interstate system."¹⁵³ Thus, the authority that Great Britain exercised over Cyprus and its role within the international system during the period studied in this thesis suggest that British neo-colonial policies did not align with the concept of Cyprus as a sovereign state within the imperialist world system.

Neo-colonialism, as seen in this research, presents an argument that different neo-colonial powers operate differently in the varying postcolonial states. The case study of this thesis emphasizes how British neo-colonialism works to maintain influence in Cyprus. In this frame of reference, the geostrategic location of Cyprus was shown to be a key motivator for the British government to engage in neo-colonialism. These methods of neo-colonialism outlined in this thesis emphasize the continued imposition of military bases within postcolonial states and the use of former colonizers as advisors.¹⁵⁴ The key tactics of neo-colonialism used in Cyprus include setting up British military bases, granting Great Britain the right to be a permanent guarantor power to further British foreign policy goals in the Middle East, and implementing 'divide and rule' policies. In this historical analysis, the neo-colonial 'divide and rule' policies worked to simultaneously pit Turkish and Greek Cypriots against each other while also furthering the cleavage between the other guarantor powers, Turkey and Greece. Neo-

¹⁵³ Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis*, 2004, p. 57.

¹⁵⁴ Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*, 1965.

colonialism accentuates the infiltration of former ruling empires into the political, economic, cultural, and military spheres of postcolonial states. In Cyprus, British neo-colonialism accentuates military and political power to maintain influence because of the island's geostrategic location within the imperialist world system.

7.1. *Annan Plan 5*

While a solution has not yet been reached, there have been comprehensive proposals to stabilize the security and sovereignty of Cyprus. The Republic of Cyprus' accession application for the European Union (EU) in 1990 was followed by the British plan for resolution in 1996 as well as the UN referendum of the fifth revised version of the Annan Plan in 2004.¹⁵⁵ With the onset of Cyprus as a future member of the EU, the British Foreign Secretary formulated a 10-pronged framework that would instill a bi-federation and facilitate a path for Cyprus to join the EU.¹⁵⁶ Ultimately, this proposal was shut down, but this framework was critical to Cyprus joining the EU in 2004. These peacekeeping and resolution discussions led to the Annan Plan 5 in 2004, which illustrated a pivotal year for the Cyprus Problem. Kofi Annan, the former Secretary General of the UN, drafted the final proposal of the Annan Plan in 2004 known as the Annan Plan 5 that aimed to resolve the Cyprus Conflict by creating a two-state solution overseen by a federal government with a divided economy.¹⁵⁷ In a Foreign Affairs report from the House of Commons published in 2005, the role of the UK in the preceding resolution negotiations was brought to the forefront of the Annan Plan discourse.

¹⁵⁵ Emel Akcali, "The European Union's Competency in Conflict Resolution: The Cases of Bosnia, Macedonia, and Cyprus." Essay. In *Cyprus: A Conflict at the Crossroads*, 180–98, 2009.

¹⁵⁶ Michális S. Michael, *Resolving the Cyprus Conflict: Negotiating History*. Revised & Updated. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

¹⁵⁷ Chris Stylianou, "House of Commons - Foreign Affairs - Written Evidence." Written evidence submitted by Cypriot Community Centre, September 14, 2004.
<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmfaaff/113/113we41.htm>.

“The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cyprus obliquely expressed its annoyance with the United Kingdom's policy on Cyprus, by informing us of the "disappointment" of Greek Cypriots about United Kingdom actions during the Annan Plan negotiating process "trying to undermine the positions of the Greek Cypriot side" and about... the fact that British policy, following the 24 April 2004 referendum, has not shown, in practice, respect for the will of the overwhelming majority of the Greek Cypriots, as expressed during the voting. There is a feeling that the British policy towards Cyprus, although in words purports to aim for the reunification, in actual terms consolidates the division and the alienation of the two communities bringing feelings of disappointment to the Greek Cypriot community.”¹⁵⁸

This excerpt from the House of Commons contributes to the narrative of British neo-colonial tactics in Cyprus because it still utilized the ‘divide and rule’ tactic by undermining Greek Cypriot interests for a collective national identity. The passage above spells out the idea that the British government benefits from a divided Cyprus and that reunification of the island would negate the authority of Great Britain as a guarantor power. With this in mind, a constitutional consultant to the President of Cyprus during the time of the Annan Plan proposition to the UN argued that British involvement with Greek and Turkish Cypriot reunification was overshadowed by its own political interests to secure American and Turkish

¹⁵⁸ UK Parliament. “House of Commons - Foreign Affairs - Second Report.” ParliamentUK. Prepared 22 February 2005, Accessed March 27, 2025. <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmfaaff/113/11307.htm>.

policy in the Middle East.¹⁵⁹ Therefore, Great Britain had personal ambitions for this plan to be implemented in Cyprus.

Another important aspect of the Annan Plan that concerned British neo-colonialism revolved around military interests in Cyprus. The settlement in the Annan Plan included Great Britain ceding sovereignty of 46 square miles of SBA territory to Cyprus.¹⁶⁰ This acknowledges a major hurdle in British neo-colonial interests in Cyprus. Giving up 46 out of 99 square miles of the Sovereign Base Areas in Cyprus would have been detrimental to covert military operations and would reduce British authority in domestic military affairs in Cyprus. This account works to explain the British hesitancy of the Annan Plan and draws upon the role of British neo-colonialism during the resolution discussion to the Cyprus Problem. While this points to a negative reaction to the Annan Plan, Great Britain's alliance with Turkey emphasizes that its interests aligned with the Turkish Cypriots' support for the revised proposal. The Annan Plan has been argued as showing favor to the Turkish Cypriots, which caters to the subsequent support from the British government and would work in their favor for the ceded SBAs. The British advised the Turks in drafting amendments to the Annan Plan 5 and campaigned for the Greek Cypriots to concede to the settlement.¹⁶¹ This plan aligned with the strategic goals of Turkey and Turkish Cypriots because it allowed Turkey to retain troops in Cyprus, did not propose a plan to return all refugees to their homes, and denied the right of Greek Cypriots to own property in Northern Cyprus.¹⁶² This resulted in overwhelming opposition from the Greek Cypriots, which

¹⁵⁹ UK Parliament. "House of Commons - Foreign Affairs - Second Report." ParliamentUK. Prepared 22 February 2005, Accessed March 27, 2025. <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmfaaff/113/11307.htm>.

¹⁶⁰ UK Parliament. "House of Commons - Foreign Affairs - Second Report." ParliamentUK. Prepared 22 February 2005, Accessed March 27, 2025. <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmfaaff/113/11307.htm>.

¹⁶¹ Keith Kyle, "A British View of the Annan Plan." 2018. *Cyprus Review* 16 (1): 13-28. <https://cyprusreview.org/index.php/cr/article/view/358>.

¹⁶² Stylianou, "House of Commons - Foreign Affairs - Written Evidence." Written evidence submitted by Cypriot Community Centre, September 14, 2004. <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmfaaff/113/113we41.htm>.

led to the failure of the Annan Plan. In response to the Republic of Cyprus' disapproval of the Annan Plan, the EU Commissioner stated that the Republic of Cyprus was only allowed to join the EU based on the "understanding that they would accept an UN-brokered settlement."¹⁶³ This statement calls into question the motivations of the EU in granting Cyprus membership. The British greatly influenced EU interests and priorities, which explains their support for Cyprus joining the EU. This differs from the British perspective of Cypriot NATO membership because NATO's agenda is run by the US. By allowing Cyprus to join the EU, the British government was able to continue its neo-colonial efforts because it safeguarded British authority on the island in the wake of possible reunification.

7.2. Current State of Affairs in Cyprus

The military features of British neo-colonialism stand to be paramount in maintaining authority in Cyprus. One example of this is seen in the current geopolitical conflict in the Middle East, which illustrates the geostrategic location of Cyprus. With the ongoing conflict in Palestine, the British Prime Minister, Sir Keir Starmer, visited a military base in Cyprus that has been proliferating British military support to Israel.¹⁶⁴ According to Declassified UK, a journal that focuses on the declassified files on British military and diplomatic pursuits from the National Archives in London, "Britain secretly sent 500 extra troops to Cyprus base being used to supply weapons to Israel" in 2023.¹⁶⁵ This emphasizes the use of Cyprus as a military hub for performing diplomatic relations under the radar. A visit from the British government to Cypriot

¹⁶³ Kyle, "A British View of the Annan Plan." 2018. *Cyprus Review* 16 (1): 13-28, p. 25. <https://cyprusreview.org/index.php/cr/article/view/358>.

¹⁶⁴ Prime Minister Sir Keir Starmer thanks troops at RAF base in Cyprus, Sky News, 2024. <https://news.sky.com/video/prime-minister-sir-keir-starmer-thanks-troops-at-raf-base-in-cyprus-13270818>

¹⁶⁵ Matt Kennard, "Britain Secretly Sent 500 Extra Troops to Cyprus Base Being Used to Supply Weapons to Israel." Declassified Media Ltd, December 12, 2023. <https://www.declassifieduk.org/britain-secretly-sent-500-extra-troops-to-cyprus-base-being-used-to-supply-weapons-to-israel/>.

bases in December 2024 explicitly shows the British neo-colonial political agenda in Cyprus. This directly conflicts with the British government's press release from October 2024 about the United Kingdom (UK) and Cyprus working together to establish a humanitarian corridor in Gaza and de-escalate regional conflicts.¹⁶⁶ By supporting Israel through the British-run sovereign military base in Cyprus, the British government was able to operate covertly in Middle Eastern affairs without facing direct repercussions from public opinion and the international community. This situation affirms the idea that the British aim to maintain authority in Cyprus through neo-colonial exhibitions because of its geostrategic location. The location of Cyprus permits proxy military and political efforts on behalf of the British government without jumping through political hoops. Future studies on the impact of British neo-colonial policies in Cyprus could contribute more to the present happenings of British militarization in Cyprus.

In March 2025, leaders involved in the Cyprus Problem met in Geneva, Switzerland to reevaluate the internal state of affairs and work towards a solution. Greek Cypriots continued advocating for reunification while the Turkish Cypriots called for a two-state solution to recognize the TRNC as a sovereign state. With that said, representatives from the Republic of Cyprus and the Turkish Republic of Cyprus have been forthcoming in open dialogues to find a solution and have agreed to another meeting in July 2025.¹⁶⁷ The representatives have agreed to four initiatives to build trust: “creation of a technical committee on youth, initiatives on the environment and climate change, including the impacts on mining areas; solar energy in the

¹⁶⁶ Prime Minister's Office, 10 Downing Street. “PM Meeting with President Christodoulides of Cyprus: 14 October 2024.” GOV.UK, October 14, 2024. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/pm-meeting-with-president-christodoulides-of-cyprus-14-october-2024>.

¹⁶⁷ United Nations, “Cyprus Talks Show ‘new Atmosphere’ between Divided Island's Leaders: Guterres | UN News.” UN News, March 18, 2025. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2025/03/1161226>.

buffer zone and the restoration of cemeteries.”¹⁶⁸ The current willingness to collaborate is a climactic development in solving the Cyprus Problem. The potential success of these summits for a long-awaited resolution would delineate British authority in the Mediterranean and Middle Eastern Affairs, especially with the current military operations in support of Israel. Since the UK is no longer a part of the EU, analyzing the strategic actions from the British government during these discussions will be vital in understanding their next steps for neo-colonial efforts in the region.

7.3. Great Britain as the Permanent Guarantor Power

The Cyprus Problem exemplifies the lack of agency and self-determination in postcolonial states because of intervention by the former colonial hegemonies during the Age of Decolonization. The most important takeaway from the Cyprus Problem concerns the role of the British government as the catalyst for the ethnic divisions that led to the conflict in 1974. By decoding archives and secondary sources, this study concludes that the main driver of the nationalist conflict in Cyprus falls onto the British imperialist ideologies that led them to conduct neo-colonial policies during Cyprus’ transition to a sovereign state. This research study investigated the causes of the rise in nationalist conflict in postcolonial states by analyzing the British neo-colonial policies in Cyprus.

As seen in Adamantia Pollis’s assertion, different colonial powers engage differently in their subjugation and colonizing tactics, this thesis has outlined that the same is true for neo-colonial powers. This concludes that different neo-colonial powers in the modern imperialist world system deal with neo-colonialism in different ways, depending on the motivations for

¹⁶⁸ United Nations, “Cyprus Talks Show ‘new Atmosphere’ between Divided Island’s Leaders: Guterres | UN News.” UN News, March 18, 2025. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2025/03/1161226>.

gaining and maintaining authority in a postcolonial state. There should not be a grand narrative that applies an all-encompassing analysis across vastly different cases of neo-colonialism. This thesis has worked to examine how British neo-colonialism operates in Cyprus. British neo-colonialism in Cyprus has been identified in this study as guarantor powers, 'divide and rule', reliance on the former colonial power for internal security, and the former colonial power being motivated by geostrategic reasons. By identifying that British colonialism and neo-colonialism differ from other empires and should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis, this thesis acknowledges that different colonial powers enact different policies to subjugate former colonies and postcolonial states. Overall, the theory of neo-colonialism was used to mobilize how a former empire maintained authority in a newly sovereign postcolonial state by identifying how and why British neo-colonialism occurred in Cyprus.

This addition to the theory of neo-colonialism identifies how nationalism was weaponized through 'divide and rule' in British neo-colonialism in Cyprus to meet its imperial goals in the region. British neo-colonialism and its connection to the imperialist world system in contemporary international politics provide the foundation for academics and policymakers to understand how to find solutions to these discordant geopolitical catastrophes. The inability to form collective identities and allow postcolonial states agency over the future of their state is a poignant yet radical measure that could increase stability within a nation that adheres to the unique culture and histories of postcolonial states.

The legacy of British colonialism, neo-colonialism, and postcolonial nationalist violence is inextricably intertwined. The relationship between the nationalist violence in Cyprus and its geostrategic location within the imperialist world system is defined by Great Britain's engagement with neo-colonialism to maintain influence in Cyprus. This case study has reframed

how postcolonial studies can understand the importance of geostrategic motivations instead of just economic dependency that has been at the forefront of neo-colonial discourses.

The actions that need to be taken to resolve the Cyprus Problem and other rising nationalist groups in postcolonial states revolve around the reassessment of promoting former colonizer intervention. In highlighting the existence of neo-colonial tactics, this thesis could serve as a way to identify other current postcolonial states that have fallen victim to perpetuated colonial rule in their sovereign states. Uncovering a new agenda for developing postcolonial states and guidelines for Westernization that focus on the need to build a collective identity could generate a positive chain of events. Instead of excluding postcolonial societies from decisions on the fate of their state, their opinions and platforms should be at the forefront of these negotiations. Cyprus' transition to a postcolonial state emphasizes the threat of lingering ties to colonialism that led to the rise of nationalist groups in Cyprus. Utilizing these miscalculations of British neo-colonial intervention could allow these state actors to better understand how to approach the Cyprus Problem.

This thesis set out to reframe the narrative of the Cyprus problem. Instead of engaging with religious and ethnic differences as the driver of nationalism, this paper argued that British colonial and neo-colonial practices served as the catalyst for the nationalist violence and the Turkish military invasion in 1974. The archives and secondary sources process traced how the alliance between Turkey and Great Britain worked to enhance British authority in Cyprus, the 1960 Constitution for the Republic of Cyprus was never intended to give sovereignty to Cyprus, and how 'divide and rule' became the centerpiece of British neo-colonialism. In this case study, independence acted as the project to combat *enosis* because if the Greek Cypriots reunited with Greece, then both Great Britain and Turkish Cypriots would lose authority over the island. These

findings present an analysis pointing to Cyprus's geo-strategic location as a motivator for Great Britain to engage in neo-colonialism as a way to maintain its foothold in Cypriot internal affairs.

The current state of the Cyprus Problem is still at the behest of the British government because of their neo-colonial goals in Cyprus. In the current geopolitical climate, a solution to the Cyprus Problem may not be feasible with the dominating presence of British neo-colonialism. With Great Britain as the permanent guarantor power and the British neo-colonial agenda, Cyprus will continue to host British military bases and rely on external intervention. Great Britain will maintain its attempts to keep Cyprus from obtaining strategic autonomy in their own governmental actions and joining NATO. Thus, the sanctity of Cypriot strategic autonomy and sovereignty must be at the forefront of this discourse.

A recommendation would be to decrease the legitimacy of Great Britain as a guarantor power through public opinion by exposing its true motivations for being involved in Cypriot internal affairs through continued scholarly engagement in this discourse. This would impact the public opinion of British involvement in Cyprus' internal affairs and decrease its legitimacy as a guarantor power. By unmasking these intentions, this would jeopardize British authority in Cyprus and would open up the possibility of dissolving the guarantor powers.

A normative contribution of this thesis towards a solution to the Cyprus Problem would be dissolving the guarantor powers in Cyprus. This could pivot the discussions to focusing on the future of the Cypriot people instead of imperialist agendas. This would allow for more transparent negotiations between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots in forming a unified Cyprus. The next step would involve admitting Cyprus into NATO to establish it as a strategically sovereign and autonomous state in the world system. This would lead to a decrease in British authority in Cyprus and combat the previous neo-colonial solutions to the Cyprus Problem.

Going forward, British motivations for staying involved in Cyprus' affairs work to reframe our understanding of this conflict and possibly look towards an applicable solution.

This thesis contributes to a new perspective in the postcolonial discourse on nationalism by shifting narratives to center around the role of the former empire instead of presupposing ethnic divisions as inevitably leading to nationalist conflict. The relationship between the nationalist violence in Cyprus and its geostrategic location within the imperialist world system is specifically reliant upon British neo-colonialism. Overall, this thesis involves shifting the narrative of the Cyprus Problem to focus on how historical relations and colonial policies impact the nationalist violence in postcolonial states, not ethnic divisions. The Cyprus Problem was not an inevitable result of two ethnicities existing on the island; it was the culmination of oppressive British colonial rule and neo-colonial tactics that aimed to cleave the island apart.

Primary Sources

Conversation Between the Secretary of State and the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs on August 27, 1955, 31 August 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew. <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>.

Denktas, Rauf R. "Letter Sent by TRNC President Rauf Denktas to the Greek Cypriot Leader Glafkos Clerides, 22 September 1996." Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1996. https://www.mfa.gov.tr/letter-sent-by-trnc-president-rauf-denktas-to-the-greek-cypriot-leader-glafkos-clerides_-22-september-1996.en.mfa.

Document 531, Central Intelligence Agency, Records of the Directorate of Intelligence, Intelligence Information Cables. Secret; Priority; No Foreign Dissem. Prepared in the CIA and sent to members of the Intelligence Community, 9 March, 1970. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76v29/d407>.

Document 407, Information Memorandum From the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs (Sisco) to Secretary of State Rogers, National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 15–1 CYP. Secret. Drafted by Boyatt and cleared by Davies, 2 March 1972. Makarios III, Archbishop of Cyprus. Telegram from Archbishop Makarios to Todor Zhivkov, 27 July 1974. November 20, 2011. Wilson Center Digital Archive. <https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/telegram-archbishop-makarios-todor-zhivkov>.

Stylianou, Chris. "House of Commons - Foreign Affairs - Written Evidence." Written evidence submitted by Cypriot Community Centre, September 14, 2004. <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmfa/113/113we41.htm>.

Telegram No.75, Foreign Office to Istanbul, 21 June 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew. <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>.

Telegram No. 76, Foreign Office to Istanbul, 21 June 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew. <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>.

Telegram No. 531, From Foreign Office to Geneva (United Kingdom Delegation to the Meeting of Foreign Ministers), 9 November 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew. <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>.

Telegram No. 532, From Foreign Office to Geneva (United Kingdom Delegation to the Meeting of Foreign Ministers), 9 November 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew. <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>.

Telegram No. 4465, From Foreign Office to Washington, 1 October 1955, FO 800/667, Cyprus The National Archives, The National Archives, Kew.
<https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C4267766>.

United Nations, “Establishment of UNFICYP.” United Nations, August 28, 2020.
<https://unficy.unmissions.org/establishment-unficy>.

UK Parliament. “House of Commons - Foreign Affairs - Second Report.” ParliamentUK. Prepared 22 February 2005, Accessed March 27, 2025.
<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmfaaff/113/11307.htm>.

Secondary Sources

- Akali, Emel. "The European Union's Competency in Conflict Resolution: The Cases of Bosnia, Macedonia, and Cyprus." Essay. In *Cyprus: A Conflict at the Crossroads*, 180–98, 2009.
- Aksu, Esref. "The UN in the Cyprus Conflict: UNFICYP." In *The United Nations, Intra-State Peacekeeping and Normative Change*. Manchester University Press, 2003.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt155j6v7>.
- Altan, Mustafa Hasim, James A. McHenry, and Ronald C. Jennings. "Archival Materials and Research Facilities in the Cyprus Turkish Federated State: Ottoman Empire, British Empire, Cyprus Republic." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 8, no. 1 (1977): 29–42. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/162452>.
- Apeyitou, Eleni. "The Turkish-Cypriot Nationalism: Its History and Development (1571-1960)." In *The Cyprus Review* 15, no.1 (2003): 67-98.
- Braudel, Fernand. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, vol. 1 (Sian Reynolds, trans.), Wm Collins Sons Ltd and Harper & Row Publishers Inc., 1972
- Camp, Glen D. "Greek-Turkish Conflict over Cyprus." In *Political Science Quarterly* 95, no. 1 (1980): 43–70. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2149584>.
- Carr, Edward Hallett. *Twenty Years' Crisis: 1919-1939*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan & CO. LTD, 1946.
- Carrington, C. E. "Decolonization: The Last Stages." In *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)* 38, no. 1 (1962), 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2611378>
- Chatterjee, Partha, *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).
- Christopher, A. J. "'Divide and Rule': The Impress of British Separation Policies." *Area* 20, no. 3 (1988): 233–40. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20002624>.
- Constantinou, Costas M. "Transgressing the Nation: In Defence of Cypriot Peasantry and Rustic Politics". 2020. *Cyprus Review* 31 (1): 73-98. <https://cyprusreview.org/index.php/cr/article/view/630>.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth* (R. Philcox, Trans.). Grove Press, 2004.
- Health-Kelly, Charlotte. *Politics of Violence: Militancy, International Politics, Killing in the Name*. Routledge, 2013, 6-53.

Inalcik, Halil. "Ottoman Methods of Conquest." In *Studia Islamica*, no. 2 (1954): 103–29.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1595144>.

Ioannides, Christos. "Cyprus, British Colonialism and the Seeds of Partition: From Coexistence to Communal Strife." In *The Journal of Modern Hellenism*, no. 30 (2014): 41–72.

Joseph, Joseph S., *Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics*, 1997th Edition, Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.

Kennard, Matt. "Britain Secretly Sent 500 Extra Troops to Cyprus Base Being Used to Supply Weapons to Israel." Declassified Media Ltd, December 12, 2023.
<https://www.declassifieduk.org/britain-secretly-sent-500-extra-troops-to-cyprus-base-being-used-to-supply-weapons-to-israel/>.

Ker-Lindsay, James, *Britain and the Cyprus Crisis, 1963-1964*, Bibliopolis, 2004.

Ker-Lindsay, James. "The Cyprus Problem." In *"Frozen Conflicts" in Europe*, edited by Anton Bebler, 1st ed., 19–34. Verlag Barbara Budrich, 2015.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvdf0bmg.4>.

Ker-Lindsay, James. *The Cyprus Problem: What Everyone Needs to Know*. Oxford University Press, 2011.

Kıralp, Şevki, and Ahmet Güneşli. "Ousting the Cypriot *Ethnarch*: President Makarios' Struggle against the Greek Junta, Cypriot Bishops, and Terrorism" *Religions* 12, no. 11: 944, 2021.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12110944>

Kumar, Krishan. "The Ottoman Empire." In *Visions of Empire: How Five Imperial Regimes Shaped the World*, 74–144. Princeton University Press, 2017.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc773dq.7>.

Kyle, Keith. "A British View of the Annan Plan." 2018. *Cyprus Review* 16 (1): 13–28. <https://cyprusreview.org/index.php/cr/article/view/358>.

Levy, Jack S. "Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logics of Inference." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25, no. 1 (February 2008): 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07388940701860318>.

Loizides, Neophytos G. "Ethnic nationalism and adaptation in Cyprus." In *International Studies Perspectives* 8, no. 2 (2007): 172–189. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-3585.2007.00279.x>

- Mallinson, William. US Interests, British Acquiescence and the Invasion of Cyprus. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9, no. 3 (2007), 494-508.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856x.2006.00254.x>
- Michael, Michális S. *Resolving the Cyprus Conflict: Negotiating History*. Revised & Updated. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Michael, Michális. "CYPRUS AND THE 1960 ACCORDS: NATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM." In *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs* 1, no. 2, 2001.
- Moran, Michael. "CYPRUS AND THE 1960 ACCORDS: NATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM." In *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs* 1, no.2 (June-July 2001).
- Moss, Walter. G. "Imperialism, Nationalism, and Globalization." In *An Age of Progress?: Clashing Twentieth-Century Global Forces*, 91–122. Anthem Press, 2008.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1gxp6dt.9>.
- Ngoei, Wen-Qing. "British Neo-colonialism in Malaya and Singapore, and U.S. Empire in the Pacific." In *The Vietnam War in the Pacific World* (2022): 16-30. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Nkrumah, Kwame. *Neo-colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd., London, 1965.
- Novo, Andrew R. *The EOKA cause: Nationalism and the failure of Cypriot enosis*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2022.
- Panayiotopoulos, Prodromos. "The Emergent Post-colonial State in Cyprus." In *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 37, no. 1 (1999): 31–55.
- Papageorgiou, Stefanos P. "The Genesis of the Greek and Turkish Nationalism in Cyprus, 1878-1914: A Common March at a Different Pace". 2018. *Cyprus Review* 9 (1): 56-65. <https://cyprusreview.org/index.php/cr/article/view/510>.
- Pollis, Adamantia. "Cyprus: Nationalism vs. Human Rights." In *Universal Human Rights* 1, no. 2 (1979): 89–102. <https://doi.org/10.2307/761796>.
- Pollis, Adamantia. "Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus." In *Comparative Politics* 5, no. 4 (1973): 575–99. <https://doi.org/10.2307/421397>.
- Prime Minister's Office, 10 Downing Street. "PM Meeting with President Christodoulides of Cyprus: 14 October 2024." GOV.UK, October 14, 2024.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/pm-meeting-with-president-christodoulides-of-cyprus-14-october-2024>.

Prime Minister Sir Keir Starmer thanks troops at RAF base in Cyprus, Sky News, 2024
<https://news.sky.com/video/prime-minister-sir-keir-starmer-thanks-troops-at-raf-base-in-cyprus-13270818>

Shafak, Elif. *The Island of Missing Trees*, Viking Press, 2021.

Souter, David. "An Island Apart: A Review of the Cyprus Problem." In *Third World Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (1984): 657–74. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3992068>.

Strauß, J. "How Cyprus Came under Turkish Rule: A Conquest and the Historians." *Wiener Zeitschrift Für Die Kunde Des Morgenlandes* 82 (1992): 325–34.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23865914>.

United Nations, "Cyprus Talks Show 'new Atmosphere' between Divided Island's Leaders: Guterres | UN News." UN News, March 18, 2025.
<https://news.un.org/en/story/2025/03/1161226>.

University of Louisville . (n.d.). *Primary sources: Definitions & examples*. University Libraries: William F. Ekstrom Library. <https://library.louisville.edu/ekstrom/primary-sources/definition>

Varnava, Andrekos. *Assassination in Colonial Cyprus in 1934 and the Origins of the EOKA: Reading the Archives Against the Grain*, Anthem Press, 2021.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *World-Systems Analysis*, Duke University Press, Durham and London, 2004, p. 43.

Yorgancıoğlu, Cemal, and Şevki Kırıl. "Turco-British Relations, Cold War and Reshaping the Middle East: Egypt, Greece and Cyprus (1954—1958)." *Middle Eastern Studies* 55, no. 6 (2019): 914–31. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48543905>.