

The Cyprus Property Issue:

A Study on Proactive Steps to a Resolution

Anya Esmaili

December 2006

SIT Cyprus

Fall Semester 2006

Transnational Identities and Inter-communal Relations

Independent Study Project

Acknowledgements

There are many people who I would like to thank for aiding me in my research process this past month. Thank you to my advisor, Erol Kaymak for sparking my interest in the property problem at the very beginning of my stay in Cyprus. Thank you to my wonderful host family for making me feel so welcome in your home and for introducing me to delicious Turkish food! Thank you very much to Kudret Ozersay whose knowledge about the property issue in Cyprus is truly remarkable. Thank you to all of my informants for sharing your opinions and stories with me, for without you, I would have no project! Also, thanks to Anna Misiaouli for helping me fine-tune my topic and for keeping up on the details and current events of the property issue. Thank you to Selhan Zeki for always being there to listen. Thank you to Rauf Denktash for allowing me to interview you, your accomplishments are truly inspiring. To Julie Cutruzzula- I will never forget our days full of paper-writing parties or our crazy adventures with the aristocracy of Cyprus. You have become someone I genuinely feel lucky to know. Meet you back in Cyprus in June? To Ezra and Shin, thanks for sticking it out as long as you could in this predominantly female group. To the rest of the 2006 SIT Cyprus crew, thank you for working out the glitches, and sticking it out: I will never forget you guys! Finally, I would like to thank my mom, for without her, I would not enjoy writing as much as I do.

Abstract

This paper attempts to reveal what the citizens of Cyprus, both in the Republic of Cyprus and in the “TRNC,” think about the property problem in Cyprus. It explains what the problem is, and what actions can be taken to find a solution, in addition to what has already been done in the past. The property problem is one of the most critical, if not the most critical facet of the Cyprus problem. To get the opinions of a wide range of people, this research includes personal interviews with displaced individuals (both Greek and Turkish Cypriot), interviews with political leaders, and with academics who have studied the property problem. Naturally, the two sides of the Cyprus issue have not yet found a remedy that will be suitable for both parties and that will not initiate more problems for the future. However, there are several options that are considered and highlighted in this paper.

Part I: Introduction

Research Question:

The question that I intend to answer through this study is: what are the property rights and the ethical actions that can be taken to begin to rectify the losses felt by the displaced individuals of 1974 in Cyprus?

Introduction:

In Cyprus, there is currently a critical issue concerning property rights for individuals who were displaced in 1974 due to the de facto separation of the island that followed the arrival of the Turkish troops in Cyprus. The island remains “divided” because the Turkish military occupies the “northern” part of Cyprus (Joseph 14). The subject of property rights is a human rights issue at the international level and is an inherently sensitive topic of discussion. Hundreds of thousands of Cypriots have been, and continue to be affected by this problem after over thirty years. There is no concrete solution in sight that will satisfy all involved parties, but there must be steps that can be taken in the right direction in terms of compensation for losses or reclaiming property. Thus, the topic I have explored is the possible solution to this problem: what has already been done in the past, and what the processes are to receive proactive results through the courts or by other means.

Background:

Cyprus is a very small island in the Mediterranean with a not so small issue. The current state of affairs in Cyprus is not simply an outcome of Greek-Turkish Cypriot animosity. Instead, it is the result of hundreds of years of external rulers and their hostility towards one another. The Byzantine and Ottoman Empires both ruled Cyprus during different periods, and of all the rulers that have taken power of Cyprus, the Greeks and Turks were the only ones who to leave a significant population and culture behind. The Ottomans ruled Cyprus for about three hundred years from 1571 until 1878. During this time, the Greeks and the Turks were said to have lived peaceful lives, co-existing

without violence. Many Turks settled in Cyprus during the period that the Ottoman Empire ruled Cyprus, and they remained there after the Ottomans no longer ruled Cyprus (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cyprus).

The British took control of Cyprus in 1878 and ruled for 82 years thereafter. By this time, there were already two main communities that had established themselves on the island: the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots. The island was comprised of about 80 percent and 20 percent respectively, although there were a few other diminutive populations that included Armenians, Maronites, and Latinos. So, for four centuries throughout Ottoman and British rule, these two groups lived amongst each other in harmony and without difficulty as far as armed conflict is concerned (Sahali, Erhun). However, it should be recognized that the two communities have always remained distinctly different as ethnic and cultural groups. The Greek Cypriots speak Greek and identify with Greece as a nation, their culture, their history, and their heritage. Almost all of the Greek Cypriots affiliate themselves with the Orthodox Church. The Turkish Cypriots speak Turkish and identify with Turkey and Turkish culture, history, and heritage. Most Turkish Cypriots are Sunni Muslims (Joseph pg.17).

During this period of British rule, the educational system, matters of religion, culture, and communal institutions were left up to the inhabitants of the island. The educational systems were supported by the two communities' respective religions and were kept very separate. The curriculum was in many ways congruent to that of the curriculum in Greece or Turkey and there was a focus on religion, national heritage, ethnicity, and the history of Greek-Turkish rivalry. This reinforced loyalties to each of their "mainland" countries, thereby enhancing the division between the two communities in Cyprus (18).

Throughout British rule, the majority of the Greek Cypriots desired to be united with Greece (enosis). The Turkish Cypriots on the hand, held the idea of taksim (the partition of Cyprus into two parts in such a way that the two communities would co-exist separately) (18). The strong disagreement between the Cypriots and their respective "mainland" countries caused more polarization between the communities because their political views about the future of Cyprus were so contradictory. The British used the divide and rule tactic to remain in control over Cyprus and they made no effort to mend

the discrepancies between the two communities. After four centuries of sharing the island between the two communities, they were still distinctively separate groups. There existed a mutual distrust between the two groups which was supported by many years of reinforcement of polarization. As J.S. Joseph stated in his book, “The two communities remained ethnically and politically distinct and looked upon each other as ethno political antagonists, without distinguishing ethnicity from politics” (19).

In 1960, the situation in Cyprus changed dramatically when Britain granted independence to the island and Cyprus became the Republic of Cyprus. A constitution was drafted to regulate the bi-communal state and tried to protect both communities. A systematic government was also set up with a Greek Cypriot appointed as the President of the Republic and a Turkish Cypriots appointed as the Vice President. Both the President and the Vice President had the right to veto, which later caused many problems in the decision-making processes having to do with foreign affairs, defense, and security (22).

In 1963, after three years of unsuccessfully running the Republic bi-communally, violence broke out. There were many reasons for the violence, some of them being “the provisions for a 70:30 ratio in public service, the separate majority vote in parliament, the establishment of separate municipalities, and the right of the president and the vice-president to veto decisions of the council of ministers and the parliament” (26). During this period of violence, the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus established a UN supervised “Green Line” that divided the two communities in Nicosia and on the rest of the island.

In 1974, the situation in Cyprus was once again one of political unrest. The Greek military regime, EOKA, staged a coup against Archbishop Makarios to attempt to overthrow him. They wanted to speed up the process of Cyprus’ unification with Greece, and Makarios was not achieving this goal fast enough to satisfy EOKA. In turn, Turkey did not respond positively to Greece’s military coup so they invaded Cyprus and occupied about 37 percent of the island (Sahali Erhun). Both the military coup by Greece and the entrance of the Turkish military in 1974 worsened the already negative relations between the two mainland countries. Both the U.S. and Britain attempted to mediate the situation, but nothing could be done and it became clear that Greece and Turkey could

not settle their differences in a diplomatic way. Turkey launched a second attack on Cyprus which forced people to be uprooted from their homes and move to different parts of the island. The Greek Cypriots who were living in the “northern” part of the island were forced to move to the “southern” part, and the Turkish Cypriots living in the “south” were forced to move to the “north” (53). The Turkish Cypriots (with the Turkish government’s support) then unilaterally declared themselves independent from the Republic of Cyprus, and were called the “Turkish Republic of North Cyprus.” The “TRNC” was not recognized by the international community (with the exception of Turkey), and is still not recognized to this day.

The population exchange in Cyprus in 1974 is the foundation for the property rights issue that has arisen over 30 years later. Hundreds of thousands of people were displaced in 1974, and with the imbalance of Greek Cypriots to Turkish Cypriots, there were many more Greek Cypriots left without homes in the “south” of Cyprus. Most of the displaced Turkish Cypriots were able to resettle into the homes of displaced Greek Cypriots, but the same cannot be said for the Greek Cypriots (Lordos pp 37). Since 1974, there have been many people who have voiced their desire to move back to their old homes. In a report on the ‘Official Negotiations of the Disputed Parties in the Cyprus Conflict,’ it is stated that the Greek Cypriots desire absolute freedom when it comes to property ownership, while the Turkish Cypriots believe there should be strong restrictions, and a moratorium (Sozen p 20).

Currently, Cyprus is faced with a major property problem which has become one of the worst results of the military operation of 1974. Turkey allotted many of the Greek Cypriot homes in the “north” of Cyprus to Turkish Cypriots who were displaced from their homes in the “south”. There are homes in the “north” that are being lived in by Turkish Cypriots, but that are truly owned by Greek Cypriots. People are starting to take action through the European Court of Human Rights to repossess their homes. The issue of statehood comes into play now: the “TRNC” is not recognized by any state in the international community except for Turkey, which means that Turkey must take accountability for what happens in the property law suits. In fact, it is illegal for Turkey to recognize the “TRNC” according to international law (Zacharaides).

History of Cyprus Property Cases Brought to Court:

It is necessary for me to outline the three major cases concerning the Cyprus property issue that have been brought to the European Court of Human Rights thus far. These cases against Turkey for violations of human rights laws, have set precedent for the many cases that will inevitably follow in the future.

The first case, *Loizidou v. Turkey* (Appendix 1) concerned a woman named Titina Loizidou. Loizidou is a Greek-Cypriot woman who was displaced from her home in Kyrenia in 1974. She has been prevented from returning to her home since that time. For this reason, she decided to take action by means of a law suit filed against Turkey. She applied to the European Commissioner of Human Rights, and then her application was sent to the Commission to the European Court of Human Rights (“Council of Europe”). Article 1 of Protocol 1 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights reads: “Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law.” (Zacharaides, Michael).

When considering Article 1 of Protocol 1, the ECHR took consideration of the Turkish troops stationed in the “occupied area” of Cyprus and decided that Turkey should be held responsible for the actions of the “TRNC.” In essence, it was stated that Turkey violated Loizidou’s basic human rights by not allowing her to occupy her own home. The ECHR also stated that “an individual has basic rights and these rights will be respected under all circumstances” (Zacharaides). In conclusion to the case, Turkey was ordered to pay Loizidou \$600,000 in damages for the continued violation of her right to peaceful enjoyment of her property, \$40,000 for non-pecuniary damages and \$244,168 for all of her costs and expenses.

The most important thing that can be derived from *Loizidou v. Turkey* is that she “is still the legal owner of the property, no issue of expropriation arises, ... and that her claim is thus confined to the loss of use of the land and the consequent loss of opportunity to develop or lease it” (COE). Therefore, Loizidou has not given up her right to return to her property if she chooses, in the event of a solution to the Cyprus problem.

The second case that was brought to the European Court of Human Rights was not specifically related to property. Instead, it was a charge against Turkey, by the government of Cyprus (Appendix 2) for 14 violations of the European Convention on Human Rights. The government of Cyprus claimed that the “TRNC” was an illegal state and that Turkey should be held responsible for all human rights violations against Greek Cypriots that occurred because of the Turkish military operation in 1974. Turkey argued that the “TRNC” was a democratic and independent state that is not connected with Turkey. With this mind set, Turkey asserted that the “TRNC” should be responsible for the claims being made against Turkey. Finally, in 2000, the case of *Cyprus v. Turkey* was brought to court and it was decided, by sixteen votes to one, that the human rights violations did indeed fall under Turkey’s jurisdiction, and that the case would proceed against Turkey. The main reason for this decision was (in accordance with the earlier *Loizidou v. Turkey* case) that Turkey exercises control over “northern” Cyprus by means of military control over the area (ECHR).

While there were many issues brought up by the government of Cyprus, I will only provide details about the decisions on property rights for the purposes of this paper. The court held that there had been a violation of Article 8 because the Turkish military force’s continual denial of Greek Cypriot access to their “northern” Cyprus properties. The court also found Turkey responsible for the violation of Article 1, Protocol 1 because the Greek Cypriots were not allowed to access, use, control, or enjoy their property, in addition to the fact that they were not provided compensation for these denials. Lastly, the court held that there had also been a violation of Article 13 because of Turkey’s failure to provide any options for remedies for the violations of Articles 1 and 8 (ECHR).

The third and most recent case that was brought to the ECHR is the case of *Xenides-Arestis v. Turkey* (Appendix 3). The facts of the case are as follows. Myra Xenides-Arestis is a Greek Cypriot woman who was born in 1945. She owns a piece of land in Famagusta in “northern” Cyprus that has a shop, a flat, and three houses on it. She also owns another plot of land with an orchard on it. One of the houses on her property was the one she resided in (before 1974), and the other homes were either lived in by her family members, or rented out. Xenides-Arestis has been prevented from living

in her home and using the rest of her properties in “northern” Cyprus due to the division of the island and Turkey’s military control in the “north” (ECHR).

In 2005, the court decided that Turkey was again guilty of violating Article 8 and Article 1 of Protocol 1. However, the court found that it was not necessary to address the applicant’s claim of the violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) because they would already be providing a remedy for her loss of property. The court held that Turkey must provide a remedy for the violations of Article 8 and Article 1 of Protocol 1 within 3 months. Redress for the applicant’s losses was ordered to be provided within the next 3 months after that (ECHR).

The Turkish Cypriots have not been as successful in bringing cases to the courts. However, it should be noted that there have been two cases against the Republic of Cyprus government by Turkish Cypriots to argue the illegal use of their property in the “south” of Cyprus. A Turkish Cypriot named Arif Mustafa filed a complaint against the government in 2004 saying that he was being denied his rights to occupy his home in Episkopi. The Supreme Court ruled that Mustafa could move back to his house in the “south” of Cyprus. There has been a Greek Cypriot woman living in his home since 1974 that had to relocate due to the court’s decision to give Mustafa’s property back (Cyprus-Mail 2004). Another Turkish Cypriot landowner, Mehmet Ali Birsen filed a case against the Republic of Cyprus government as well in August of 2006. Birsen applied to the ECHR claiming that the government was denying him access to his 20-donum land in Larnaca because a military camp was built on it. He had three houses on the land that are now being used by the National Guard. According to the chairman of the Turkish Cypriot Human Rights Organization, Emine Erk, Birsen depleted all of his options when trying to get an answer about his property from the government of the Republic of Cyprus, but that he was told that the current situation in Cyprus would not permit him to receive compensation (Cyprus-Mail 2006). Erk further stated that “it is vital that the refugees from both sides of the island are treated equally and their interests are protected” (Cyprus-Mail 2006). A ECHR ruling in favor of Birsen could have a major impact on the property issue because it would be the second successful property case for the Turkish Cypriot community.

Rationale:

The issue of property rights has essentially been put on the back burner for many years because political strife was at the forefront of Cypriot agendas for so long. Since 2003, there has been a partial lift on the restriction of movement from the “north” to the “south” and vice versa, which has finally permitted many people to see their old homes after 30 years. This is an incredibly complex issue that has proven itself to be very difficult to solve because it involves so many external factors such as politics, culture, ethnicity, and the physical division of the island. It is also a very personal and emotional issue for many people, and is one that should be taken very seriously. The issue of property rights in Cyprus is a prevalent one because it is currently being dealt with everyday. Cypriots who were displaced in 1974 are starting to take action to recover their homes or land. It is imperative that people understand the severity of the situation because it could easily directly or indirectly affect any person on this island.

The sudden uproot of people becoming more proactive about getting their property back can also affect foreigners. Many citizens from countries abroad have bought land in Cyprus, but in some cases the land they purchase may have actually belonged to a member of the opposite community before the de facto division of the island. So as it turns out, this concern of property rights has extended beyond Cyprus because foreign buyers are beginning to play a larger role than they did before.

This issue of property rights in Cyprus has the potential to affect people in both of the two major communities in Cyprus because if people begin to retrieve their property and move into houses that are on the side opposite their own community, a whole new set of problems could emerge. For instance, if Greek Cypriot filed and won a property law suit and wanted to move into his or her old home in Kyrenia, it is difficult to imagine that process going smoothly after thirty years of physical separation between the two communities. Because of the reasons stated above, this is an issue that every person in Cyprus should be informed about since it has become such a substantial and vital addition to the Cyprus issue.

Part II: Literature Review

Throughout my research, there are several guiding concepts that I wish to address and refer to. The first is the issue of legal standards that must be abided. The Council of Europe is Europe's oldest political organization, founded in 1949. It is a unifying body that includes 46 countries, and strives to protect human rights amongst these countries. Its main goals are to "defend human rights, parliamentary democracy and the rule of law, develop continent-wide agreements to standardize member countries' social and legal practices, and to promote awareness of a European identity based on shared values and cutting across different cultures" (Council of Europe). It aims to ensure that all member states abide by the rules and regulations set forth by the organization so that the European continent will have a unified social and legal standard. In relation to the Cyprus Property issue, the Council of Europe has served as the court for the few cases that have been heard so far. It has set the precedent for what the future will hold for Cyprus in terms of property and human rights. In other words, it is likely that cases that have been brought to the Council of Europe will be looked to in the future when trying to determine answers to similar questions having to do with the property issue in Cyprus.

Michael A. Zachariades' article, "Transplanted Populations and the Problems Caused: Cyprus" is a complete overview of results of the events in Cyprus in 1974. He gives a brief summary of the chronology of Cyprus' history leading up to the Turkish invasion, and then discusses in detail the consequences of the invasion in terms of international law. The article explains that since the "TRNC" is not a legal entity, yet is still recognized by Turkey, Turkey is responsible for any detriments incurred by the "TRNC" (illegally distributed property deeds for instance). Court cases that deal with the property rights issue in Cyprus are summarized and explained. Finally, he offers possible solutions to the Cyprus property issue that will adhere to international law and maintain recognition of human rights and democracy. In addition to reading their work, scholars such as Zachariades, who have studied law, will be very helpful in my efforts to adequately present the property issue in legal terms.

Secondly, because the property issue is very much a result of the islands' history of division of the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots, this paper would not be thorough without the supplemented historical background. *Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics. From Independence to the Threshold of the European Union* by

Joseph S. Joseph is an analytical look at the Cyprus issue with a comprehensive historical breakdown. Joseph discusses the issue through 7 contexts which are: the domestic setting of the ethnic conflict in Cyprus, Greek-Turkish relations (historically and currently), American-Soviet relations (and their relationships to Cyprus), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the United Nations (UN), and the European Union (EU). This book provides a broad understanding of the background of the Cyprus problem and the possibility for growth and recognition by the international community. It should be noted that this book was written prior to the Republic of Cyprus' accession to the EU.

Reflections on the Cyprus Problem: A Compilation of Recent Academic Contributions is a book of essays written by scholars that have done extensive research on the Cyprus issue. The article that I reference is called "The Cyprus Negotiations: From the 1963 Inter-communal violence to the Annan Plan" which is written by Ahmet Sozen. In the article, he gave a brief historical background, and then went on to discuss the Annan Plan in more detail. The Annan plan was very vague when it addressed the property issue in Cyprus and it did not provide a concrete or feasible solution to the problem. Sozen goes into more detail about this fact and also mentions some of the other reasons the plan did not get voted into action. I feel that it is important to address what tactics have not worked thus far in trying to find solutions related to the Cyprus issue.

Alexandros Lordos' survey report titled, "Civil Society Diplomacy: A new approach for Cyprus?" is a solid overview of the opinions of the residents of both of the main communities in Cyprus. He discloses information about people's views on a few important aspects of the Cyprus. The topics of discussion are: underlying attitudes about the Cyprus issue in general, security, governance, property, settlers, the economy, education, legal status, implementation guarantees, and the failed UN plan for Cyprus. In relation to my area of interest, property rights, Lordos tried to find out what Cypriots think is the more important aspect, territorial adjustment or property rights. He also tried to learn what people think would be the most sensible plan of action so that the Greek Cypriots will no longer feel wrongfully treated, while at the same making sure that the Turkish Cypriots do not feel disrespected. This study provides a loose framework for my own research, though I will not be using his methodology of conducting a mass survey.

Ayla Gurel and Kudret Ozersay wrote an article called “Cyprus and the Politics of Property,” that proved to be the most influential piece of work that I have referenced throughout my study. I extracted their opinions on what the two sides’ general opinions are on the property issue in Cyprus. Generalizations are inevitable when attempting to explain the positions of two considerably large populations, and in no way do I believe that the opinions that will be expressed hereafter are necessarily the opinions of the entire populace of either given side. As there is not currently an agreed upon set of property ownership figures, the Greek and Turkish Cypriots will have argued over the numbers for years. Kofi Annan, the UN Secretary General at the time when the Green Line was opened for crossing, made a statement about the two sides’ demands in relation to the property issue: “the Greek Cypriot side advocated a solution based on full respect for property rights so that all displaced persons, from either community, would have the right to have their properties reinstated. The Turkish Cypriot side argued that property claims should be settled through liquidation by means of a global exchange and compensation scheme, meaning that no displaced persons, from either side, would have the right to have their properties reinstated” (6).

A point worth mentioning before explaining the two sides’ arguments is that the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots see the Cyprus issue as a result of two entirely separate events. The Turkish Cypriots view their suffering during the period of 1963-1974 as the true reason for the problem on the island. In fact, most Turkish Cypriots consider the Turkish military operation as the liberation and ending of a long period of struggle and strife. In this way, some Turkish Cypriots have ignored the painful experiences of the 1974 military operation for the Greek Cypriots. Needless to say, the Greek Cypriots’ opinion of which event initiated the greater Cyprus problem is of a contradictory nature. They see the Turkish military operation as the catalyst for the current problems that Cyprus faces today. How can a problem be resolved when the two sides see the foundation of the problem so subjectively?

The Turkish Cypriot stance on the property issue is that it should be resolved based on what they call “the established principle of bi-zonality,” which again is the proposal that there should be a compensation formula and adhered to by both sides of the argument. It is seen by many as a practical way of managing a problem that has the

potential to be detrimental for much of the population in the “north” of Cyprus. In 1985, there was a provision added to the “TRNC’s” constitution stating that “abandoned” Greek Cypriot properties in “northern” Cyprus, are automatically the property of the “TRNC.” Shortly after this amendment, many of the deeds for the Greek Cypriot homes were given to Turkish Cypriots who had been allocated the properties after being displaced in 1974 (8). This is further proof that the “TRNC” believed that a ‘global exchange’ of properties would be the most rational way to solve the property issue, and also saw it as a stepping stone for an overall solution to the Cyprus problem. They seemed to hold a “separate but equal” mentality with their desire for ‘bizonality.’

The Greek Cypriot opinion of this argument is wholly connected to the issue of return and to them it is matter of basic human rights. They view the Turkish invasion of 1974 as a basic human rights violation by Turkey that has continued for over thirty years. Their stance is that the fact that the “north” has been “occupied” by Turkey has kept them from returning to their homes if they desired to do so. This brings up the concept of the “three freedoms” which includes: the freedom of movement, freedom of settlement, and the right to property. This concept is meant to be applied to all the displaced Greek-Cypriots who may want to return to their original homes in the “north” (Theophanous, 43). Since the Greek Cypriots feel that Turkey has been committing human rights violations for so long, they see the problem as being solvable only by means of reinstating all property to displaced persons and allowing them to return to their homes if they choose. This is easier said than done for one reason: unlike the Turkish Cypriot properties in the “south,” Greek Cypriot ownership of properties in the “north” have not been upheld. In other words, many of the Greek Cypriot properties have been considered “abandoned,” and therefore the property of the government that can be allotted to any person of their choosing (8).

As for the Turkish Cypriot properties in the “south,” a law was passed in 1991 by the Greek Cypriot government to mandate the usage of the properties that were left behind in 1974. The Greek Cypriot Minister of the Interior is appointed as the “custodian” of all the Turkish Cypriot properties in the “south.” The idea behind having a “custodian” is to protect the properties and allocate them fairly to Greek Cypriot displaced persons. While the Republic of Cyprus government does not argue that these

properties are indeed owned by Turkish Cypriots, they hold that compensation will not be given until there is a solution of the Cyprus problem. Until the time of an overall settlement, the “custodian” will manage a property fund for the Turkish Cypriots’ monetary compensation. Being that the likelihood of an overall settlement is not in the foreseeable future, there is little to no hope for Turkish Cypriots to have their property returned to them.

The property issue did not go unnoticed in the UN Secretary General’s plan for a Cyprus solution. He made suggestions for a major territory adjustment and a property regime. This meant that the current Turkish Cypriot-controlled part of the island would be reduced from 36% to about 29%. According to the plan, this would allow about 54% of the Greek Cypriot displaced persons to return to their homes in the “north.” The plan stated that these people who relocated would still be under administration of the Republic of Cyprus, hence the need for a territory adjustment (UN, 2003). Of course, since there would still be many people unable to return to their homes, compensation and reinstatement for their losses was outlined in the Annan plan.

Despite the fact that the Turkish Cypriots voted ‘yes’ for the plan by a two-thirds majority, there were many things relating to the property issue that were not taken well by the Turkish Cypriot community. For example, if the plan had been voted into action, about 70,000 Turkish Cypriots would be forced to move because of the territorial adjustment or because of the reinstatement of properties to the Greek Cypriots. There were many reasons for the Turkish Cypriots to have voted ‘no’ for the Annan plan, but somehow, two-thirds of the population voted ‘yes.’ Two of the Turkish Cypriots I interviewed while doing my research mentioned that the fact that Turkey strongly supported the plan, and since the “TRNC” relies so heavily on Turkey’s aid, some people may have felt like they had no choice but to vote ‘yes’ for the plan (10).

The Greek Cypriots were also dissatisfied by the Annan plan’s property proposal. Many Greek Cypriots felt that the Annan plan did not fully respect their basic human rights because the plan suggested ‘limited restitution,’ which was still a violation of their ‘right to return’ and their ‘right to property’ (17). According to Gurel and Ozersay, the Greek Cypriots may have felt that the Annan plan did not acknowledge their “inalienable

right to full and unqualified restitution.” Therefore, the Greek Cypriots deemed the Annan plan to be an unacceptable solution to the property question.

Part III: Conceptualizations

Conceptual Framework:

For the purposes of my study, I have chosen to follow the theory that Ayla Gurel and Kudret Ozersay have put forth in their article, “Cyprus and the Politics of Property,” that states the consequences of the Greek and Turkish Cypriots’ opposing viewpoints on the actual cause of the property problem, as well as the propositions for a solution. The article makes the point that the property problem will be very difficult to solve if the two sides can not even agree on the origin of the problem. The question of whether the Cyprus problem began in 1963 or in 1974 is, and probably never will be agreed upon.

Conceptualization of Definitions:

It is necessary to define several terms that will be used throughout the discussion of my study of the property issue in Cyprus. Terms are an especially poignant concern when examining issues concerning Cyprus’ de facto separation. There are many terms and phrases that may offend certain groups given the sensitivity of the current political circumstances in Cyprus. For this reason, I have tried to use terms that I feel are the most courteous to all people who may read this case study. It should also be noted that quotation marks are used to differentiate between I have carefully chosen the terms that I will use because I feel that they are necessary and appropriate for my area of study. I do not mean, or wish to offend anyone in this process. A list of the definitions of these terms is provided below in the “Conceptual Definitions” section.

Operational Definitions:

Bizonality: The proposal for the two major communities in Cyprus to live on the island, separately.

Community: A social group of any size whose members reside in a specific locality, share government, and often have a common cultural and historical heritage.¹

Cyprus Issue: For the purposes of this paper, it is the conflict between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, and also the Republic of Cyprus and Turkey, over Cyprus.²

Displaced Individuals (internal): Someone who has been forced to leave their home for reasons such as religious or political persecution or war, but has not crossed an international border.³

Greek Cypriot: A person of Greek origin who is from Cyprus.

Green Line: A term often used to refer to the line of demarcation that divides the Cypriot capital of Nicosia into the southern Greek Cypriot region and the northern Turkish Cypriot region.⁴

“Turkish Invasion”: The period in 1974 that Turkey took military action to take occupation of over 30% of the island of Cyprus.

“north”: For the purposes of this paper, it refers to the area of Cyprus that is not controlled by the Republic of Cyprus.

“Occupied Area”: The area of the “north” of Cyprus that has been militarily controlled by Turkey and the “TRNC” since 1974.

Republic of Cyprus: The internationally recognized political entity of Cyprus.

Right of Return: As stated by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is that "everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each State. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and *to return to his country*."⁵

“south”: For the purposes of this paper, it refers to the internationally recognized Republic of Cyprus.

Turkish Cypriot: A person of Turkish origin who is from Cyprus.

¹ <http://dictionary.reference.com>

² <http://en.wikipedia.org>

³ <http://en.wikipedia.org>

⁴ <http://en.wikipedia.org>

⁵ <http://en.wikipedia.org>

Turkish Republic of North Cyprus (TRNC): A de facto, break-away state on the island of Cyprus, whose statehood is recognized only by Turkey.⁶

Part IV: Methodology

Research Design:

I will classify my case study on the property issue in Cyprus as a field study because it was qualitative in the sense that it made use of asking open-ended questions and analyzing the results. I wanted to structure my research around people who have been directly affected by the property problem in Cyprus. In other words, I wanted to locate people who were displaced in 1974 and who were forced to move to the opposite side of the island in order to hear first hand accounts of peoples' experiences.

In addition to talking to people who have been affected by the situation and discussing it at a personal level, I also talked to professionals who have dealt with the problem or who know about the laws associated with property rights specific to Cyprus' situation. Rather than receiving a personal story, I tried to learn what can be done to begin to resolve the situation in a feasible manner. For example, I discussed this issue with a lawyer who knew more about the logistics of the Cyprus property issue than somebody who has not researched property rights applicable to this situation. I got the opportunity to interview Rauf Denktash, who is the founder of the "TRNC" and who served as their president for over thirty years. I also got to speak with his son, Serdar Denktash who is the Democratic Party leader for the "TRNC." In speaking with these two individuals, I was able to get a grasp of what they feel should be done to remedy the property issue from a political perspective.

Another group of people that I interviewed were academics that have done extensive research and are very knowledgeable about the topic of property rights in Cyprus. Reading articles that have been written by scholars has already, and will continue to aid me in my research in terms of finding more quantitative information such as, statistics on how many people are interested in reclaiming their old property, or what people in both communities (based on wide-spread surveys) think should be done about

⁶ <http://en.wikipedia.org>

this problem. One article that has already been helpful in providing statistics is Alexandros Lordos' report called, "Civil Society Diplomacy: A new approach for Cyprus?" which is based on two surveys, one administered to the Greek Cypriot community, and the other to the Turkish Cypriot community. The survey asks various questions on several important topics in relation to the Cyprus issue to see how people in both communities feel about the current situation.

Lastly, I referred to cases that have been brought to the European Council that have set precedence in terms of what can be expected to happen in similar cases in the future. Looking at previous court cases, is in fact one of the most concrete ways to predict impending verdicts. In the case of this problem, there have been very few trials brought to court, so there are still many things left to be determined.

I have chosen to base my study on qualitative research because it is not a situation that can be fully explained or understood by looking at surveys and statistics. Instead, it is a very personal topic and one that will be explained differently by each respective informant. However, I did use published statistics and surveys to supplement my research because it is a way to gain a wider perspective on the situation than I have time to examine myself. It also assisted me in making clear the opinions of people that I was not able to interview.

Each interview that I conducted began with certain procedures such as receiving written consent, and gaining a bit of background about my interviewee. When I designed this project, and constructed my procedures prior to my interviews, I created a fixed set of questions that I would ask my informants. I knew that I would have to modify some of the questions according to who I was interviewing at the time, but I never expected my interviews to veer from my proposal as much as they did.

I taped recorded each interview so that I could transcribe them and re-listen to what my informants told me, in addition to taking extensive notes on what they were telling me. Taking notes on information that I was not previously aware of helped me remember what I wanted to read about in more depth at a later date. This method was used mainly in my interviews with the academics and professionals because of the specific nature of some of the subject matters. When analyzing the data that I have collected, it took a certain level of understanding of the current situation and perception

of the blatant biases that my interviewees on either side of the issue harbor. I tried to maintain a strictly analytical point of view while trying to assess the relationship between my informants' opinions and historical trends amongst the groups on both sides of the issue.

Population and Sample:

For my study, my population consisted of the groups named above in the Research Design section. I conducted about 7 interviews with people who have been personally affected by the property rights issue in Cyprus, along with academics who have done extensive research on the topic, and professionals (preferably lawyers) who were able to supply me with information about the specific laws that can be applied to this problem. The people that I interviewed were all either people that I have cultivated relationships with, or people that I met through people I already knew. This created a comfort level that aided me in conducting my interviews in a very straightforward manner that proved to be highly informative in most cases.

Reliability and Validity:

Throughout my research period, I took every precaution necessary to assure that my research is reliable and valid. I interviewed multiple people (both Greek and Turkish Cypriot) to help ensure that the final product is as unbiased and equitable as possible. I made it a priority to interview people with varying perspectives and knowledge on my topic. While I was fortunate to have been able to speak with two political leaders in “north” Cyprus, I would have liked to interview their counterparts in “south” Cyprus as well. Unfortunately, I did not have that opportunity, so I would like to state that the political view of my research is regrettably one-sided in some ways. I was living in the “north” of Cyprus during the time that I was conducting my research, so I was presented with more chances to meet Turkish Cypriots than Greek Cypriots in my day to day life. However, I strived to conduct and present my research in such a way that all parties who may read this paper will feel justly regarded.

Ethics:

As a researcher in Cyprus, I feel that I had to take extra precautions in maintaining ethical research. In every interview that I conducted, I made sure to inform them of my intentions of my study as my first step. I wanted to make sure that they were aware of what I planned to do with the information provided to me. Every interviewee (aside from the two public figures I spoke with) was given a consent form to read that clearly outlined my area of study and intent. I assured each informant that their personal information and stories would remain anonymous throughout my paper, and I have maintained that agreement accordingly. With my informants' acceptance of the terms, and once the form was signed, I proceeded with my interviews. I chose not to use pseudonyms to differentiate between my informants, and instead used an even broader method to describe my informants in paper. I referred to their occupations and places of residence instead of their names.

While conducting my interviews, I had to be careful not to use terms that may offend people on either side of this conflict. While studying in Cyprus for over 3 months, I have learned that there are many subjects that may be inappropriate in certain contexts, depending on who you are speaking to. My duty to not offend had to be carried out through careful choice of words depending on the person that was speaking with.

Lastly, I had an obligation to listen to what my informants were willing to share with me about their personal lives and opinions, and it was not my place to judge or impose my own biases on them. I found this to be slightly challenging because of the simple fact that people naturally harbor biases on issues as controversial as this one. To the very best of my ability, I left my personal biases out of my interviews and my paper to provide a fair representation of the current property issue in Cyprus.

Limitations:

There are several limitations to my research that were foreseeable before I started my research and I will state those limitations here:

The time constraint: I had less than one month devote to researching such a complex topic as this one. Because of this time constraint, I was not able to interview as many people or research as comprehensively as I could have if I had more time.

The language barrier: Unfortunately, due to the fact that I am a native English speaker, many of my informants and I do not share the same first language, which may have lead to slight miscommunications and errors in comprehension. In addition, my population will be limited to English-speaking informants which reduces the population of people that I am able to interview.

Finding willing informants: I thought that it may be difficult to find people (especially those have been personally affected by the property issue) to interview for my research. Locating people who were displaced in 1974 was the easy part of the task because there are so many people in both communities who had to leave their homes and move to the “other side”. However, I thought finding people who would be willing to disclose their personal stories would be a different task all together. I thought that I would have trouble finding people that would not mind talking to me about the property problem. In essence, a significant limitation would have been that there would be many people with a story, but some who are not willing to discuss things from their past that may be painful to recall. After actually conducting my interviews, I found out that this was not a problem because all of the people that I asked to interview were more than willing to share their stories and opinions. Finding professionals who have dealt with the property issue and academics who have studied it was not a challenge.

Having completed my study, there were several limitations that I had not anticipated when I began this project. I will state those limitations here.

In most of the interviews that I conducted, I would ask a broad question having to do with their opinion on what should be done about the property issue. This would usually result in a long, detailed explanation that oftentimes satisfied many of the questions that I would have asked. The reason that I consider this to be a slight limitation to my research is that I cannot diametrically compare each of my informants’ answers in the analysis of my data.

The second limitation is one that I consider to be major hindrance to obtaining a well-rounded understanding of both sides’ perceptions of the property issue in Cyprus.

Because I have lived in the “northern” part of Cyprus for over 3 months, I have been presented with more chances to make connections with people that I could interview for my research. Also, the community in the “north” is very small which makes it easier to get to know more people. For example, I met Rauf Denktash’s (the founder of the “TRNC” and president for over 30 years) grandson, which enabled me to speak with 2 political leaders in the “north.” The reason I consider this a limitation is that I did not have the same opportunity to interview their counterparts in the “south” to learn what the Greek Cypriot political leaders’ opinions are.

Part V: Data Analysis

This section is a description of the interviews that I conducted about the property issue in Cyprus throughout my study. I will analyze the information that was given to me while also trying to connect that information with the framework that I have set up for this study. There were several over-arching themes that I noticed through my interviews that I will attempt to make meaning of in a larger, more general context. The spectrum of people that I interviewed was wide, and therefore helped to provide me with a greater understanding of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriots’ varying opinions on what should be done about the property issue in Cyprus. It would be inaccurate to say that there is one agreed upon opinion about the problem in each community because there are in fact many divergences in peoples’ beliefs even within the same community. With that stated, I would like to also make clear that the information in this analysis cannot, and should not be considered as the general opinions of the population at large on either side of the problem.

There were several themes in my interview that seemed to correlate directly with the community to which the interviewee belonged. Many of these themes were mentioned in Ayla Gurel and Kudret Ozersay’s article, “Cyprus and the Politics of Property.” They made several statements about Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot opinions of the Cyprus Property issue. Some of the main points included:

Greek Cypriots:

- Feel that the larger Cyprus problem began in 1974 when the Turkish military forces took control over around 37% of the northern part of the island, and that the property problem is a result of this fact.
- View the property problem as a personal issue as well as a human rights violation by Turkey (hence the cases brought to the ECHR).
- Believe that monetary compensation is not the only answer to solving the property problem, and that the ‘right to return’ needs to be recognized.
- In the political arena in the “south,” they maintain that property will not be given back to displaced persons in the “north” until there is a solution to the greater Cyprus problem.

Turkish Cypriots:

- Feel that the Cyprus issue actually began in 1963, and that the Greek Cypriots should recognize that there were many people who lost their property 11 years before the Turkish invasion.
- Think that the property problem should be solved by means of a global exchange with compensation for peoples’ losses on both sides.
- Advocate the Greek Cypriots utilizing the developing property commission in the “north” as a solution to the property problem using domestic means, rather than involving the ECHR.
- Knows that Turkey is responsible for any incurring human rights violations filed by the Greek Cypriots.

While conducting my interviews, I was surprised to see many of these same trends among my informants. There was general agreement on several points amongst people of the same community. I will attempt to elucidate my findings and correlations in the following section.

Since my interviews included such a wide spectrum of people, I will begin with the people who were displaced in 1974 that I spoke with. One Turkish Cypriot man who is a retired teacher, and now owns a shop in Nicosia in the “north” of Cyprus, had an atypical outlook on the property problem. He described how drastically his family’s life

changed in 1974 when he had to move from Paphos in the “south” to the “north.” He said, “my family was the second richest in my village until we had to move in 1974” (Interviewee B). He had to move to a very small house (Greek Cypriot property) that was basically given to him to use, but not to own.

When the gates were opened for crossing in 2003, the Greek Cypriot couple that used to reside in the small house in the “north,” came to visit him. He had long since built a new house and moved out of the house that was given to him, but when the Greek Cypriot couple came to him, he gladly offered to take them to the house and show them around. The couple had left behind many belongings in the house which he saved and kept for a time that he may meet them. Since then, he and his wife have become friends with the Greek Cypriot couple, and they visit one another regularly. I had spoken to this man several times prior to the interview, so I knew that he also teaches Greek voluntarily to Turkish Cypriots who are interested in learning the language. He seemed to possess an uncommon willingness to understand the “other.”

He expressed a wish to have his property in the “south” returned to him because of the value of the land compared to what he owns in the “north.” The one thing that he really stressed the most in the interview was that this problem (property and the greater Cyprus issue) needs to be solved by the two communities’ political powers, and not by external powers, such as Greece or Turkey. He, like many Turkish Cypriots, seemed frustrated with the fact that the Greek Cypriot leaders expect compensation to be given to their people, but they are not willing to reciprocate that compensation until there is a comprehensive Cyprus solution.

When asking Turkish Cypriot displaced persons if they think that the property commission that is currently being reviewed by the ECHR, is a step in the right direction as far as remedying Greek Cypriot losses, they spoke positively about it. This shows that some Turkish Cypriot displaced individuals probably have empathy for the Greek Cypriots who were displaced as well. While there is no direct benefit for the Turkish Cypriots that can be derived from the Property Commission, people recognize that it is a domestic alternative to the ECHR, and that it is a good first step. This however, does not mean that the Turkish Cypriots I interviewed are content with the Greek Cypriot stance on compensation.

This led me to the next obvious question in my research: Why would the Turkish Cypriots want to offer compensation to the Greek Cypriots if they are not going to reciprocate? The answer that was provided to me by a Turkish Cypriot international lawyer (who also happened to be a displaced person as well) was that it really had nothing to do with the Turkish Cypriots monetarily because the financial burden is Turkey's to deal with. According to the ECHR's rulings in the three property cases that were brought to court, Turkey has committed several human rights violations by invading and occupying 37 percent of the island making it impossible for Greek Cypriots to enjoy their properties, and is therefore obligated to provide redress. Turkey has one large incentive to follow these court rulings: European Union accession. Simply stated by the international lawyer that I interviewed, "the European Union takes human rights very seriously, so if Turkey has over 1,000 cases of human rights violations against them, they are inevitably going to run into problems" (Interviewee A). Even though this interviewee has done extensive research on the property problem in Cyprus and is a highly educated individual, biases cannot be fully omitted, and his were no exception. He made it very apparent that he agreed strongly with the "northern" Cyprus property commission and he seemed to be very confident that the commission could do what it has set out to do, depending on if the ECHR finds it to be a legitimate organization, of course. He also informed me that the ECHR would be reviewing the commission's mission and standards in December.

When interviewing a professor at Near East University in the "north," I asked her what she thought the best solution would be, and she admitted that there is no solution that is going to perfectly satisfy the Greek Cypriots *and* the Turkish Cypriots. She said that the only remedy for the property problem that could produce compensation in a quicker way is the property commission in the "north," backed by Turkey's funds. She mentioned that it is important to consider how the ECHR is reviewing the property commission as a valid organization despite the fact that the "TRNC" is not recognized by the international community, is a major step. The ECHR is looking at the property commission from a human rights perspective, not a political one. She also brought up an interesting point when she said, "...you also need to question how likely a moratorium is, and what the other options might be aside from the property commission. For instance,

could the Turkish Cypriots challenge the Greek Cypriot's position on not reciprocating compensation? Could they possibly bring this issue to the ECHR?" (Interviewee B). It is very unlikely, but it is something to think about. The fact that Turkey committed human rights violations against the Greek Cypriots, and the "TRNC" is for all political purposes, linked with Turkey; it would not be an easy case to win.

When interviewing a Greek Cypriot elementary teacher who was also a displaced person, I noticed that same sense of desire to return to his property in Famagusta. The man who's family was from Famagusta, told me that his parents still consider their home in Larnaca to be a temporary replacement for their old home. Their desire to go back to their place of origin is so strong, that they have held on to the idea for over 30 years. He informed me that their old home is in a militarized zone, and cannot be entered by civilians. When I asked him what he thought about remedies for the property problem, he (not unlike many other Greek Cypriots) was interested in applying to the ECHR to seek compensation. Considering that there have been a total of three cases that the ECHR has accepted related to the property problem out of the thousands that have applied, the chances of a case making it to the court are very slim. He made it very clear that he wanted his family's property returned to them, as well as monetary compensation for their loss of use for over 30 years. The Greek Cypriot view on a remedy for the property problem was focused on the ECHR, and highly skeptical of the "north" property commission's validity. I certainly got the feeling that many displaced individuals believe that it is the politicians' job to fix the property problem, and not the job of the people. People on both sides of the problem seem to hold a "politicians will figure it out" mentality.

The confidence in the ECHR by Greek Cypriots was ascertained in another one of my interviews. This man was a taxi driver in the "south," who was born in Famagusta and lived there before 1974. He too, had a desire to return to his home, but not to live there; he just wants to be able to see it. His house, like the elementary school teacher's, is in a militarized zone in Famagusta, so it is not possible to visit it. He was very young when his family had to move, so he barely remembers the house, but he wanted to see the place of his younger brother's death. His brother died of cancer when he was very young. He has no desire to take back his property because he feels at home in the

“south” and does not feel it is necessary to retrieve his family’s property. He does however, want monetary compensation for all the years that his family has been unable to use their home. He informed me that he was skeptical about the property commission’s ability to provide any remedies, and that he would wait and see what happened. So hypothetically, if the property commission starts to carry out their mission, what reasons will the Greek Cypriots have not to apply to the commission rather than the ECHR?

In personal interview with Rauf Denktash, the founder of the “TRNC” and president for over 30 years, I got a first hand look into what negotiations for a property settlement were like. He stressed the point that the property problem did not start in 1974, and that it actually started in 1963. He stated that the reason the Greek Cypriot political leaders do not have motivation to compromise with the “TRNC,” is because of their EU membership. Denktash holds that the accession of the Republic of Cyprus to the EU was illegal and unjust under the “Treaty of Guaranty.” He feels that “being crowned,” with EU membership gives them no reason to want to solve the property problem on the basis of a global exchange. During the interview Denktash said, “why should they make a compromise really? They are the only government that the world knows in Cyprus, they have no reason”

As far as a solution is concerned, he believes that the property problem in Cyprus should be solved globally, by exchange of compensation. He did not deny the human rights violations by Turkey to the Greek Cypriots, but he feels that the Turkish Cypriots should be compensated as well. When addressing the “north” of Cyprus property commission, he did not seem to agree that it is a fair way of dealing with the property problem. He described the commission as a hindrance to his ultimate goal of bi-zonality in Cyprus. He seemed does not agree with the way that the new government in the “TRNC” is dealing with the property problem by allowing Greek Cypriots to be compensated without reciprocation to the Turkish Cypriots.

I also interviewed Rauf Denktash’s son, Serdar who is the Democratic Party leader for the “TRNC.” It was interesting to witness the “generation clash” (as Serdar called it) of the two leaders. Their opinions on the property issue, and the Cyprus issue in general were divergent on several points. Serdar opened the interview by saying, “...we do not deny the property rights for the individuals,” which is everything that his father is

against (Denktash, Serdar 11/30/06). Serdar holds that individuals' property rights should be recognized, but that there should be an exchange of property on both sides. He is a strong advocate of the property commission, and thinks that the Greek Cypriots should develop an organization with similar goals for compensating Turkish Cypriots. The reason he feels that the property should be solved on an individual basis is because of the considerable amount of development the "north" of Cyprus has completed in the past 30 years. His main concern is about peoples' investments, and how they will be compensated for those losses. His stance on this issue is that Greek Cypriots should be compensated monetarily, or have their property reinstated if it is not being used by a Turkish Cypriot. He used Kyrenia as an example, saying that it used to be a very small town with about 600 homes, and now it has developed into the second most developed area in "northern" Cyprus. He said, "what are we going to give back, to whom are we going to give it back to? What will happen with all the investments we made in this area? Who will compensate that? The state, the individual? It will get more and more complicated." (Denktash, Serdar).

He agreed with Rauf Denktash that the EU granting admission to the Republic of Cyprus has caused countless problems for the "TRNC," and that it was a mistake to let a country that has not yet solved their internal problems, into the organization. He expressed hope to someday be able to join the EU as well, so that both sides of Cyprus can be on a level playing field when issues such as the property problem arise. Overall, Serdar Denktash expressed a willingness to provide the Greek Cypriots with a remedy, and to work out a solution that is based more on monetary compensation than anything else. The main problem with this is that there are many Greek Cypriots who want their property back whether a Turkish Cypriot has invested money in it, or not. This approach does not seem to consider the sentimental and sociological attachment people many have with their old homes, and that the answer may not always be monetary.

After completing these interviews, I understand that people on either side of the conflict undeniably adhere to some of the fundamental views of their community. I believe that it would be nearly impossible to eradicate these positions no matter how educated an individual may be. These interviews are proof that people innately believe in what will produce the best potential outcome for themselves.

Part VI: Conclusions

Through my research, I have concluded that there are not many options for settling the property problem in Cyprus. Unfortunately, there are almost no options for the Turkish Cypriots to receive compensation until there is a comprehensive Cyprus solution. With that knowledge, it can be stated that unless the Republic of Cyprus administration has a sudden change of heart in regards to the property issue, the Turkish Cypriots will continue to wait for redress.

The Greek Cypriots however, have been successful in three cases brought to the ECHR against Turkey. These three cases (see Appendices) have proven that Turkey is guilty of committing several human rights violations, and forced the country to design a model of redress for the Greek Cypriots. The redress model has taken shape as a property commission in the “north” of Cyprus that Greek Cypriots can, and undoubtedly will, apply to.

The latest news about the property problem in Cyprus is that the ECHR was to review the property commission’s validity as far as human rights standards are concerned on December 7, 2006. This shows how prevalent this topic is in Cyprus politics. According to a recent article in *Zaman*, a journal written in Turkey, “Eighty Greek Cypriots, who have property in TRNC territory, have applied to the TRNC compensation commission so far. In seven cases, the commission ruled for financial compensation and for the return of the property in three cases” (*Zaman*, 11/28/06). The *Xenides-Arestis* case, along with the property commission, was reviewed once more by the ECHR on December 7th and the results were positive for the property commission. The commission will now be fully recognized by the ECHR. Greek Cypriots will now have to exhaust this domestic option before applying to the ECHR about their property rights. This option will provide results in a timelier manner so that a greater number of people will receive redress for their losses. This recent ruling by the ECHR is one of the most significant achievements that has been made for the property problem in Cyprus in over 30 years, and could be the beginning of a solution to the property problem for the Greek Cypriots.

Thus far, the Turkish Cypriots do not have a comparable offer from the Greek Cypriots, but one can only hope that there will be one in the near future so that the property problem, in addition to the greater Cyprus problem, can be solved on a bilateral basis rather than a unilateral one.

References

Activity Chart:

12 Nov: Rural Stay	13 Nov: Rural Stay	14 Nov: Meet with Erol Kaymak	15 Nov: Interview T/C int. lawyer and displaced person	16 Nov: Transcribe Interview	17 Nov: Set up more interviews	18 Nov:
19 Nov:	20 Nov: Made corrections on my paper from draft	21 Nov: Interview professor at Near East	22 Nov: Research Property Commission	23 Nov: Meeting with Erol Kaymak	24 Nov: Interview with a G/C displaced person at 12	25 Nov: Work on data analysis
26 Nov: Set up two more interviews	27 Nov: Meeting with Erol Kaymak	28 Nov: Research info Erol provided, work on log book	29 Nov: Interview with a T/C displaced person at 4	30 Nov: Interview with Rauf and Serdar Denktash	1 Dec: Interview with G/C displaced person	2 Dec: Transcribe interviews
3 Dec:	4 Dec: Interview with a G/C displaced person	5 Dec: Transcribe interview, work on log book	6 Dec: Work on ISP paper	7 Dec: Work on ISP paper	8 Dec: ISP paper due	9 Dec: ISP Presentations at 10

Instrumentation:

1. Tell me a little about yourself.
2. Based on your research, how many Cypriots do you think would be willing to give up their home (if they were properly compensated) to give property back to a person who was displaced in 1974? (To an academic).

3. What are the different types of compensation that can be given to remedy the property problem? (To an academic).
4. Would you want your property back if you could, or would you rather be compensated monetarily? Would you move back there, or just keep your ownership?
5. Do you think that the “north” of Cyprus property commission is a step in the right direction?
6. Have you or your family applied to the ECHR or the “north” of Cyprus property commission?
7. What do you think that the ECHR thinks of the property commission? (To an academic).
8. In your opinion, what do you think should be the solution to the property problem? Should it be treated as a personal human rights issue, or should it be solved by means of a global exchange?
9. What do you think should happen to Varosha?
10. What do you think will logistically happen concerning the property issue in Cyprus?
11. Have you seen your property since the gates were opened for crossing?
12. How did having to leave your home in 1974 affect your family?
13. Would you be willing to live side by side a Turkish Cypriot family if you could move back to your home on the opposite side of the “Green Line?”
14. Would you be willing to live side by side a Greek Cypriot family if you could move back to your home in the “south?”
15. Do you think that the Republic of Cyprus should give back Turkish Cypriot properties before a comprehensive Cyprus solution?

Works Cited or Referenced

“Council of Europe.” <http://www.coe.int/>

“Cyprus Mail.” <http://cyprus-mail.com/>

Denktash, Rauf. Personal Interview. Nicosia, Cyprus. November 30, 2006.

Denktash, Serdar. Personal Interview. Nicosia, Cyprus. November 30, 2006.

“European Court of Human Rights” (ECHR). <http://www.echr.coe.int>

“European Court of Justice.” <http://www.curia.europe.eu/>

Gürel, Ayla and Özersay, Kudret. “Cyprus and the Politics of Property.” *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 9, No. 3. 349-369. Eastern Mediterranean University. November 2006.

Interviewee A: Famagusta, Cyprus. November 15, 2006.

Interviewee B: Nicosia, Cyprus. November 21, 2006.

Interviewee C: Nicosia, Cyprus. November 29, 2006.

Interviewee D: Nicosia, Cyprus. December 1, 2006.

Interviewee E: Nicosia, Cyprus. December 4, 2006.

Joseph, S. Joseph. 1997. *Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics. From Independence to the Threshold of the European Union*. New York, NY: St. Martin’s Press Inc.

Kaymak, Erol. “A Roundtable Discussion.” Eastern Mediterranean University. October 2006.

Lordos, Alexandros. 2005. “Civil Society Diplomacy: A new approach for Cyprus?” CYMAR Market Research Ltd, KADEM Cyprus Social Research.

“Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cyprus.”
<http://www02.mfa.gov.cy/mfa/mfa.nsf/mfa?OpenForm>

Plumer, Aytug. *Cyprus, 1963-64: The Fateful Years*. 2003. Cyprus Research and Publishing Center, Nicosia, Cyprus.

Sahali, Erhun. *History of Cyprus*. Nicosia, Cyprus. October 2006.

Solomou, Emilios. “History of Cyprus”. Intercollege, Nicosia, Cyprus. 2 February 2006.

Sozen, Ahmet. 2006. Reflections on the Cyprus Problem: A Compilation of Recent Academic Contributions. "The Cyprus Negotiations: From the 1963 Inter-communal Negotiations to the Annan Plan." Cyprus. Eastern Mediterranean University Printing House.

Theophanus, A. (1996). *The Political Economy of Cyprus*. Intercollege Press, Nicosia, Cyprus.

UN Secretariat (2003). Report of the Secretary General to the Security Council on Cyprus. April 1, 2003. <http://www.un.org/docs/sc/sgrep03.html>

"Wikipedia." <http://www.en.wikipedia.org>

Zachariades, Michael. 2002. Leiden University. "Transplanted Populations and the Problems Caused: Cyprus." <http://www.aunitedcyprus.com>

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Loizidou v. Turkey summary judgment

Appendix 2: Cyprus v. Turkey summary judgment

Appendix 3: Xenides-Arestis v. Turkey summary judgment