4-1-2005

The Inter-Communal Relations Among NGOs Operating With Cyprus

Shelby Reneé Port
SIT Study Abroad

SIT INDEPENDENT STUDY PROJECT:

"The Inter-communal Relations among NGOs Operating with Cyprus"

May 12, 2005

Conducted By: Shelby Reneé Port

Preface

  This research paper should be viewed as a first step to my undertaking of research NGOs operating within Cyprus that are realizing inter-communal relationships with other organizations and implementing inter-communal projects. This topic proved to be very interesting and extremely valuable to the Cyprus issue and its future. Considering I had to leave Cyprus for a week during the Independent Study period due to the death of a family member, I only had three weeks to conduct, analyze, and draft this research when I should have had four. For this reason, I definitely felt the limited amount of time as an obstacle to produce a research project that could be used as a significant contribution to society. Although I am proud of the work that I have executed and the findings of this research, I feel that I could have more clearly presented my findings than I have done throughout the current draft of this paper. With more time, I would be able to continue to revise and clarify my findings to produce a draft that is very clear and concise so that members of organizations could easily read this paper in order to achieve effective relationships with organizations operating across the Green Line. Even so, I have revealed very interesting observations throughout this paper which should be given consideration by all individuals looking to achieve these inter-communal relationships in Cyprus.

Acknowledgements

  It is with sincere gratitude that I acknowledge all of the individuals who have contributed to the completion of my Independent Study Project as well as to my semester living and studying in Cyprus. Among these individuals, I would like to acknowledge all of the NGO officials that I conducted interviews with for offering their time and honesty, all of the professionals and experts who presented lectures, my academic directors, Anna Misiaouli and Selhan Zeki for organizing lectures and our excursion to Greece and Turkey, Anna Misiaouli for conducting our field-study seminar, my language teacher, Nancy for finding the time to teach both our Greek and Turkish language courses in the midst of a very busy schedule, my ISP advisor, Judith Kallick Russell for editing and

revising my project as I went along, and the Management Centre of the Mediterranean
for providing a classroom and café for the last three and a half months.

I. INTRODUCTION

General Statement of Research Question

The purpose of this research paper is to demonstrate the dynamics of the inter-communal relations established between Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) operating in northern Cyprus and NGOs operating in southern Cyprus fulfilling a similar purpose or serving a similar population in their respective communities.

Introduction and Statement of the Problem

Throughout the past three and a half months, I have lived and studied in Cyprus, an island located in the heart of the Mediterranean Sea. However, when I would ask a Cypriot friend of mine the whereabouts of the island, a smile would spread across her face and she would teasingly respond, "Well, in the center of the universe of course." Although there a few overly proud individuals I encountered in Cyprus, a majority of Cypriots, my friend included, are not quite as arrogant as this statement would suggest. Rather, Cypriots in general are consumed with many aspects of the past and future of Cyprus because this is an island that has been engaged in a deep-rooted conflict which has resulted in the 1974 de-facto partition of the island including its capital city, making Cyprus the homeland of the last divided capital of the world. Today, Cyprus is territorially divided by the UN Green Line, while ethnically divided between the two largest ethnic groups existing on the island, the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots. There are two separate administrations operating in Cyprus, one of which does not recognize the other and until the spring of 2003, did not allow members of their own community to have access or contact across the UN Green Line. Today it is the case that members of both communities are allowed access to the other side and contact with members of the other community, but the issue remains to be unresolved in Cyprus considering that the Turkish Cypriot administration is unrecognized as the official government of northern Cyprus by the Republic of Cyprus throughout the world, with the exception of Turkey. Throughout the last thirty years of isolation, members of both Cypriot communities and of the international community have made extreme efforts to

reunify the island including the island's ethnic peoples, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. As a main contributor to this cause, Cypriot NGOs have been at the forefront of peace-building and reconciliation in Cyprus as well as to promote inter-communal relations among Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. It is for the latter reason that I became interested in investigating NGOs in Cyprus that have established relations with other organizations across the Green Line.

Historical Background

The Republic of Cyprus was established on 16 August 1960 under the Zurich-London agreements. In order to protect the rights of minorities on the island, it was outlined in the 1960 Constitution that the Republic of Cyprus would be governed by a President elected by and from the Greek Cypriot community and a Vice President elected by and from the Turkish Cypriot community. At the time, the population was comprised of approximately 80 percent Greek Cypriots and 18 percent Turkish Cypriots. Not more than three years later, there was a breakdown in the newly-found constitution of Republic of Cyprus and inter-communal violence on the island exploded in December of 1963 resulting in the withdrawal of Turkish Cypriots from the Republic of Cyprus government; a year later, some 20,000 Turkish Cypriots fled from areas where violence occurred into enclaves protected by the British military because there were a number of Turkish Cypriots villages looted and destroyed by guerilla warfare. In June of 1964, there was a threat by Turkey to invade Cyprus, but harsh reaction from the United States and the United Kingdom deterred Turkey from doing so. That same year United Nations peacekeeping troops were sent to the island to prevent further violent outbreaks in Cyprus. Even so, the civil unrest among the two communities continued throughout the next ten years were intensified in 1974, when a coup against the Greek Cypriot leader, President Makarios was staged by the Greek military dictatorship in order to annex the island to Greece. Consequently, Turkey executed two interventions in Cyprus by sending Turkish troops to the island first in July 1974 and again in August 1974 to obtain control of 37% of the northern region of the island after its second intervention. As a result of the interventions, six thousand people were found dead or missing; anywhere from 150,000 to 200,000 Greek Cypriots living in northern Cyprus were forced to flee their homes to take refuge in the southern part of the island while almost of the Turkish

Cypriots living in the south fled their homes to relocate in the north (www.cyprus-conflict.net).

Since that time, the island remains to be highly militarized and today is separated by the UN Green Line. The dominant ethnic groups of the two communities speak two different languages, follow two different religions, and have established two distinct governments which instilled the nationalist's beliefs of their homelands into its respective citizens. In spite of thirty years of unresolved conflict with members of both communities living in uncertainty and isolation from one another, both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, especially those involved in NGOs have made significant strides to reunify the island a bring the two ethnic groups together. At the forefront of the funding of inter-communal relations, the Bi-Communal Development Programme (BDP) was established to promote peace building and co-operation in Cyprus through the implementation of projects of common interest to Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. Funded by United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and operated by United National Office for Project Services (UNOPS), the BDP NGO Sector Support has been a leading contributor to NGOs working to promote inter-communal relations among individuals and organizations in Cyprus (www.unopspmu.org).

One of the more recent developments in Cyprus was the opening of the UN Green Line in the spring of 2003 by the Turkish Cypriot administration and the Republic of Cyprus to allow unfettered access between members of northern and southern Cyprus. This has drastically changed the dynamics of the current situation considering that Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots can now email, call by telephone, and meet with one another, rights which they have previously been refused for thirty years. Perhaps even more significant to the contemporary Cyprus issue is the April 24, 2004 Referendum in which Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots voted for the Annan Plan in two separate referendums in order to reunite the island based on a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation. Unfortunately, the referendum was rejected by the Greek Cypriots with 70% of the population in the south voted "No." This was quite different from the outcome in the northern region of Cyprus where 65% of Turkish Cypriots voted "Yes" despite opposition from their administration (www.cyprus-conflict.net). Now we are in the

current situation, in which Cypriot NGOs and funding organizations such as the BDP continue to promote and establish inter-communal relations and the possibility of peace in Cyprus.

Rationale

There are a variety of reasons as to why I chose to explore the inter-communal relations amid Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot NGOs. Cypriot NGOs have played a significant role in promoting inter-communal activities and relations since the early 1990's and continue to do so. Since the UN Green Line has opened in the spring of 2004, it has become drastically easier for NGOs to carry out these inter-communal activities and to collaborate with NGOs from the other community. Considering this is a relatively new phenomenon, there has been little research on the inter-communal relations of NGOs in Cyprus both before and after the opening of the borders. And since Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots involved in NGOs are the largely the ones promoting inter-communal relations, it is only natural that I investigate further into the relations they have established amongst themselves in order to come to some conclusions about how they are currently communicating, cooperating, and collaborating with members of the other community. Additionally, it is my hope that this research will reveal some of the successes of inter-communal relations among Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot NGOs as well as various challenges that arise while working together. It is also meant to draw conclusions about the two Cypriot societies and attempt to determine if there are similarities among Greek Cypriot NGOs and/or Turkish Cypriot NGOs, despite their different functions and/or the fact that they serve different populations. Furthermore, it is intended to expose some of the similarities amongst NGOs involved in inter-communal activities regardless of the NGO functions.

It is my hope that this research can be used as an example for other organizations who wish to develop relationships with organizations operating in the other community. This research paper is meant to provide these organizations with methods to establish relationships, examples of types of joint projects, examples of relationships other than the implementation of joint projects and effective communication and cooperation among members of NGOs. Furthermore, it will hopefully provide these organizations with examples of the past successes and challenges that Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot

NGOs have faced while working together as well as to have some conscious expectations of what to anticipate prior to working with organizations on the other side.

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

There has been an array of sources including evaluations, academic writings, theories, lectures, and panel discussions that allowed me to enhance my understanding of how NGOs are developing inter-communal relations in Cyprus and to design my research methodologies prior to conducting my research. The following hypotheses have shaped the ways in which I chose to design my research project, especially regarding the questions I asked to the NGO officials.

In the present situation, it is no longer necessary for NGOs to conduct projects or activities for the sole purpose of "bi-communality." In May 2004, a research institution conducted an evaluation of the BDP at the request of USAID in order to assess the effectiveness of the program's bi-communal objectives and to offer future improvements and suggestions for the program. For the reason that the BDP has been at the forefront of funding NGOs doing inter-communal work in Cyprus, it is necessary to take into account the evaluation conducted on the progress of the BDP and the improvements it suggests. In regards to the NGO Sector of the BDP, the evaluation states that since the opening of the UN Green Line in the spring of 2003, there has been a major breakthrough in the relations between the two communities, including NGO relations, for the sole purpose that members of both communities now have access to each other for the first time in 30 years. With the present situation, it argues that it is no longer necessary for NGOs to conduct projects or activities for the sole purpose of "bi-communality" considering that it is now possible for Cypriots to have contact with members of the other community any time they wish. Even so, the evaluation emphasizes the point that today it is essential that NGOs attempt to achieve inter-communality as a result of their communication, cooperation, and collaboration with NGOs and/or organizations across the divide serving a similar population or fulfilling a similar purpose (USAID Evaluation 2004). This research paper was designed in order to determine if NGOs are achieving inter-communality in this manner and if it has been successful. Accordingly, I have inquired

about the nature of joint programs implemented by the four NGOs, whether they have a specific purpose or if they were implemented for the sole purpose of inter-communalism.

Creating conditions for groups to get to know one another and create dialogue amongst each other helps break down negative stereotypes, prejudices and hatreds. This is the essence of the "Contact Hypothesis" which provides a solution to conflict between two groups. It states that the lack of knowledge and information about the "other" is the source of all evil and that isolation causes groups to exaggerate differences and fall prey to propaganda against the "other" (Misiaouli 2005). The BDP has applied this theory to encourage contact and bi-communalism to both Cypriot communities (USAID Evaluation 2004). It can also be applied to the opening of the Green Line to determine if there has been a breakdown of negative stereotypes and/or prejudices of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots since they have access to one another for the first time in thirty years. For the purpose of this research project, it has been applied to determine if NGO officials working with members of the other community have overcome their own prejudices and/or stereotypes of the "other." Accordingly, I will inquire about the character of the relationships among NGO officials from different communities and the challenges that arose in working together.

Despite the censorship and oppression of the Turkish Cypriot administration, Turkish Cypriots have put on an awe-inspiring demonstration that they are ready to find a solution to the Cyprus issue; while the supposedly free and democratic Republic of Cyprus is haunted by accusations of censorship and intimidation. This claim is made by Rebecca Bryant, an American scholar, who has recently conducted research on place and memory in Cyprus. She pointed out the irony of this situation in the article, *An Ironic Result in Cyprus,* which was first published in the Middle East Report Online on May 12, 2004 (Bryant 2004). This new dynamic and observation within the two Cypriot societies has prompted me to further investigate this phenomenon within my own research. For this reason, I inquired about the exterior obstacles that NGOs in northern Cyprus and southern Cyprus faced and to what degree the government, media, and members of their community influenced and/or hindered the inter-communal relations with other organizations operating on the other side.

Today there is a general malaise and unwillingness of Greek Cypriots to reach a solution to the Cyprus issue and to reach out to Turkish Cypriots. This was also the claim of Rebecca Bryant in her article, *An Ironic Result in Cyprus.* She claimed that because Greek Cypriot politics has long been centralized and party-oriented, it has caused members in the southern region of Cyprus to become apathetic to the Cyprus conflict. Furthermore, she claims that a majority of Greek Cypriots are also unwilling to establish relationships with Turkish Cypriots even when there is a chance to do so (Bryant 2004). Her claims have influenced me look for examples of this throughout my research to determine if her analysis is correct. Therefore, I have designed my research questions in a way that I could inquire if there were any internal challenges between Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot NGO officials working together to see if these themes were revealed among the four NGOs I analyzed.

Bi-communal programs and activities must teach conflict resolution skills to Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. Canan Oztoprak, a Turkish Cypriot woman active within her community, delivered this recommendation to an international conference in California, U.S.A. the summer of 2000. Although this paper was written before the borders opened, it is a valuable suggestion for NGOs doing inter-communal today. She claimed that meetings and activities which involve members of both communities are not giving consideration to the fact that these groups have not received any communication and conflict resolution skills; this in turn causes debates between the two groups to go on and on while making very little progress to address a specific issue and/or to develop relationships with one another (Oztoprak 2000). In regards to my research, I have designed my interview questions to inquire if there were any barriers to communication and or collaboration. Furthermore, I have inquired about the recommendations of NGO officials to reveal whether or not they believe these conflict resolution skills would be valuable to the working relations of NGO officials across the green line.

III.   METHODOLOGY
Research Design

For this research project, I have used a "qualitative" research technique in order to conduct my research. When one uses the qualitative research technique, she or he is interested in…(Spyros Notes)

In order to implement the qualitative research technique, I have conducted six interviews with NGO officials; for two of the NGOs, I interviewed two officials from each organization, the NGO director and an NGO project coordinator. For the third NGO, I only interviewed the director because they were the most qualified individual to answer questions about projects implemented by the NGO and the relationship with organizations in the south in order to plan and implement these projects. For the fourth NGO, I only interviewed the project coordinator because the director of the NGO was on sick leave the day the interview was scheduled The interviews were conducted in the NGO offices, with the exception of the interview with Director #2, which was conducted outside at a local café. The time it took to conduct the interviews ranged from 45 minutes to 90 minutes. I conducted all of the interviews in English, my first language, but a second language for all of the NGO officials I interviewed. Nevertheless, all of the NGO officials spoke fluent English. To each of the NGO officials, open-ended questions were asked during the interview, rather than "yes/no" questions or "multiple-choice"; this was to ensure that it would be possible to obtain very clear and descriptive results and to ensure that the questions would not be misleading and/or limiting. To each of the three NGO directors, I intended to ask almost identical interview questions. Similarly, I intended to ask almost identical questions to the three project coordinators. The reasoning behind this is to reduce the variable factors which can affect the outcome of my research. Even so, at the time of the interview, there were additional questions asked in a few interviews and there was no need to ask all the questions I had planned on asking in other interviews. For these reasons, the questions essentially asked to the NGO directors are similar, but not identical. The same is true for the questions asked to the project coordinators (See Appendix A and Appenix B).

All of the interview questions asked were reviewed and revised prior to the period I conducted the interviews to ensure that the questions are phrased with the least possible bias, to ensure that the questions asked will be understood in case there is a cultural barrier and to ensure that the questions would enable me to obtain the information I was

seeking. In the beginning, Anna Misiaouli and Selhan Zeki reviewed the written interview questions; Anna is a Greek Cypriot and Selhan is a Turkish Cypriot; therefore, I was able to get the expertise from members of both communities, which is vital considering I was to interview members of both communities. After taking into account their suggestions, I conducted a semi-mock interview with my Independent Study Project Advisor, Judith Kallick Russell. Not only did this allow me to practice how to conduct the interviews, it allowed me to get an estimate of how much time the interview would take. It was during this meeting with the advice of Judy that I narrow down my interview questions to the ones that are critical to my research.

Operational Definitions

Greek Cypriot: An individual who lives and has citizenship in the Republic of Cyprus, speaks Greek, and/or considers themselves ethnically Greek; Greek Cypriots have a majority and dominate the government in South Cyprus

Turkish Cypriot: an individual who has citizenship in the Republic of Cyprus, lives and has citizenship in the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC)," (which is only recognized by the "TRNC" and Turkey), speaks Turkish, and/or considers themselves ethnically Turkish; Turkish Cypriots have a majority and dominate the government in northern Cyprus

Northern Cyprus: The territory north of the UN Green Line in Cyprus which recognizes itself as the "Turkish Republic of Northern Turkey;" the TRNC is not recognized by south Cyprus nor the international community besides Turkey, therefore I will refer to the territory as "northern Cyprus" to refrain from controversial terminology

Southern Cyprus: The territory south of the UN Green Line in Cyprus which is internationally recognized as the Republic of Cyprus. The Republic of Cyprus is not recognized by north Cyprus, therefore I will refer to the territory as "southern Cyprus" in order to refrain from controversial terminology

Non-governmental Organization (NGO): An organization that does not receive exclusive funding from the government (if any at all) which is working to make some type of social contribution in Cyprus

NGO Director: An individual who oversees all of the functions carried out by the NGO

NGO Project Coordinator: An individual who plans and implements specific programs or activities carried out by the NGO

Bi-Communal Development Programme (BDP): The program is dedicated to the promotion of peace building and co-operation in Cyprus through the implementation of projects of common interest to Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots (www.unopspmu.org)

United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS): UNOPS is an arm of the United Nations responsible for the project management of thousands of initiatives worldwide. It provides a broad range of management services, from the administration of loans for UN institutions to the implementation of rehabilitation, reconstruction and development projects in a variety of fields. In Cyprus, UNOPS has established a Programme Management Unit to implement this program (www.unopspmu.org)

United States Agency for International Development (USAID): USAID, dedicated to supporting economic growth, agriculture, trade, health, democracy, conflict prevention and humanitarian assistance, was created by executive order of President John F. Kennedy in 1961, and is an independent federal government agency (www.unopspmu.org)

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP): UNDP is the UN's global development network with a presence in 166 countries, is focused on assisting communities worldwide to build and share solutions to the challenges of democratic government, poverty reduction, crisis prevention and recovery, energy and environment, information and communications technology, and HIV/AIDS (www.unopspmu.org)

United Nations Green Line: The UN controlled buffer-zone that divides the island into two territories; the north consists of 37% of the territory in the northern region of the island and the south consists of 60% of the territory in the southern region of the island (3% of the island's territory is occupied by the British military). Until the spring of 2003, the Green Line was a "closed" border, meaning there was basically no access for Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots to cross the Green Line into the other side. In April 23, 2003, the Green Line was opened by the administration in the North and the administration in the South also allowed unfettered access between the North and the South.

UN Annan Plan: A plan designed by UN Secretary General Kofi Annan and UN Special Envoy Alvaro DeSoto which called for the island's partial reunification by outlining a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation.

UN sponsored Referendum: On April 24, 2004, there were two separate referendums conducted, one in the north and one in the south, to allow the citizens of Cyprus to vote to accept ("Yes" vote) or reject ("No" vote) the implementation of the UN Annan Plan, to reunify the island. In the end, the UN Annan Plan passed in the north with a 65% "Yes" vote, however was decisively rejected by the south with a 76% "No" vote.

Peace-Building: The term can be used for the general promotion of peace throughout the world. In the case of Cyprus, it is often used to refer to the promotion of a solution in Cyprus to reunify the island but does not necessarily imply a specific solution, such as the UN Annan Plan; I may also use the term "peace-promoting" throughout this research paper, which is synonymous to peace-building.

Bi-communal: The term used since the origin of the Bi-communal Movement, which has materialized and escalated since the early 1990's; it refers to the promotion of peace building and cooperation in Cyprus among Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. Throughout the interviews with NGO officials, the term "bi-communal" was frequently used

Inter-communal: The term refers to the promotion of peace building and cooperation in Cyprus among a diverse array of Cypriot groups. For the purpose of this paper, I will refer to "inter-communal" relations, rather than "bi-communal" relations because it includes a wide range of cultural groups within Cyprus; also, the "bi-communal" tends to polarize the two sides (USAID Evalution);

Population and Sample

In order to gain a better understanding of the dynamics of the relationships between Greek Cypriot NGOs and Turkish Cypriot NGOs, I have analyzed four NGOs operating in Nicosia, Cyprus that have engaged in inter-communal activities; two Greek Cypriot NGOs and two Turkish Cypriot NGOs. Of these four NGOs, there are two similar categories of NGO, one operating in the north and one operating in the south. The first category is made up of a Greek Cypriot NGO and a Turkish Cypriot NGO that frequently conducts peace-promoting activities; the second category is made up of a Greek Cypriot

NGO and a Turkish Cypriot NGO which mainly, but not exclusively, provides services to women. By no means are these NGOs parallel organizations nor are they identical in every single way; in fact, the NGOs of a similar category have many differences among them, including their missions, visions, activities, structure, funding, etc. Nonetheless, the two NGOs of a similar category have at some point worked together, either to promote a specific issue pertinent to both organizations or, to a lesser degree, on a joint program meant to promote inter-communal relations and contacts. For two of the NGOs, I interviewed two officials from each organization, the director and a project coordinator. For the third NGO I only interviewed the director and for the fourth NGO, I only interviewed the project coordinator. In order to distinguish between the four NGOs, I will refer to the NGOs as NGO #1, NGO #2, NGO #3, and NGO #4 (See Appendix C).

Table 1: NGO Description

NGO	Region	Main Population	Main Purpose
NGO #1	Northern	NGOs, Businesses, Turkish Cypriots, Greek Cypriots, Youth	Management related trainings, research, peace-building activities
NGO #2	Southern	NGOs, Youth, Greek Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots	Pure research, peace-building activities, youth programs, sub-contracting programs
NGO #3	Northern	Women, Youth	Promote human rights, specifically women's rights
NGO #4	Southern	Women, Youth	Promote reproductive rights and other issues

			concerning women

NGO #1 operates in the North that provides services for the productive working of the public, private and non-profit organizations, applies theory to practice in management, teaches the application of international and modern management techniques, and establishes systems to channel international funds to its community (NGO #1 Pamphlet). In order to implement these functions, NGO #1 has executed many inter-communal programs and partnerships (Director #1 2005). NGO #2 operates in the South to execute activities to promote activities concerning technology and communication education, youth, and peace-building, represents international bodies, conducts pure research activities, and sub-contracts programs and activities to other organizations (NGO #2 Profile 2004). NGO #3 is a women's organization working in the field of community development northern Cyprus. The objectives of this NGO are to work for human rights and women's rights, raise awareness of the needs of female children, strengthen women's position in society, work for international peace and understanding, work to establish moral values, and to promote the understanding of "Unity in Diversity" (NGO #3 Pamphlet). NGO #4 is working in southern Cyprus to promote and teach on issues concerning a woman's reproductive rights, abortion, HIV/AIDS awareness, sexual identity, and sexual liberation (NGO #4 Pamphlet). In order to distinguish between the seven NGO officials, I will refer to the NGO directors as Director #1, Director #2, etc. depending on the NGO he or she works for. As for the NGO project coordinators, I will refer to them as Project Coordinator #1, Project Coordinator #2, etc. depending on the NGO she or he works for. Note that Project Coordinator #3 or Director #4 does not exist because I did not interview these NGO officials. All NGOs, NGO directors, and NGO project coordinators are to remain anonymous. All NGO officials interviewed signed a written consent form giving permission to use their statements in the content of this research paper.

Reliability and Validity

All NGOs analyzed and NGO officials interviewed for the purpose of this research paper have full anonymity. All NGO officials interviewed signed a written consent form giving permission to use their statements in the content of this research paper. NGO

directors also signed a written consent form giving permission to use their names in the content of this research paper; however, it was after conducting the seven interviews that I opted *not* to use the names of the NGOs nor the names of the NGO directors for the purpose of this research paper. The reasoning behind this is to enable me to use *all* of the statements given during the interviews for the purpose of this research project, while protecting the anonymity of the NGOs and the NGO directors.

In each of the interviews I conducted with NGO officials, I took hand-written notes of the questions asked to them and their responses. The interviews were not recorded. In some cases, I paraphrased their statements to enable me to remember their statements afterward and in other cases, I wrote down their statements word for word. If I needed a statement to be repeated or if I did not understand the statement, I would ask the NGO official to restate the comment and/or explain what was meant by her or his comment. It was my intention to send a transcription of the interview to the NGO official following the day of the interview in the form of an email. Unfortunately, the limited nature of this research project, which outlines one month to conduct and draft my research project, only allowed for me to do this with the first interview I conducted with Director #3.

This research paper uses the American Sociological Association Style Guide, Second Edition. All sources used for the purpose of this research paper will be included the Bibliography, which can be found at the end of the Reference section. All sources consist of the seven interviews I conducted, web-sites, and published documents.

Limitations

The nature of this Independent Study Project is limited. It only allowed for one month, from April 15, 2005 to May 11, 2005 to enable me to conduct, analyze and draft my research. Furthermore, I had to leave Cyprus for one week during this period due to a death of a family member, thus I only had three weeks to conduct, analyze, and draft my research project as a reality. For this reason, I was only able to analyze four NGOs and interview six NGO officials in Cyprus. Due to this limited population sample, my findings will not be generalized to all Cypriot NGOs, but true only for my sample population. Even so, it is important to acknowledge that the purpose of this research project was not make generalizations through quantitative research, but to better understand the inter-communal relations between northern and southern Cyprus through

qualitative research. Another limitation I encountered was the restricted amount time I lived and studied in Cyprus, from January 31 to May 15, 2005. For this reason, I was not able to achieve full and accurate portrayal of both Cypriot societies, how the four NGOs are operating in Cypriot society and to describe the inter-communal relations between the NGOs. The fact that I am not a Cypriot and that I do not speak fluent Greek or Turkish also had its limitations. I conducted the interviews in English, my first language, but a second language for all of the NGO officials I interviewed. Nevertheless, all of the NGO officials spoke fluent English. The language barrier did not seem to be a problem during the time I conducted the interviews, but I suppose it is possible that the meanings of their statements could have been misconstrued because of translations and/or cultural differences. On the other hand, due to the fact I am not Cypriot and have only lived in Cyprus for 3 ½ months, I am able to achieve a valuable perspective as an outsider with lesser probability of any unconscious biases that one may develop if she or he was a Cypriot and/or lived in Cyprus for a greater length of time. Due to my own limitations, it is not my intention to analyze and interpret everything that I was told at the time I conducted the interviews. Rather, I have reported the statements given by the NGO officials at the time of the interview, while leaving some interpretation to the reader. Even so, I *have* acknowledged trends or patterns that emerged from my findings. It must also be clear that a number of the questions regarding the Cyprus issue have touchy and political implications, therefore I was not able to directly ask all the questions I wanted to ask nor did I always get the information I asked.

Not only do I have limitations as the researcher and conductor of the interview, but the population sample I used may have its own limitations. The four NGOs I chose to analyze have all been involved in a number of peace-building and inter-communal activities; therefore they may find it easier to establish inter-communal relations than other Cypriot NGOs or organizations. The six NGO officials I chose to interview may have a bias in their perception towards their respective NGO and/or programs and activities carried out by the NGO. As members of their community, as Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, the NGO officials also had unconscious biases towards members of their own community and members of the other community.

The settings in which I conducted my interview also had its limitations. I left the decision of where to conduct the interview to the NGO officials so that they could feel comfortable; as a result, a majority chose to conduct the interview in their offices, with the exception of Director #2. Although there were a few outside distractions during the interview I conducted with Director #3 in the café, I feel as though I received the most honest and descriptive answers to my questions. It must be acknowledged, however, that Director #2 also had more time to allocate for the interview and the nature of their personality may have influenced their honest and descriptive answers.

PART IV: DATA ANALYSIS
Commonalities among All NGOs

1. *The NGO had a purpose to promote a specific issue which affects both communities for a majority of joint projects they execute, rather than joint projects carried out for the sole purpose of inter-communal relation and/or contact.* Among some of the specific issues which were addressed in these projects and activities included AIDS awareness, promotion of media literacy, body image awareness especially among young Cypriot women, building management skills and training, trafficking of women, promoting the trade of goods across the Green Line to businesses as well as many other special topics. The project coordinator from NGO #2 said, "Parties and meetings for Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots are important, but it is not where life concentrates" (Project Coordinator #2 2005). Additionally, the project coordinator from NGO #4 stated that it is natural that organizations work together on an issue common to both communities and it is not necessary to implement so-called "bi-communal" activities exclusively for the purpose of being bi-communal (2005).

NGO #1 and #2 developed an equal partnership for more than a year's time in order to implement a total of six very successful workshops on "Human Rights through Media Literature" which trained individuals and/or organizations how to transform journalism in Cyprus to meet new international standards as well as to implement trainings on the economic development in Cyprus to Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot business owners (Director #2 2005). While collaborating with a university in southern Cyprus, NGO #1 is currently implementing a program in order to teach Greek lessons to

Turkish Cypriot business people, a program to strengthen civil society, and is working to develop a joint accounting program for Cypriots. With other organizations, NGO #1 has offered their management trainings to Greek Cypriots living in rural areas, organized a Green Line Regulation conference to promote the selling of goods across the Green Line and an inter-communal youth program to promote historical research in Cyprus (Director #1 2005).

NGO #3 and NGO #4 collaborated to promote AIDS in both communities as well as to implement conferences designed to educate members of both communities on women's issues, specifically reproductive rights and body image among Cypriot youth. NGO #3 has also coordinated events with Greek Cypriot organizations to promote environmental awareness on UN World Environment Day in June, to raise awareness about the mentally ill and disabled individuals, to organize a youth camp to educate on multi-national tolerance and awareness, and to promote anti-smoking and anti-racism campaigns and bike/motor safety with a southern university (Director #3 2005). NGO #4 has also collaborated with other Turkish Cypriot and bi-communal organizations by coordinating events on the legal framework of reproductive rights, gender equality, women's role in Cypriot media, and the trafficking of women in both Cypriot communities.

NGO #2 is the only NGO I interviewed which has implemented programs which more or less have the main purpose of inter-communal relations among Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, including the establishment an on-going a youth group for the rapprochement movement and a website dedicated to promote the interaction of members of both communities (NGO #2 Profile 2004).

2. The NGO's mission is to educate and provide services on a specific issue in order to empower citizens of their community. Although each NGO has different missions in which they educate and promote issues differing from one another, the driving force behind their mission is to empower individuals through the dissemination of information. The nature of these public welfare organizations usually implies a tendency for the NGOs to be inclined to inter-communal relationships and peace promoting activity.

A main reason for this is the fact that the NGO promotes issues to all members of its community, especially those who are the most disenfranchised and are therefore even more in need of the information. The most disenfranchised citizens are usually minorities, women, youth, children, elderly, and people living in rural areas. For that reason, the Greek Cypriot NGOs focusing on disenfranchised populations more often than not translates into promoting and educating Turkish Cypriots, the largest minority in Cyprus. This has caused Greek Cypriot NGOs to reach out to their neighbors in northern Cyprus and to develop relations with Turkish Cypriot organizations. The project coordinator from NGO #4 said, "Turkish Cypriots are important to our organization because they do not have the same access to reproductive rights education as Greek Cypriots. There is no organization operating in the North." They went on to say, "[NGO #4] represents all of Cyprus. We can't carry out our purpose if we don't acknowledge Turkish Cypriots considering they make up one third of the population. It is only right." This idea was heavily emphasized by Project Coordinator #4 and it emerged a number of times throughout our interview (2005). NGO #2 shared this opinion that Turkish Cypriots deserve the same access to information and to receive the same services as Greek Cypriots. The main way in which they achieved this was by establishing a website to provide peace-promoting Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots support and information, a bi-communal youth program, and to promote Information and Communication Technologies to both communities (Director #2 2005).

Observably Turkish Cypriots are the main population served by Turkish Cypriot NGOs, therefore it would not be accurate to make this analogy; however, there have been some incidences in which Turkish Cypriot NGOs have provided their services to Greek Cypriots and Greek Cypriot NGOs residing in rural areas in southern Cyprus. For example, NGO #1 collaborated with an environmental NGO in southern Cyprus in order to design and implement a series of three workshops on Strategy Planning and Management in order to train 15 to 20 Greek Cypriots from ten NGOs operating in a small village in southern Cyprus. In the last workshop, NGO #1 brought seven Turkish Cypriot NGOs so that the Greek Cypriot NGOs could gain the experience and make contacts with Turkish Cypriot NGO officials (Project Coordinator #1 2005). NGO #3 has also collaborated with a women's NGO operating in Pafos, a relatively small village in

southern Cyprus in order to promote issues to Greek Cypriot women in rural areas (Director #3 2005).

3. The NGO has received funding from the Bi-Communal Development Programme. All of the NGOs have written project proposals to the BDP in order to plan, organize and implement an inter-communal project and usually to collaborate with an organization operating on the other side. Although the NGOs range as to how frequently they apply for BDP funding and how much they receive from the BDP, all four NGOs have written more than one proposal to the BDP and received funding from BDP at least once (See appendix E).

4. The NGO receives funding from sources other than the BDP to conduct inter-communal programs. Not only do the NGOs all receive funding from numerous sources and through the revenue it creates for itself, but all four NGOs have received funding from sources other than BDP to implement inter-communal projects (See Appendix D).

Table 2: NGO Funding Sources for Inter-communal Projects

NGO #1	UNOPS, European Union, HasNa Inc., Israeli Embassy, European Parliament, European Commission, British High Commission
NGO #2	UNOPS, HasNa Inc., European Commission, United States Institute of Peace and the Institute of World Affairs,
NGO #3	UNOPS, European Union
NGO #4	UNOPS, Republic of Cyprus of Justice, HasNa Inc.,

5. The NGO cooperates with more than one organization operating on the other side. The NGOs cooperated with a range of different NGOs operating on the other side on an issue imperative to both organizations even though the two organizations served different populations, fulfilled different purposes, and had different functions. Among the organizations that the four NGOs developed working relations with were environmental NGOs, organizations that focus on management and economy, NGOs

serving women and children, organizations serving disabled individuals, research institutions, organizations for dyslexic individuals, centers for childhood and adolescence, youth organizations, and universities (See Appendix E).

     6. The NGO cooperates with an organization operating on the other side in more than one context. Apart from coordinating joint projects with an organization operating on the other side, the NGOs have found new and interesting ways to work together; this includes sub-contracting programs to an organization operating the other side and/or executing sub-contracted programs from an organization operating on the other side, distributing informational materials produced by an organization operating on the other side throughout their community, providing their services to an organization operating on the other side or receiving the services of an organization operating on the other side, attending and/or presenting at an activity of an organization operating on the other side, attending an activity of an organization operating on the other side, inviting organizations operating on the other side to attend and/or present their activities, providing resources and support for an organization operating on the other side (See Appendix F).

Commonalities among the majority of NGO officials from All NGOs

     1. The NGO official has an inclination to promote peace and inter-communal relations. Considering the nature of the NGO as a public welfare organization, it attracts individuals who want to work to make a social contribution to their society. Many of the NGO officials have been involved in inter-communal activities not just on an institutional level, but on a personal level. When referring to inter-communalism, Project Coordinator #4 said, "There is an inclination [to inter-communal activity] of all the employees working at [NGO #4] because we have a *personal* feeling to promote this kind of activity." NGO officials for the most part tend to be attracted to inter-communal activities because it is for the betterment of their society, something that they are already promoting and implementing in their every-day work at NGOs.

     2. The NGO official has a fear of criticism by members of their own community. Although the specific fear varies from organization to organization, almost every NGO official I conducted interviews with raised the issue of criticism by their own community. In general, Greek Cypriots tended to fear criticism of their own government and media that they are recognizing the northern region of Cyprus by working with Turkish Cypriot

organizations. Turkish Cypriots generally tended to fear that they will be criticized by their own community for allowing the Greek Cypriot individuals and/or organizations dominate them or treat them as inferiors, a fear that the NGO officials tended to have themselves. Both of these trends will be elaborated upon later on.

3. The NGO official has a bias toward their own community. It is also evident that the NGO officials are inclined to work with members and organizations in the other community, however there were some subtle biases exposed throughout the interview. In the case of NGO #4, the project coordinator stated that the NGO has never implemented a program or activity in the northern region of Cyprus nor have they conducted meetings in order to plan joint projects in Turkish Cypriot NGO offices in northern Cyprus. As for Turkish Cypriots, the Project Coordinator #1 expressed her frustration at times to work with certain Greek Cypriots because "the two sides have different working styles." She was referring to one specific instance, however she unconsciously generalized all Greek Cypriots as having one working style and all Turkish Cypriots to have another, which involved taking their work more seriously and being more organized (Project Coordinator #1 2005).

Commonalities among a Majority of NGOs (Three of Four)

1. The NGO has made the promotion of inter-communal relations institutional. NGO #1, #2, and #3 have incorporated an element of inter-communalism in the aims of their organization in addition to peace promoting. NGO #1 does not print this objective in its general brochure. Regardless, the NGO was originally proposed in 1998 to the BDP as a bi-communal project with a parallel NGO in the southern Cyprus which is no longer functioning. Within a few years, its creation and establishment was completely funded by a grant from UNOPS through the BDP. Today it is only receiving 30% of its funds through BDP, but continues to collaborate with Greek Cypriots and their organizations (Director #1 2005). NGO #2 is not receiving any funding through the BDP, but has outlined inter-communal relations in their organization's constitution. The aims of the constitution states that the NGO will collaborate with individual citizens, universities, organizations, and other institutions of Cyprus and abroad and will promote research in Cyprus and abroad with collaboration with other organizations for its objectives (NGO #2 Profile 2004). One of the main objectives of NGO #3 is to promote

international peace and understanding has developed a *Peace Education Programme Complex* which states that the NGO will implement peace education in camps, in target schools, bi-communal programs, conferences, and seminars; they will implement celebrations and social activities dedicated to peace; they will provide peace education workshops for trainers; translation of peace education in its publications; will collaborate with domestic and foreign NGOs, especially with Greek Cypriots; and will provide peace building programming on radio programs in order to reach rural areas (PEPC 2000). Project Coordinator #4 states that the NGO does not have a "bi-communal" element, but they achieve working relationships with Turkish Cypriots "naturally" through the objectives of the NGO (Project Coordinator #4 2005).

2. The NGO has realized an equal partnership with an NGO operating on the other side. In this context, an equal partnership means that the NGO has equally shared the work of proposal writing, planning the project, coordinating the project, working out the budget, and writing the event report with an organization operating in the other community. NGO #1 and NGO #2 demonstrated this through their collaboration on the workshops for media literacy and economic issues in Cyprus funded by HasNa Inc. For over a year, the two project coordinators met frequently and communicated frequently in order to carry out the series of six workshops. The project coordinators were paid equal salaries on this project. NGO Director #3 also claimed that they had achieved "equilibrium" with a specific organization in southern Cyprus. They stated, "The budget was discussed and signed together, the proposals were written together, and they met frequently" in order to implement the joint project (Director #3 2005). Project Coordinator #4 never claimed to experience this degree of collaboration with an organization in the north.

Commonalities among NGOs Serving Women

1. The NGO serves disenfranchised members of their community other than women. Both NGO #3 and NGO #4 provided services and promoted issues concerning youth, rural women and children, and minorities. Furthermore, NGO #3 provided services and promoted issues concerning disabled individuals while NGO #4 gave a large emphasis to promote specific issues to minorities within Cyprus including Turkish Cypriot, Russian, Armenian, Marinate, Sri Lankan and other immigrant women,

especially working as artists and performers. Project Coordinator #4 claimed that the working relationships with Turkish Cypriots are really important because it is the objective of the NGO to grant access to reproductive rights and other issues concerning women to *all* Cypriot citizens, including minorities (Project Coordinator #4).

　　　　2. The NGO faces the challenge of operating in a male-dominated society. This commonality was seen as a means that women could unite against a common injustice within both societies. Project Coordinator #4 said that an inter-communal workshop they coordinated on women in the media was a huge success because it united women under a common struggle, gender oppression in Cypriot society and media. They said that a Turkish Cypriot woman who spoke on this issue gave an interesting view of the Cyprus conflict and gender oppression; she pointed out that the media tends to demonize and/or insult members of the other community by making references to women. NGO Director #3 also expressed this view that they are operating within a male-dominated society. They claimed that the Turkish Cypriot government gives no priority to women's organizations and/or issues whatsoever; thus, it is very difficult for NGO #3 to get any support and/or funding from the government. This commonality may be a valuable tool to create unity among Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot women to rise up against gender inequalities within Cyprus.

　　　　3. The NGO had little difficulty getting along with other members of organizations on the other side. The two women's NGOs exchanged very high regards of each others organizations at the time we conducted the interview. Director #3 said that she really liked working with NGO #4 because they were very organized, nice to work with, and did really good work in southern Cyprus (Director #3). The same kind words were said about Director #3 by Project Coordinator #4; they had previously worked together, including a time when Project Coordinator #3 was invited to speak on reproductive rights at a bi-communal women's workshop that NGO #3 had coordinated with a different Greek Cypriot organization. At no point did I hear criticism from either Director #3 or Project Coordinator #4 of another women's organization and/or NGO.

Commonalities among NGOs Conducting Peace Promoting Activity

1. Established an equal partnership between a Greek Cypriot and a Turkish Cypriot. The relationship between NGO #1 and NGO #2 created and developed by working on the HasNa project is a perfect example of this. Even so, it was not the original intention of Greek Cypriot NGO to have the degree of equality that the project actually achieved; however, Director #1 would only agree to collaborate with NGO #2 on the project if all aspects of the partnership were equal and Director #2 accepted this arrangement. It was set up to where there would have two project coordinators and all the work to plan and implement the project would be shared and executed together. Since Director #2 wrote the first proposal for the project prior to the involvement of NGO #1, Director #2 said, "It was almost like an unwritten gentlemen's agreement to have [Director #1] writes the second proposal. I basically wrote the first proposal, so it was only natural to have [Director #2] write most of the second" (Director #2 2005). Even with these equal terms from the beginning, challenges between the two organizations still arose. But with help from the conflict resolution negotiator, they were able to compromise on their opinions and/or principles in order to finish the project and achieve a working relationship between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. Director #2 said, "When the GC project coordinator want to quit, I told [them], there are two things; first, this is your work and it is something you have to get done; and second, if you really believe in peace, which is why we are doing this, then you have to make this work" (Director #2 2005).

2. Distribution of grant money was a challenge. This challenge is only a reality for NGO #1 and NGO #2. Neither woman's organizations expressed that this was ever an issue or a challenge of working with members of the other community. Nonetheless, Director #2 said that the distribution of the grant money was an important issue. They said, "The north wanted to split the grant money 50/50, and the south did not feel that was a fair arrangement. Let's be honest here, it is unfair for CNTI. The cost of living is higher in the south, our rent is higher, our electricity is higher, and so on." Additionally, he said that the Turkish Cypriots wanted both the project coordinators to be paid the same salary for the project, but the project coordinator from NGO #2 opposed because the project coordinator "felt uncomfortable with the 50/50 salary out of a matter of principle." They went on to say, "For the same amount of money that our project coordinator could

survive on in the south, the project coordinator in the north would be rich. It [the 50/50 arrangement] is not equality. In the modern sense, equality is equal right of the individual, not equal in all areas." Nonetheless, there was a compromise. They decided to pay the project coordinators the same salary "out of philosophy" but the south received more money for the logistics (rent, electricity, projects, etc.). As a follow up, Director #2 said, "Even still, we are probably the only organization in the south that would agree to this arrangement."

Commonalities among Greek Cypriot NGOs

1. The NGO official has a fear of criticism by the government, the media, and the citizens of southern Cyprus. Both the Greek Cypriot NGOs brought up the fact that they the name of their NGO was published in a southern Cyprus newspaper as receiving a large amount grant money from UNOPS through the BDP. Not only did this article have a negative spin towards the NGOs they listed, they printed false statements regarding NGO #2. The director of NGO #2 stated, "They said that we received three grants from UNOPS, but we actually already received only two of those. And the bogus grant they claimed we received was a bulk of the grant money…and we didn't even receive it!" They expressed that they were very upset about this article and the negative media coverage that they received both as an individual and as an organization (Director #3 2005).

2. The NGO official unconsciously views the Turkish Cypriot as inferior. All the Greek Cypriot NGO officials were very committed to inter-communal relations with Turkish Cypriots; however there were a few instances in which Greek Cypriots exposed this attitude about Turkish Cypriots. When referring to NGO Director #1, the Director #2 said, "Before the Turkish Cypriots I worked with didn't have as much experience, they seemed to be less educated and less powerful, therefore they thought they were inferior and this was definitely a problem. It wasn't like this with [Director #1]." They added, "[Director #1] also has good people working for [them]. [Their] project coordinators are educated and experienced." Although they were admiring and complimenting the Director for NGO #1, they were unintentionally and probably unknowingly putting down other Turkish Cypriots. It is also interesting because they said that Turkish Cypriots

thought they were inferior, but they gave no consideration that they were feeding into the Turkish Cypriot fear that they will be treated like an inferior. In this case, the Turkish Cypriot fear of domination must be somewhat justified. The Greek Cypriot project coordinator working for NGO #4 gave no reference to put down Turkish Cypriots they had worked with. But the fact that NGO #4 has never implemented a project in the north nor have they even conducted a meeting in the northern part of Cyprus implies that there is somewhat of an superiority complex realizing that NGO #4 is expecting Turkish Cypriots to come to the southern region of Cyprus, yet they are unwilling to venture to the northern region of Cyprus.

3. The NGO has received funding by the Republic of Cyprus Ministries, therefore the NGO is intimidated and influenced by the government. NGO #2 last received government funding in order to conduct a research project in 1999; however, it was cut off from local funding once NGO #2 became involved with peace building and inter-communal activities (Director #2). NGO #4 continues to receive government funding from the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Health. Both Greek Cypriot organizations expressed their fears of criticism by the government and/or media. Project Coordinator #4 said that NGO #4 could be very valuable to the bi-communal movement just as long as there is no fear of the political repercussions. Originally, they said that NGO #4 was prohibited to implement projects in the northern region of Cyprus because of the "political monster," but then she changed her statement to say that they aren't necessarily prohibited, but the have to be very careful (Project Coordinator #4 2005). It is not clear if Project Coordinator #4 was referring to the actual government or the policy of their organization. NGO Director #2 also had strong opinions about the criticism the NGO has received from the government and the media. First Director #2 said, "[The Cypriot media is] monopolized by a few rich individuals; it is often distorted, it only gives the voices of a few politicians in power, and the quality is declining." They were upset because their organization and name was slandered by the government through the media and it really evoked strong feelings in them (Director #2 2005). It is apparent that the Republic of Cyprus government has "gotten under the skin" so to say of both the Greek Cypriot NGOs simply for participating in inter-communal activity. It also

appeared as though the government caused a significant hindrance for both organizations to participate in inter-communal relationships freely without hesitations or reservations.

Commonalities among Turkish Cypriot NGOs

1. The NGO official has a fear that the Greek Cypriot views them or will treat them as inferior. Not only was this the view of Turkish Cypriots, but Greek Cypriots also acknowledged that this is a fear of the Turkish Cypriots when they work with members from the other community. Director #2 said, "They feel that the Greek Cypriots will dominate them, but this is not unjustified. They are not inferior, but our population is bigger, we have more money, and things like this, so it is understandable that the Turkish Cypriots felt like this." Turkish Cypriot Director #1 said, "There was a fear of the north of being dominated by the south and being criticized by members of their own community for allowing the south to dominate them." Turkish Cypriot Director #3 also expressed that many Greek Cypriots did not feel inclined to come to the northern region of Cyprus or to carry out inter-communal relationships (Director #3 2005). This attitude of Greek Cypriots implies superiority as well as a lack of empathy for Turkish Cypriots.

2. The NGO official is influenced by the criticisms of members of their community. Director #1 brought up the fact that Turkish Cypriots do not just fear domination, but they fear that other members of their community will accuse them of being dominated by Greek Cypriots. This fear may cause them to overreact or become overly conscious of Greek Cypriots intentions and/or actions. When there was a disagreement between NGO #1 and NGO #2 about how to distribute the grant money, Director #2 said that he acknowledged why the Turkish Cypriot NGO officials were so adamant about splitting the budget 50/50 and said that the NGO #1 would be criticized by their community for "allowing the south to dominate them" so they wanted to make sure everything was equal (Director #2 2005). Director #3 was not as concerned with the criticisms of members within the Turkish Cypriot community, but acknowledged that this is a fear of other Turkish Cypriots.

3. The NGO feels like many Greek Cypriots are only involved in inter-communal relations in theory, not in reality and the implementation of the projects. The Director for NGO #3 stated that one challenge of developing inter-communal relations with Greek Cypriots is their interest was not very high. They went on to say that many Greek

Cypriots have an interest in theory, but not in implementation. They said, "When it comes to writing the proposal and finding a counterpart in the north they are ok. But when it comes to actually implementing these programs, we are the ones who have to reach out." Even so, they followed up with these statements by saying that there are some Greek Cypriot organizations in which they have developed a reciprocal relationship with and there is a high degree of respect (Director #3). Director #1 acknowledged this reality that Turkish Cypriots are faced with, although they had a different experience of working with Greek Cypriot organizations. Director #1 said, "Due to our partnerships with organizations in the south and our good relations with our funders (*sic.*), many organizations in the south have contacted the [NGO #1] to collaborate on joint projects; although we must remain focused on our specific vision, we have begun to direct these organizations to other organizations in the north which have a similar focus or mission." The project coordinator from the same NGO however, when describing a joint project said that there was a smaller turnout of Greek Cypriots than they would have liked, but the participation of Turkish Cypriots and the international speakers were good. It is apparent that the reality of Greek Cypriot malaise does exist today, but it may not be to the same degree that many have assumed and hypothesized.

 4. The NGO faces the challenge of operating in an isolated community. This implication came up in both interviews I conducted with the Turkish Cypriot directors. Director #3 said that it is hard to get the funding of organizations like the European Union because they are unrecognized. Although NGO #1 does receive funding from the European Union, they also expressed the past difficulties of NGOs operating in an isolated society, such as the original establishment of NGO #1 and its objective to execute bi-communal activities. The Turkish Cypriot administration was adamantly against this type of activities at the time and there was little that the Greek Cypriot and/or international community could do (Director #1 2005). Nonetheless, this situation isn't necessarily a reality anymore.

Establishment of Inter-communal Relations

 Among the four NGOs, there were three ways in which they established relationships with organizations on the other side; they were able to find an organization operating in the other community which has similar activities and/or serves a similar

population in order to plan and implement a joint program which addresses an issue relevant to both communities; they attended inter-communal workshops and/or trainings for NGOs in order to make contacts with organizations operating on the other side; finally, they networked among each other with individuals and/or organizations on the other side to get the name and contact of an organization that would be ideal to collaborate on a joint project with (See Appendix F).

Forms of Inter-communal Relationships

Among the four NGOs, there were seven ways in which they carried out inter-communal relationships; they executed a joint project funded by BDP; they executed a joint project funded by a source other than BDP; they sub-contracted a program to an organization operating the other side and/or execute a sub-contracted program from an organization operating on the other side; they distributed informational materials produced by an organization operating on the other side throughout their community; they provided their services to an organization operating on the other side or receive the services of an organization operating on the other side; they presented at an activity of an organization operating on the other side; they attended an activity of an organization operating on the other side; finally, they provided resources and support for an organization operating on the other side (See Appendix G).

Successes of Inter-communal Relations

1. Achievement and implementation of a final joint project a majority of which were successful. All four NGOs claimed to have executed successful programs with organizations across the Green Line. NGO Director #1 said, "We proved that we could work together for one year continuously and we could overcome any difficulties" and "Now that the [NGO #1] and [NGO #2] have good relations and know how the other organization operates, it will be much easier to conduct future programs together." NGO Director #2 believed that the HasNa project coordinated with NGO #1 was the most successful bi-communal program coordinated by NGO #2. There are three reasons he gave including the impact it had on society; there were 6-8 workshops carried out each with 20 to 30 people in attendance. Also, they said that it was good timing to have the workshops because the media in Cyprus is and has been going through a hard time; and finally because the collaboration between the two organizations could be looked at as a

success (Director #2). NGO #3 and NGO #4 were also very happy with the outcome of the projects they have collaborated with one another. NGO Director #3 said that she liked working with NGO #4 and would want to work with them again. In reference to other Greek Cypriot organizations, they also said, "We had success because the Greek Cypriots like to come to the north now. We were able to create three things, mutual respect, tolerance, and understanding. This is important for all NGOs to achieve." Project Coordinator #4 stated that an inter-communal workshop they coordinated on women in the media was a huge success because it united women under a common struggle, gender oppression in Cypriot society and media. They emphasized the role that women's NGOs can play in promoting inter-communalism because they can unite Cypriot women in a way that other organizations can not.

    2. Examples of effective communication between members of both communities. Although there were obstacles to communication, there were examples of effective communication. During the HasNa project, NGO Director #2 said that there were frequent meetings between the two project coordinators, especially towards the end of the project. In addition, both offices were used equally for meetings, so the project coordinators had to cross the border frequently. Also, members from the NGOs met for social gatherings outside of work as well in order to establish good relations. Director #1 said, "This relationship [NGO #1 and #2] can be used as a model for the future in order for other organizations attempting to establish relations across the border. It was sincere and there was effective communication, therefore the two organizations were able to collaborate." Both women's NGOs did not specify whether or not they achieved effective communication between the two organizations. NGO #3 did not seem to have a problem with communication, although NGO #4 did express that they had problems with the language barrier and the "limited" ways to communicate to the northern region of Cyprus.

    3. Establishment of friendships and close relationships among members of both communities. When talking about the relationship with their Turkish Cypriot counterpart on a joint project, the project coordinator from NGO #2 said, "The bond is there. Maybe I don't see him every day or even talk to him very much any more, but the bond is still there…I can't quite explain it. Now when I see him, it is just so nice" (Project

Coordinator #2). Additionally, the two women's NGOs exchanged very high regards of each others organizations at the time we conducted the interview. Director #3 said that she really liked working with NGO #4 because they were very organized, nice to work with, and did really good work in southern Cyprus (Director #3). The same kind words were said about Director #3 by Project Coordinator #4; they had previously worked together, including a time when Project Coordinator #3 was invited to speak on reproductive rights at a bi-communal women's workshop that NGO #3 had coordinated with a different Greek Cypriot organization.

4. *Establishment of respect, understanding, and tolerance of members between members of both communities.* The establishment of respect and understanding was not inherent in the relations between members of opposite communities. Rather, these traits were developed through the evolution of their relationship because there were many times that fear and distrust of the other individual prevented these traits to emerge. Nonetheless, I did find one example in which these traits developed between a Greek Cypriot and a Turkish Cypriot NGO official after a year of working together. From the time of the origin of the HasNa project on "Media Literacy," Project Coordinator #2 and their Turkish Cypriot counter-part had a number of problems with one another that were not being addressed. After some time, it was the decision to bring a conflict resolution negotiator from the United States with the support of HasNa to implement a four-day workshop so that the two project coordinators could develop better working conditions as well as to resolve some other discrepancies between NGO #1 and NGO #2. It was through this workshop that the project coordinators engaged in effective communication, gained understanding of where the other was coming from and therefore gained the respect and tolerance of one another. Project Coordinator #2 said, "We were finally able to get over it. Now we are able to love, work, argue, and celebrate together" (Project Coordinator #2 2005).

5. *Achieved truly equal and reciprocal partnerships between organizations of both communities.* The relationship between NGO #1 and NGO #2 created and developed by working on the HasNa project is a perfect example of this. Even so, it was not the original intention of Greek Cypriot NGO to have the degree of equality that the project actually achieved; however, Director #1 would only agree to collaborate with

NGO #2 on the project if all aspects of the partnership were equal and Director #2 accepted this arrangement. It was set up to where there would have two project coordinators and all the work to plan and implement the project would be shared and executed together. Since Director #2 wrote the first proposal for the project prior to the involvement of NGO #1, Director #2 said, "It was almost like an unwritten gentlemen's agreement to have [Director #1] writes the second proposal. I basically wrote the first proposal, so it was only natural to have [Director #2] write most of the second" (Director #2 2005). Even with these equal terms from the beginning, challenges between the two organizations still arose. But with help from the conflict resolution negotiator, they were able to compromise on their opinions and/or principles in order to finish the project and achieve a working relationship between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. Director #2 said, "When the GC project coordinator want to quit, I told [them], there are two things; first, this is your work and it is something you have to get done; and second, if you really believe in peace, which is why we are doing this, then you have to make this work" (Director #2 2005).

     6. Exchange of people between both communities. Three of four NGOs truly reached out to the other community in order to emerge itself in the other society. NGO Director #3 has traveled to great lengths to make contacts and implement programs in many areas throughout the south of Cyprus. Among these are the Stavraeto Youth Organization located in Pafos and the Women and Child Organization located in Morfu. She said that it is harder to get Greek Cypriot NGOs to come to the north, but she has established some reciprocal relationships with Greek Cypriot organizations that are willing to come to the north (Director #3 2005). NGO #1 has traveled to rural and urban areas in southern Cyprus in addition to succeeding in bringing Greek Cypriot organizations and individuals to the north (Project Coordinator #1). NGO #2 has had frequent meetings in the north and has implement a few of its projects in the north (Director #2 2005).

Challenges to Inter-communal Relations
     1. Distrust and fear among NGO officials towards members of the other community. There were many assumptions about the others intentions and many feelings

of distrust of each other. At one point, Project Coordinator #2 said, "If me and [the Turkish Cypriot project coordinator] had a problem it always went back to the fact that I am a Greek Cypriot and he is a Turkish Cypriot. Even if it had nothing to do with this, I would find myself asking myself…is it because I am a Greek Cypriot? It was the same for him." Director #1 said, "There was a fear in the south to collaborate with organizations in the north because they were afraid of being criticized for recognizing the north and NGOs in the north as 'official.' There was a fear of the north of being dominated by the south and being criticized by members of their own community for allowing the south to dominate them" (Director #1 2005). Beyond the fear and distrust NGO #1 and NGO #2 had of the others intentions, there were additional barriers to communication which prevented both project coordinators to cover up the situation and simply ignore it. Once they were able to engage in open communication, these fears and distrusts were acknowledged by both members and able to dissipate in order to build trust and understanding.

    2. Barriers to effective communication. The obstacles for the two sides to communicate is two-fold; some NGOs experienced physical challenges including language and the difficulty that the Cypriot governments have made it to communicate across the green line, while other barriers to communication were psychological; NGO officials from both sides were hesitant to bring up the negative feelings they were feeling. Referring to the first type of communication barrier, the NGO Project Coordinator #4 believed the language barrier between the two communities this was the biggest challenge for their organization to implement inter-communal relations and projects. They said, "We speak two different languages so we are forced to speak in English. No one is happy with this situation. I don't know how to put it, but it is the 'language of our oppressors' so to say since Cyprus was a British colony for so many years." They also explained the very high costs of hiring translators for events and translating educational materials. Beyond the language, they claimed that communicating across the Green Line was very difficult and that email was really the only way to affectively communicate. They claimed that the only way to call was through a switch board, but I believe they were referring to the way it has been in the past, not the current situation (PC #4 2005).

Regardless, there are still physical challenges to contact individuals in the other community.

The unwillingness of NGO officials to acknowledge and/or admit their negative emotions is quite possibly the more dangerous of the two types of communication challenges. Moreover, it is possible for the NGO officials to more easily overcome this challenge if both sides are willing to communicate. Project Coordinator #2 said, "All these problems we were having were never addressed until the conclusion of our final product. We should have addressed these issues a lot sooner, but no one wanted to admit they were unhappy. But once we did communicate, we were able to develop a relationship of trust…it should have happened sooner" (PC #4 2005). Director #2 substantiated this claim by saying, "There was not enough communication between the project coordinators and directors, so there were some misconceptions of the intentions of the other…so we met more regular" (Director #2 2005).

3. Exterior factors, including government, media, and the members of their own community caused challenges to inter-communal relationships and programs, especially for Greek Cypriots. Project Coordinator #4 said that NGO #4 could be very valuable to the bi-communal movement just as long as there is no fear of the political repercussions. Originally, they said that NGO #4 was prohibited to implement projects in the northern region of Cyprus because of the "political monster," but then she changed her statement to say that they aren't necessarily prohibited, but the have to be very careful (Project Coordinator #4 2005). It is not clear if Project Coordinator #4 was referring to the actual government or the policy of their organization. NGO Director #2 also had strong opinions about the criticism the NGO has received from the government and the media. First Director #2 said, "[The Cypriot media is] monopolized by a few rich individuals; it is often distorted, it only gives the voices of a few politicians in power, and the quality is declining." They were upset because their organization and name was slandered by the government through the media and it really evoked strong feelings in them (Director #2 2005). It is apparent that the Republic of Cyprus government has "gotten under the skin" so to say of both the Greek Cypriot NGOs simply for participating in inter-communal activity. It also appeared as though the government caused a significant hindrance for

both organizations to participate in inter-communal relationships freely without hesitations or reservations.

The Turkish Cypriot NGOs also faced this challenge, although not to the same degree as the Greek Cypriots. Director #1 brought up the fact that Turkish Cypriots do not just fear domination, but they fear that other members of their community will accuse them of being dominated by Greek Cypriots. This fear may cause them to overreact or become overly conscious of Greek Cypriots intentions and/or actions. When there was a disagreement between NGO #1 and NGO #2 about how to distribute the grant money, Director #2 said that he acknowledged why the Turkish Cypriot NGO officials were so adamant about splitting the budget 50/50 and said that the NGO #1 would be criticized by their community for "allowing the south to dominate them" so they wanted to make sure everything was equal (Director #2 2005). Director #3 was not as concerned with the criticisms of members within the Turkish Cypriot community, but acknowledged that this is a fear of other Turkish Cypriots.

4. Lack of interest to plan and/or implement inter-communal programs by other organizations, mainly Greek Cypriots. The Director for NGO #3 stated that one challenge of developing inter-communal relations with Greek Cypriots is their interest was not very high. They went on to say that many Greek Cypriots have an interest in theory, but not in implementation. They said, "When it comes to writing the proposal and finding a counterpart in the north they are ok. But when it comes to actually implementing these programs, we are the ones who have to reach out." Even so, they followed up with these statements by saying that there are some Greek Cypriot organizations in which they have developed a reciprocal relationship with and there is a high degree of respect (Director #3). Director #1 acknowledged this reality that Turkish Cypriots are faced with, although they had a different experience of working with Greek Cypriot organizations. Director #1 said, "Due to our partnerships with organizations in the south and our good relations with our funders (*sic*.), many organizations in the south have contacted the [NGO #1] to collaborate on joint projects; although we must remain focused on our specific vision, we have begun to direct these organizations to other organizations in the north which have a similar focus or mission." The project coordinator from the same NGO however, when describing a joint project said that there

was a smaller turnout of Greek Cypriots than they would have liked, but the participation of Turkish Cypriots and the international speakers were good. It is apparent that the reality of Greek Cypriot malaise does exist today, but it may not be to the same degree that many have assumed and hypothesized.

5. *Distribution of grant money.* This challenge is only a reality for NGO #1 and NGO #2. Neither woman's organizations expressed that this was ever an issue or a challenge of working with members of the other community. Nonetheless, Director #2 said that the distribution of the grant money was an important issue. They said, "The north wanted to split the grant money 50/50, and the south did not feel that was a fair arrangement. Let's be honest here, it is unfair for CNTI. The cost of living is higher in the south, our rent is higher, our electricity is higher, and so on." Additionally, he said that the Turkish Cypriots wanted both the project coordinators to be paid the same salary for the project, but the project coordinator from NGO #2 opposed because the project coordinator "felt uncomfortable with the 50/50 salary out of a matter of principle." They went on to say, "For the same amount of money that our project coordinator could survive on in the south, the project coordinator in the north would be rich. It [the 50/50 arrangement] is not equality. In the modern sense, equality is equal right of the individual, not equal in all areas." Nonetheless, there was a compromise. They decided to pay the project coordinators the same salary "out of philosophy" but the south received more money for the logistics (rent, electricity, projects, etc.). As a follow up, Director #2 said, "Even still, we are probably the only organization in the south that would agree to this arrangement."

PART V: RECOMMENDATION

1. *Have a specific focus on an issue that affects both communities for joint projects.* The most successful inter-communal projects were those which focused on a specific topic relevant to both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. The inter-communal projects which were created for the sole purpose of inter-communality tended to have lower attendance rates and/or impact on the community because there is no true incentive to attend. This is largely due to the fact that the Green Line has been opened for two years now and contact with members of the other community is not a main obstacle. Nonetheless, contact between members of both communities does seem to be somewhat

of an issue; therefore, it is still vital that NGOs and other organizations are bringing people together around a common interest or topic.

   2. *Make inter-communal relations and peace promoting institutional within NGO's aims.* The three NGOs which made inter-communal collaboration and/or peace building institutional within their organization had much more success with establishing equal partnerships, meeting in both communities, holding events in both communities, and direct contact with NGO officials from the other side. The NGO which did not make inter-communal relations as a concrete objective, failed to achieve these working conditions even though they are engaged in a fair amount of joint programs and inter-communal relationships. These working conditions are beneficial to NGO officials because it allows them to open their minds to experience the other community, it fosters the development of friendships and close relationships between members of both communities, and it creates a mutual respect, tolerance and understanding of members of both communities.

   3. *Cooperate with a number of organizations.* The more organizations that the NGO collaborated with not only allowed the NGO to educate and promote a wide variety of issues pertinent to the betterment of their society, it allowed them to interact with a wide variety of individuals from the other community. This would then allow Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots to break the stereotypes they have about members of the other community in order to view the individual as an individual, *not* by where they grew up, what language they speak, and/or what religion they practice.

   4. *Cooperate with organizations in different contexts.* When an organization is thinking of partaking in inter-communal activity, it must think in terms of all contexts. There is a wide range of the forms of inter-communal relationships that organizations can develop; the four NGOs analyzed in this research paper offered many examples of these (See Appendix G). The different methods of establishing inter-communal relations offer a lot of flexibility as to how much time, money, and human-power the joint projects would take. This would allow organizations to partake in inter-communal programs more frequently considering it would not necessarily have to allocate a large amount of time, funding, and/or human-power for the purpose of this inter-communal activity.

5. Develop an equal partnership on a joint program with an organization on the other side. Although it is important to collaborate with organizations on the other side in a variety of ways, it is valuable for the NGO to develop an equal partnership at least a few times. An NGO can realize an equal relationship with an organization on the other side as long as there are two project coordinators working together and sharing the work to write the proposal, implement the program, agree upon the budget, and write the event report. Moreover, it should plan events and conduct meetings in both communities. It was also helpful for the NGOs to meet in a context outside of work to socialize and develop better relations. As a result, this will cause the NGO officials to have much more direct contact with members of the other community which will allow them to open their minds to experience the other community, it foster the development of friendships and close relationships between members of both communities, and it create a mutual respect, tolerance and understanding of members of both communities.

6. Take pride in inter-communal and peace building work in order to not allow the outside criticisms to affect or restrict the progress of the NGO. This is easier in theory than reality because NGOs are receiving funding from the government, especially in southern Cyprus. All four NGOs said that they faced problems finding sufficient funding for their organization, so it is very difficult for NGOs to give up a source of revenue. Even so, it should always be the objective of the NGO to work on the grassroots level in order to refrain from allowing the government's objectives to interfere with the NGO's objectives.

7. Undergo team-building and/or conflict resolution training with organization prior to working together in order to achieve affective communication and to foster respect, understanding, and tolerance prior to working together. This was the suggestion of Project Coordinator #2 who underwent a four-day conflict resolution workshop with her Turkish Cypriot counter-part in order to resolve their discrepancies. Director #2 believed this workshop was extremely beneficial for the NGOs and the Project Coordinators working relationships. In order to avoid a situation in which underlying fears and assumptions are covered up or ignored until they aggressively emerge, it is important to teach NGO officials the importance of effective communication and the

development of trust, respect, and understanding in order to execute successful inter-communal relationships.

    8. *Find other sources than the BDP to fund inter-communal activities and programs.* Considering the borders have now opened and access to the other side is now feasible, it is at a point where it is no longer necessary for NGOs purpose to be solely inter-communal relations and contact. Although the BDP has acknowledged this, it continues to be limiting in its purpose of inter-communality; therefore, it has been limiting the potential of the NGOs and the work that they can achieve. Also, there are other organizations that are willing to fund inter-communal activities, some of which are included in this research paper (See Appendix D).

PART VI: REFERENCES

Appendices

Appendix A. Interview Questions to NGO directors and NGO Project Coordinator #4

1. How was your organization established?

2. How is your organization staffed?

3. What are the challenges of the NGO?

4. Are there any organizations in southern Cyprus that you have collaborated with? Can you briefly describe what this project is/was?

5. What were the dynamics of the relationship between the two organizations? (Communication, project structure, balance of power, etc.)

6. How were these projects funded?

7. In your opinion, what have been some of the successes of joint programs and/or collaboration with the south?

8. What have been the challenges of working on a joint program with an organization in the south?

*If questions not addressed in previous questions, the following questions were asked

9. What impact did the borders opening in 2003 have on the collaboration and/or implementation of the projects?

10. What impact did the introduction of the Annan Plan and the April 2003 Referendum have?

11. What impact has the political leaders had?

12. What impact has the media had?

13. What languages did you use and/or print information in?

Appendix B. Interview Questions asked to Project Coordinators

1. Are there any organizations in the South that you have worked with on past projects?

2. Can you briefly describe what this project was?

3. How did the projects get established?

4. What were the dynamics of the relationship between the two organizations? (Communication, project structure, balance of power, etc.)

5. How was this project funded?

6. In your opinion, was this project successful?

7. How do you measure the success of your projects?

8. Were there any challenges to collaboration and/or implementation of the project?

9. What were the external influences?

10. What language(s) did you use to communicate? What language(s) were your final projects printed in?

*Only asked to Project Coordinator #2

11. If you could do anything differently next time, what would you do?

Appendix C. Table 1: NGO Description

NGO	Region	Main Population	Main Purpose
NGO #1	Northern	NGOs, businesses	Management related trainings, research, peace-building activities

NGO #2	Southern	Peace-Building Orgs., Youth	Technological research, peace-building activities
NGO #3	Northern	Women	Promote human rights, specifically women's rights
NGO #4	Southern	Women	Promote reproductive rights

Appendix D. Table 2: NGO Funding Sources for Inter-communal Projects

NGO #1	UNOPS, European Union, HasNa Inc., Israeli Embassy, European Parliament, European Commission, British High Commission
NGO #2	HasNa Inc., UNOPS, European Commission, United States Institute of Peace and the Institute of World Affairs,
NGO #3	UNOPS, European Union
NGO #4	UNOPS, Republic of Cyprus Ministry of Justice, HasNa Inc.

Appendix E. Table C: NGO Partners, Projects, and BDP-funded Projects

NGO	NGO #1	NGO #2	NGO #3	NGO #4
Partners	NGO #2; Intercollege; Highway Communication Co.; AKTH; GC Academic Ass.	NGO #1; TC youth org., TC associates, PeaceNet	NGO #4, AKTH; AKME; Cyprus College; Cymera; Stavraeto Youth Org. of Pafos, Women and Child Org. of Morfu	NGO #3; TC Youth NGOs; NGO #1/NGO #2; TC professional woman; Gardash (*bi-communal org.)
Project Focus	Media literacy and	Media literacy and	AIDS, women's	AIDS, women's

	economy; strengthen civil society, Greek language courses; Cyprus trade/economy; management trainings; historical research for youth	economy; website for peace-promoting individuals/groups; youth groups promoting peace	issues; environment; disabled individuals; environment; gender equality, AIDS; youth camps	issues; reproductive rights, abortion; attended media literacy training; body image, women in media; female trafficking, reproductive rights, female orgasm
BDP Sponsored Projects	Management trainings for AKTH	Website; youth program	All projects with exception of NGO #4	AIDS pamphlets, trafficking of women/rep. rights with Gardash

Appendix F. Establishment of Inter-communal Relations

      1. Search for an organization operating in the other community which has similar activities and/or serves a similar population in order to plan and implement a joint program which addresses an issue relevant to both communities.

      2. Attend inter-communal workshops and/or trainings for NGOs in order to make contacts with organizations operating on the other side.

      3. Network with individuals and/or organizations on the other side to get the name and contact of an organization that would be ideal to collaborate with.

Appendix G. Forms of Inter-communal Relations

      1. Execute a joint project funded by BDP

      2. Execute a joint project funded by a source other than BDP

      3. Sub-contract a program to an organization operating the other side and/or execute a sub-contracted program from an organization operating on the other side

      4. Distribute informational materials produced by an organization operating on the other side throughout your community

      5. Provide your services to an organization operating on the other side or receive the services of an organization operating on the other side

6. Present at an activity of an organization operating on the other side

Attend an activity of an organization operating on the other side

7. Provide resources and support for an organization operating on the other side

Bibliography

Bryant, Rebecca. 2004. "An Ironic Result in Cyprus." *Middle East Report Online*.
    Retrieved April 4, 2005 (http://www.merip.org/mero/mero051204.html).

"Cyprus Conflict Chronology." 2005. Retrieved April 4, 2005. (www.cyprus-
    conflict.net).

Development Associates, Inc. 2004. "Cyprus Bi-Communal Development Program
    Evaluation: Final Report." Submitted to USAID. Evaluation IQC No. AEP-I-00-
    00-00023-00.

Director #1.Interview conducted on May 4, 2005 at 3:00 PM in the NGO #1 office.

Director #2. Interview conducted on May 5, 2005 at 12:00 PM at a café.

Director #3. Interview conducted on May 3, 2005 at 11:00 AM in the NGO #3 office.

Misaouli, Anna. 2005. "Conflict Resolution Seminar." *SIT Study Abroad Program.*
    Lecture on April 4, 2005.

"NGO #1 General Information." 2005. *NGO #1.* Brochure.

"NGO #2 Profile." 2004. *NGO #2.* Profile.

"NGO #3 General Information." 2005. *NGO #3*. Brochure.

"NGO #4 General Information." 2005. *NGO #4*. Brochure.

Oztoprak, Canan. 2000. "The Experience of Bi-communal Contact through the Eyes of a
    Turkish Cypriot." Presented at an international conference, summer of 2000,
    California. Retrieved April 4, 2005 (www.cyprus-conflict.net).

Project Coordinator #1. Interview conducted May 5, 2005 at 4:00 PM in NGO #1 office.

Project Coordinator #2. Interview conducted May 9, 2005 at 2:00 PM in NGO #2 office.

Project Coordinator #4. Interview conducted May 9, 2005 at 9:30 AM in NGO #4 office.

UNOPS Home Page. Retrieved April 4, 2005 (www.unopspmu.net).