

# **Greek and Greek-Cypriot Political Strategies up to the Declaration of Independence (1945-60)**

by John Milios and Tasos Kyprianidis

## **1. Introduction**

Our aim is to conduct a detailed analysis of the political power balance and the strategies of the leading political Greek-Cypriot groups in Cyprus, but also the political strategy of the Greek state, chiefly in the period preceding the agreements of Zurich and London, the founding documents of the Republic of Cyprus.

Our assertion is that the establishment of the Cypriot state was determined primarily by the dynamic of the class and political power balance in Cyprus: the formation above all of an autochthonous Greek Cypriot bourgeoisie and (through the Zurich and London agreements) a Greek Cypriot political power structure, and secondly the dynamic of balance of forces at the international level that shaped developments in Cyprus.

## **2. First phase: “Enosis”,<sup>1</sup> the common strategy of Greek and the Greek Cypriot leadership (1945-1957)**

### *2.1 The pre-history and the political context in Cyprus.*

Cyprus was ceded to Great Britain in 1878 following an agreement with the Ottoman Empire, the island’s previous rulers. But British sovereignty was not “absolute”. Cyprus (that is to say, the British rulers) were simply tributaries of the sultan, who was recognized as the “supreme sovereign” of Cyprus. When in October 1914 Turkey entered the First World War on the side of the Central Powers, Britain proceeded to annex Cyprus in the sense of asserting absolute sovereignty.<sup>2</sup> In February 1915 Great Britain proposed to the Greek government that it would cede Cyprus to it (on the basis of the fact that 80% of the population of the island were Greeks) in exchange for entry of Greece into the war on the side of the Entente (AKEL, 1952, p. 42). The proposal came to nothing because both the internal balance of forces inside Greece and the vicissitudes of war in the Balkans precluded participation by Greece in the Great War until 27/6/1917 (Milios 1988, pp. 179-188).

At the economic level the status of tributary to the Sultan for the Cypriots translated into high taxes, imposed by the British to help them pay their “rent” to the Ottoman Empire. At the political level – and that is what interests us here – it meant retention of the Ottoman system for representation of the subject Christian population (of Greek Cypriots). This arrangement, which emerged out of the evolution of the Ottoman Empire’s political system of Asiatic despotism (for more details see Milios 1988, pp. 116-141) involved recognition of the religious leader, the Archbishop of Cyprus, as political representative of the Greek Cypriots. He was elected through a most singular “electoral” procedure. In 1754 the Sultan in fact bestowed further privileges on the Greek Cypriot Archbishop, essentially extending his power to cover the Turkish Cypriot population also (Psyroukis 1975, p. 179). Thus, from the very first day of British sovereign rule, the Greek Cypriots had their own system of political representation and their own representative (the religious political “Ethnarchy”) to counterpose to the rulers. (The only essential privilege the

---

<sup>1</sup> “Unification” (with Greece).

<sup>2</sup> British sovereignty in Cyprus was ratified by the treaties of Sèvres (1920) and Lausanne (1923).

Greek Cypriot Archbishop lost after the British annexation was that of collecting taxes both from the Christian and from the Muslim Cypriots).

This political system for representation of the Greek Cypriots was retained after the “absolute” annexation of Cyprus by Britain (in 1925 Cyprus was designated a “Crown colony” of Great Britain). The election of the Archbishop, in accordance with the “Statutory Charter” of 1914, was to be assigned to a body of 66 electors, 33 secular and 22 clericals “directly elected through universal suffrage of the adult male population” (Tsekouras 1984, p. 89).

The political cohesion of the Greek Cypriot population acquired further strength from the Greeks’ almost total domination<sup>3</sup> of the island’s domestic economy, marginalizing the Turkish minority (18% of the total population). In the first phase of British rule (up to World War I) the “Ethnarchy”, *de facto* the Greek Cypriot population’s only “party”, exerted simultaneous political and social power of such strength as to enable it apparently to represent the “will of the Cypriot people” and not just of the Greek Cypriots.

The British governed Cyprus through a system of “joint administration” based on two councils (the “Legislature” and the “Executive”). After 1925 there were 12 elected Greeks, 3 elected Turks and 9 Britons (the so-called “official members”) in the Legislature. This system of government enabled them to secure “proportional representation” of the island’s two communities without ever permitting any leeway for questioning of British domination. It is, however, characteristic of the capacity for “political expression” of the national communities within the British governmental system that “the desire for *enosis* had in many cases been proclaimed from the rostrum of the Cypriot Parliament” (Kranidiotis 1981, p. 17).

The system was supplemented by yet another “democratic institution”: free elections at the municipal level, which made it possible for Greek Cypriot mayors to be elected in almost all of the island’s municipalities and communes. Finally, both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots participated in the Cypriot police and administration.

The economic and social development that took place in Cyprus as the 20<sup>th</sup> century progressed, along with the influence – albeit indirect – of the ideological and social ferment taking place during the same period in Greece (but also in the rest of the world, e.g. the October Revolution) had the effect of bringing into existence new Greek Cypriot political and social movements above and beyond the “Ethnarchy”. The most important of these organizations was the Communist Party of Cyprus (KKK), which was founded on 15<sup>th</sup> August 1926 in Limassol (Mastrogiannopoulos 1981, p. 12). The KKK put itself in the front line of the trade union and social struggles of the Greek Cypriot workers and rapidly acquired influence. “In 1939 30 workers’ associations had been recognized by the colonial government and 27 others were in the process of formation”. The KKK also played a pioneering role “in establishing agricultural co-operatives and other farmers’ associations, cultural societies, etc.” (Mastrogiannopoulos 1981, p. 17). In 1941 the KKK established the Progressive Party for the Working People (AKEL) to function as a broader legal progressive-leftist party. But in 1944 the KKK proceeded to close itself down as an autonomously functioning organization, merging completely with AKEL.

With the establishment of the KKK and later AKEL (and with the development of the organized trade union movement), the “Ethnarchy” ceased to be the Greek Cypriots’ only representative. It became the representative just of the conservative segment of Greek Cypriots. But the “Ethnarchy” retained its “institutional” character within the British colonial system and continued to be recognized by the British administration as “the” representative of the Greek

---

<sup>3</sup> Characteristic of the economic inequality that prevailed between the two Cypriot communities throughout the period under examination is that two years after the proclamation of the Republic of Cyprus in 1962-63, Greek Cypriots (80% of the population) controlled 93.9% of secondary production, 96.1% of the import trade and 99.5% of the export trade of Cyprus. (*The Cyprus Problem...* 1988, p. 132) Similarly in the interwar period “Virtually all of the import and export trade of Cyprus and all Cypriot industry are in the hands of the Greeks of Cyprus. This could also be said of Cypriot banking foundations” (*Great Hellenic Encyclopedia*, Vol. I, Hellas, p. 767, 1934).

Cypriots. In October 1931 the Greek Cypriot population rose in rebellion with the demand for *enosis* of Cyprus with Greece “The 1931 uprising was put down and a state of terror and dictatorship was imposed on the people of Cyprus (...). The pseudo-constitution was abolished (as was the Legislature, M.K.), the political parties were declared illegal (...) The regime of absolutism, of palmerism, that followed the events of October introduced new dictatorial laws that prohibited all political activity and organization and all political functions, abolished freedom of the press, freedom of association, freedom to march, freedom to teach Greek history, raise the Greek flag, and much else” (AKEL 1952, in L.T., AKEL, Psyroukis 1977, p. 35). At the same time two prominent members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in Cyprus were sent into exile, resulting in suspension of the procedures for electing the Archbishop from 1933 (death of Archbishop Kyrillos III) until 1947. In 1937 in fact laws were passed providing that candidates for the Archiepiscopate had to be approved by the Cypriot (colonial) government and be Cypriots (the so-called “anti-ecclesiastical laws”).

With Greece’s entry into the Second World War on the side of the Allies the emergency measures in Cyprus were relaxed. The exiled leaders of the uprising of 1931 were allowed to return to Cyprus, the Orthodox Synod was reconstituted, and in 1943 the political parties were legalized and free municipal elections were proclaimed, in which the now legal AKEL achieved significant gains. In 1946 the religious laws of 1937 were repealed. In 1943 the leadership of AKEL and Leontios, the suffragan bishop occupying the patriarchal throne, both called upon the Greek Cypriots to enlist as volunteers in the British army. It is estimated that 25,000 to 30,000 Greek Cypriots responded to this appeal by their political leadership. Among them were eleven members of the central committee of AKEL (Mastrogiannopoulos, 1981, p. 20, AKEL 1952, op. cit., p. 36). Moreover “in the course of the war, King George II and the Prime Minister Emmanuel Tsouderos included Cyprus in the memorandum of Greek claims they submitted to President Franklin Roosevelt in June 1942. A similar demand was put forward to Anthony Eden (December 1942) by the Deputy Prime Minister Panagiotis Kanellopoulos” (Kranidiotis 1981, p. 18).

## 2.2 *The period of “preparation” for the enosis struggle (1945 - 1949)*

The first five-year period following the end of the Second World War is of decisive importance for the shaping of the political forces but also for formation of the policy of the Greek state in relation to Cyprus.

What is particularly important to understand here is that despite the fact that the Greek Cypriot political scene was divided into two political camps, left and right, even despite the fact that inside these camps (and particularly on the right) a number of different, and to some extent contradictory, political centres and corresponding political tendencies were emerging, despite the fact finally that contradictions and sharpening divisions could be seen between the Greek Cypriot political leadership and Greek external policy, nevertheless what is involved is a uniform political strategy on the Cyprus question with which both the Greek state and the Greek Cypriot political parties were aligned: the strategy of *enosis* of Cyprus with Greece.

With the termination of the War the divisions between the two political camps of the Greek Cypriots become blunted. At the same time the ideological climate of Allied victory (“a victory for Democracy and Freedom of the Peoples”), the enlistment of Greek Cypriots in the British army, the lifting of the colonial government’s emergency measures, created the impression that the “national aspirations” of the Greek Cypriots were on the point of being “vindicated”. Even before the War was over (August 1944) AKEL had organized mass demonstrations demanding *enosis* in all the big towns in Cyprus (AKEL 1952, op. cit., pp. 39-40).

With the “restoration of constitutional order” municipal and communal elections were held in Cyprus in which the candidates of “National Collaboration”, supported by AKEL, were elected in the island’s four big municipalities (Ioannis Clerides in Nicosia, Ploutis Servas in Limassol, A. Adamantos in Famagusta and L. Samantas in Larnaca).

As for the right-wing initiatives, some entirely political entities, such as the “Cypriot National Party” (KEK) were created, but also trade-union movements like the “Cyprus Farmers’ Union” (PEK). In the municipal elections of 1946 the Right stood for election as the “Party of Patriots”. But the backbone of the Right continued to be the church and the “Ethnarchy”, within whose organizational structures (Ethnarchy Council) secular activists also participated.

The balance of forces and the tendencies formed in the upper echelons of the Church are thus of more decisive political importance than the orientations of the unequivocally political or trade union movements. During the period we are examining, inside the Church (and the Right) two tendencies had emerged: a “moderate” tendency under the Metropolitan of Paphos Leontios (the suffragan bishop occupying the archiepiscopal throne) and a far right tendency around the Metropolitan of Kyrenia and the Secretary to the Metropolitan of Kyrenia Polykarpos Ioannides.

Though the ideological climate from the head-on collision of Right with Left that was at that time unfolding in Greece had to some extent been transmitted to Cyprus, nevertheless the internal conditions on the island still did allow of coexistence of the two camps, on the basis of the shared strategy of *enosis*. Thus the Leftist mayor of Nicosia participated in the National Council, through his presence there was entirely cosmetic, legitimating as national – that is to say representing all Greek Cypriots – a political and organizational institution whose origins were in Middle Ages and which in essence functioned as the “party” of the Cypriot Right. Admittedly in early 1947 a common Representation (“Embassy”) was established, headed by the suffragan bishop occupying the archiepiscopal throne, who went to London to submit to the British government the demand for *enosis*.

The British government, as is well-known, did not accept the Greek-Cypriot demands and made the counterproposal of granting a “Constitution of Self-Government” under the suzerainty naturally of the British governor. The “Ethnarchy” immediately rejected this proposal, while AKEL accepted it, on the one hand because they regarded the constitutional reform as a step towards *enosis*, on the other through giving due reckoning to the political conditions prevailing at that time in Greece (physical extermination of communists, civil war). Nevertheless, although the AKEL-supported mayor of Nicosia withdrew from the Ethnarchy Council, accusing it of “anticommunist activity” (Kranidiotis 1981, p. 14) AKEL continued to extend legitimacy to the Church and the “Ethnarchy”, participating in the procedures for election of the Archbishop-Ethnarch that took place in May 1947. It supported the “moderate” Metropolitan of Paphos Leontios, who was duly elected.

The refusal of the Ethnarchy to enter into the constitutional framework established by the Colonial Government and AKEL’s participation in it exacerbated the conflict between the two camps but also strengthened the influence of the Ethnarchy over Greek Cypriots at the expense of AKEL. AKEL nevertheless continued indirectly to accept its central role in the Ethnarchy. After the death of Leontios it again participated in the archiepiscopal election (December 1947) where, however, this time the cleric elected was the Metropolitan of Kyrenia, representative of the Cypriot far Right.

Following the failure of the colonial government’s “constitutional reform” experiment (summer 1948) AKEL made an attempt to regain the political initiative. It organized rallies, and promoted resolutions that were approved by all the municipal councils and mass organizations controlled by AKEL, demanding *enosis* and sending its own “embassies” abroad to influence public opinion. Exactly the same types of action were promoted at the same time by the Ethnarchy. In March 1949 the central committee of AKEL resigned and a new leadership was

elected. From that time onward AKEL would refuse all participation in the colonial governmental system, boycotting also all the functions of the Ethnarchy, apart from the referendum of January 1950 (see 2.4). Notwithstanding the struggle between them for political hegemony (a struggle which in 1958 reached the point physical extermination of communists by EOKA, see Section 3), the two political camps continued, up until the end of the period under examination, to comprise “subjects” of the same strategy of *enosis* of Cyprus with Greece.

In May 1949 municipal and communal elections were held again, This time the Left lost the Municipality of Nicosia, but retained its position in Limassol, Famagusta and Larnaca.

During the period under examination (1945-1949) the policy of the Greek government in relation to Cyprus could be characterized as one of “wait and see” or non-involvement. The main reasons for this were the internal conjuncture in Greece (civil war) and the country’s international aspirations for entry into the political and military system of the advanced capitalist countries of the West so as to be able to put forward whatever “national demands” and “objectives” it might have from a position of greater strength (e.g. 1947 *enosis* of the Dodecanese, 1950 participation of Greece in Korean War, 1952 entry of Greece into NATO).

But above and beyond these conjunctural factors dictating the “wait and see” stance of the Greek state, the stance was consonant with a more permanent and more strategic political objective: to sideline Turkish Cypriot reactions and avoid involvement of Turkey in solution of the Cyprus problem. Non-involvement of Greece (and therefore also of Turkey) would make it possible for Cyprus to be an “internal affair” of the British Empire, a disagreement between Great Britain and a “Cypriot people” who were aspiring to “self-determination” (like Malta, etc). In political terms the Cypriot question would thus be a problem between the British government and the “Ethnarchy” (the representative of the “overwhelming majority of the Cypriot people, seen as a uniform collectivity).

This common Greek and Greek-Cypriot strategy concealed behind (or rather revealed by) the “inertia” of the Greek government on the one hand and on the other the persistent and reiterated initiatives of the Greek Cypriots under the leadership of the Ethnarch-Archbishop involved a certain futility insofar as it left out of account both the persistent refusal of Britain to countenance direct acceptance of the “Cypriot people’s right to self-determination” and the reaction of the Turkish Cypriots.<sup>4</sup> But at this point it would be appropriate to embark on a brief digression.

### 2.3. *A necessary parenthesis: “Enosis” and the Turkish Cypriots*

But despite their economic and political marginalization and notwithstanding all the somewhat lame argumentation of Greek nationalism, the Turkish Cypriots had been Turks for a long time and believed (or rather knew) that for them there would be less national oppression in a British colony than in a Greek province. The more so because they were aware that in the context of the post-war international balance of political forces they too, as a specific national group, had their own “right to self-determination”. Up until 1919 the “political leadership” of the Turkish Cypriots had sought the reincorporation of Cyprus into the Ottoman Empire, this being their

---

<sup>4</sup> Exactly the same view was supported by conservative Greek politicians (see for example Averof’s August 1958 letter to Grivas, in Grivas 1961, p. 281) and by the Cypriot and Greek Left. (See, for example, Servas 1975, p. 21 and Servas 1988, p. 85 ff). It is characteristic that in the “Minimum Programme” of AKEL, published in 1952, it is mentioned that the basic motive forces behind the struggle for *enosis* are “all Greek, Turkish and Armenian workers, men and women” (AKEL 1952, p. 56) while at the same time it is acknowledged that “the Turkish masses are immersed in economic squalor and at the mercy of the chauvinism of the beys and the agas” (op. cit., p. 50). A systematic critique of the chauvinistic apologist ideology according to which the Turks of Cyprus are not opposed to *enosis* (unless they are “incited” by the British) and did not have reasons to be opposed to the prospect of *enosis* is contained in *The Cyprus problem...* 1988, pp. 22-78.

reaction to the Greek Cypriots' calls for *enosis* (see Psyroukis 1975, pp. 189-190). At the end of the Second World War, when the rapprochement between Greece, Britain and the Greek Cypriot colonial administration (e.g. enlistment of Greek Cypriot volunteers in the Allied armed forces, relaxation of emergency measures, etc). made *enosis* seem probable, the Institution of the Turkish Minority of the Island of Cyprus (KATAK) was founded (in 1945). The organization was soon re-launched under the leadership of F. Kiucuk and called the "Popular National Party of Turkish Cypriots". The organization "Cyprus is Turkish" made its appearance at the same time. "Demonstrations and rallies began to be organized in the big towns of Cyprus for Turkish Cypriots to express their opposition to *enosis*. In one of these gatherings in Nicosia which took place on 28<sup>th</sup> November 1948 it was decided that a telegram should be sent to the President and Prime Minister of Turkey with the following content: '15,000 Turkish Cypriots decided unanimously to reject the Greek request for annexation of Cyprus by Greece or for autonomy. They believe that annexation or autonomy would result in the disappearance of the Turkish community'" (P. Terzelis, "The Diplomacy and Politics of the Cyprus Question", quoted in *The Cyprus Question...* 1988, p. 41).

The Turkish Cypriots were almost 90,000 in number, comprising 18% of the population of Cyprus. As we shall see below, they rapidly oriented toward adoption of the demand for partition (dual *enosis*) of Cyprus via the "self-determination" of each nationality. When the Greek side embarked on armed struggle for *enosis* through the EOKA organization (1955), the Turkish Cypriots launched a similar armed group, the Volkan, which in 1957 was renamed to "Turkish Defense Organization" (TMT).

We shall see in what follows that the simplistic conception according to which the Turkish Cypriots came out against *enosis* only when they were incited to do so by the "imperialists" (and so were "foreign-controlled" and/or "executive organs of imperialism") serves one purpose and one purpose only: to conceal the fact that the Greek strategy for *enosis* entailed the political (and after 1956 even physical) extermination of the Turkish minority in Cyprus.<sup>5</sup>

#### 2.4. *The escalation of the struggle under the hegemony of the "Ethnarchy" (January 1950 - October 1955).*

The political balance of forces that took shape between 1950 and 1955 was decisive for the evolution of the Cyprus question. The climate was created within which in the ensuing periods (1955-57 and 1957-59) the conflicts and the negotiations were to be enacted from which finally the Zurich and London agreements emerged.

During this period the "Ethnarchy" secured absolute political hegemony of the Greek Cypriot political forces (as against both the Left and the far-Right opposition of Kyrenia). It functioned in close collaboration with the Greek state and its international diplomatic activity, retaining primacy at this level also however. Escalation of the diplomatic and political activities of the Greek state was a characteristic feature of this period.

The starting point for this particular phase was the referendum organized by the "Ethnarchy" on 15/1/1950 and supported by the Left. 95.7% of the adult Greek Cypriot population voted in favour of *enosis* of Cyprus with Greece.

---

<sup>5</sup> In AKEL's "Minimum Programme" of 1952 we read: "Today we are not faced by the dilemma: SOCIALIST OR CAPITALIST CYPRUS. The dilemma we have before us today is: ENOSIS OR ENGLISH OCCUPATION. To this question we reply. THE WHOLE PEOPLE UNITED FOR ENOSIS" (AKEL 1952, p. 59). Up until April 1952, when EOKA launched its actions, AKEL's chief disagreement with the Ethnarchy was that the latter was inclined to consent to the retention of British bases in Cyprus, in return for Enosis.

The referendum served to legitimate the “Ethnarchy” as undisputed representative of the Greek Cypriot people, bearing its mandate against both the British administration and the Left opposition.

At the same time the referendum marked the beginning of a new chapter in the struggle for *enosis* because it encountered the categorical refusal on the part of the British government to discuss any change in the status quo for Cyprus, the main argument being the strategic importance of the island for the British Empire. It thus became abundantly clear that the strategy of “non intervention” by the Greek state had exhausted its potential. It was a strategy that had taken to ensure that the Cypriot problem was to be solved as a “colonial question”, i.e. as an outstanding agenda item that concerned only the British government and the “Ethnarchy” (“representative of the overwhelming majority of the Cypriot people”). Britain’s “intransigent” stance necessitated more dynamic Greek involvement to change the balance of political forces in Cyprus.

Precisely at this moment the archiepiscopal throne in Cyprus fell vacant again with the death of Archbishop Makarios II. In the election that was then called, the opponent of the new Metropolitan of Kyrenia, who in the first phase of the electoral campaign managed again to secure the support of the far right of the “patriotic party”, was the Metropolitan of Kition Makarios. The latter went on to win the election (20<sup>th</sup> October 1950). Although he did not belong to the new far-right tendency in Kyrenia, the new archbishop, Makarios III seems at that time to have been a “dyed-in-the-wool nationalist”. “As a young student in Athens he had joined far-right organizations (...), he identified with (...) the ideas and the symbols of ‘Hellenic-Christian Civilization’ as understood by the conservative elements of the Right (...) His ambitions resembled the similar ambitions of Mediaeval archons” (N. Kranidiotis, 1981, pp. 45-46).

Included among the closest collaborators of the new Ethnarch were Nikos Kranidiotis, General Secretary of the Ethnarchy, the Ethnarchy advisor Zinon Rossidis and the new Metropolitan of Kition Anthimos. AKEL boycotted the archiepiscopal elections, characterizing them a “chauvinistic farce”.

With the “mandate” of the referendum as the chief weapon in its arsenal, the Ethnarchy re-established close contact with the Greek government as well as with the Greek opposition parties with a view to establishing tactical co-ordination. (The Prime Minister at this time was S. Venizelos).

What this meant in reality was establishment of a common decision-making centre and joint headquarters for directing the struggle for *enosis*. Leadership was in the hands of the “Ethnarchy”, both formally and actually. But its basic political and diplomatic initiatives now derived from Greek political power and diplomacy. They were advanced jointly with the Greek state or following consultation with it. Naturally it was not only the international political balance of power that influenced the course of developments but also the internal power balance and the dynamics of the political conflicts in Greece and in Cyprus. In any case the basic concern of the joint leadership centre in Nicosia and Athens was to marginalize the Cypriot Left politically and minimize its role in resolving the problem of Cyprus.

There were two key components to the chosen policy in the new political conjuncture: a) Internationalization of the Cyprus question, chiefly through resort to the United Nations, for the purpose of securing recognition from that international organization of “the Cypriot people’s right to self-determination”, b) intensification of the conflict in Cyprus, including recourse to armed struggle.

a) The policy of internationalization was launched in 1953 by the Greek government under gen. Papagos. The Greek government declared to Great Britain that it “would from now on handle this question (the question of Cyprus) as it judges best and most opportune, reserving the right to absolute and total freedom of action” (22/12/1953, see Kranidiotis, 1981, pp. 65-66).

Shortly afterwards it submitted a petition on the Cyprus problem to the Ninth General Assembly of the United Nations (September 1954). But the General Assembly resolved to engage in “no further examination of the subject”. (The next Greek petition to the 10<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of the United Nations in September 1955 met with a similar fate).

The rationale of the United Nation’s resolution not to seek application of the “principle of self-determination” in the case of Cyprus (50 votes for, 8 abstentions) was a reflection of the position that the Cypriots are not a “distinct people” but a population comprising Greeks (the majority) and Turks (the minority) and that therefore any attempted solution of the Cypriot problem should derive from a peaceful settlement between the three interested parties: Great Britain, Greece and Turkey. This rationale was supported by the Western countries who sought to keep Cyprus within the framework of NATO. But it is a view that was also shared by the countries of the Third World, who saw the Cyprus problem more as a dispute between three NATO countries than as a question of colonial oppression. A decisive role was played here by the intervention presented by Turkey, whose argument was that what was presented by Greece as the “right to self-determination of the Cypriots” was in reality a demand for territorial annexation by a particular country that would deny the Turks living in Cyprus *their* “right to self-determination”.

Thus, contrary to the expectations of the Greek and Greek-Cypriot leadership, the Greek Cypriots’ struggle for *enosis* did not, in this phase, obtain substantial international recognition and legitimation.

Simultaneous with international diplomatic activity on the part of Greece, mass mobilizations were stepped up in Cyprus. The “Ethnarchy” rejected every proposal by the colonial authorities that they should participate in a “constitutional system of government”. Exactly the same policy, but on an organizationally autonomous basis, was pursued by AKEL<sup>10</sup>. The mobilizations and strikes intensified, reaching a peak when Greece’s appeal for recognition of the Cypriots’ “right to self-determination” was rejected by the United Nations General Assembly.

Internationalization of the Cyprus problem and the by now active support of Greece for the demand of “self-determination and *enosis*” led on the one hand to greater tension in the reactions of Turkish Cypriots and on the other to more energetic involvement of Turkey in the question of Cyprus. Immediately after the submission of the Greek appeal to the United Nations Turkey, in a move aimed at Greece, was already declaring its intention (and its “right”) to participate together with Greece in the decision-making process for the future of Cyprus.

International isolation of Greece in its demand for annexation of Cyprus, confirmed by the stance of the 9<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of the United Nations, obliged the Greek government to accept the British proposal for a three-day conference in London (Britain-Greece-Turkey) on the future of the Cyprus question. The conference ended in failure because the British proposal for granting of a “Constitution of Self-Government” (under the supervision, of course, of the British governor) in exchange for “pacification” on the island (the armed group EOKA had already commenced operations) was rejected by the Greek side. On the last day of the conference (6.9.1955). when its failure became known to the public, the well-known violent incidents targeting the Greek minority broke out in Istanbul and Izmir.<sup>6</sup>

b) In parallel with the policy of internationalization, Greek Cypriot and Greek policy was becoming oriented, from as early as the beginning of the period under examination, to organizing armed struggle in Cyprus as a means of forcing the British (but also the Turks) finally to accept a political settlement on the basis of “self-determination”.

---

<sup>6</sup> Turkey maintained that the incidents had been triggered by the explosion of a bomb the preceding day in the house in Thessaloniki where Kemal Ataturk had been born. The Greek government regarded this unexpected event as “Turkish provocation”.



Only two months after the election of Makarios, in December 1950, G. Grivas<sup>7</sup> met in Athens with General G. Kosmas, head of the General Staff of the Greek Armed Forces and secured his consent to the launching of the armed struggle in Cyprus (Grivas 1961, p. 15). In October 1952 Grivas arrived in Cyprus to “reconnoitre the terrain” and in March 1953 the final decision was taken for the armed struggle to commence.

The armed organization established in Cyprus by G. Grivas, EOKA, was not in any sense a “political organization” conducting guerrilla warfare. It was an irregular military organization entirely subordinated to the policies and the diplomatic initiatives and orders that came from the joint political leadership in Athens (Greek government) and Nicosia (“Ethnarchy”). EOKA did not have any kind of internal political dimension. It was organized on a military basis, with its members and cadres simply obeying the orders of the leader. The ideological profile of the organization was, of course, crystal clear: *enosis* and anti-Communism (Kranidiotis 1981, p. 74).

The man who was now leader, Grivas, who retained for himself the privilege of political decisions, always operated if not exactly in accordance with orders at least in consultation with (or rather from within) the Greek Cypriot and Greek political leadership. Generally through the Metropolitan of Kition or his collaborator Azinas he was in constant touch with the “Ethnarchy” and through the Greek ambassador in Cyprus with the Greek Foreign Ministry, but also with the Greek Prime Minister.<sup>8</sup>

The armed struggle finally got under way on 1<sup>st</sup> April 1955.

The new situation created by the launching of armed struggle by EOKA led to the collapse, as already indicated, of the post-war “Greek-Turkish friendship and collaboration”, which had however already been crippled by the Greek diplomatic initiative in 1953-54 for international recognition of the Cypriot people’s “right to self determination”. The appearance of EOKA was duly followed by the appearance of the Turkish Cypriot armed organization Volkan and the TMT (Grivas 1961, pp. 50-51 and 91) but also by reorganization of the Cypriot police, with mass exit of Greek Cypriots and mass appointment of Turkish Cypriot policemen.

### *2.5 Plans for resolving the Cyprus question and the sharpening of conflict (October 1955 - March 1957).*

The change in the balance of forces in Cyprus (but also internationally) that may be discerned in the preceding period led into a new phase of the Cyprus question, key feature of which was the elaboration by Great Britain of certain specific “plans for resolution” of the island’s problems. All the moves of the political forces in Cyprus, but also of Greek and Turkish diplomacy, were overshadowed at this time by the political negotiations and political initiatives of Great Britain.

The negotiations with Makarios conducted by the Governor of Cyprus, Harding, which got under way in October 1955 and lasted until the beginning of March 1956, mark the beginning of the new period.

The basis for the negotiations was the British “plan for resolution” of the Cyprus problem, providing for “broad self-government” of the people of Cyprus (Harding Plan). Makarios counter-proposed a three-point plan: 1. “Recognition by the British government of the Cypriot people’s right to self-determination is the indispensable foundation for any solution to

---

<sup>7</sup> As explained by N. Kranidiotis, General Secretary at that time of the “Ethnarchy”, “The election of Grivas is a testament to the spirit of the Cypriot leadership in terms of the type of struggle it proposes to conduct”. (Kranidiotis: 1981, p. 74). The same writer informs us that a significant role in this election was played by the fact that Makarios had personal links to a cadre in Grivas’s fascist organization “X” (op. cit).

<sup>8</sup> “The Foreign Minister Evangelos Averof corresponded (with Grivas) under the pseudonym ‘Isaakios’ (and sometimes ‘Benefactor’), the Consul General under the pseudonym ‘Glafkos’, the consul Rodas Roufos under the pseudonym ‘Scipio’, the Consul A. Frydas with the pseudonym ‘Xiros’ or ‘dry’. The Archbishop corresponded with Grivas under the pseudonym ‘Haris’” (Kranidiotis 1981, p. 78).

the Cyprus question. 2. Following such official recognition (of the right to self-determination) the Archbishop would be willing to work together with the British government to elaborate a constitution for self-government and put it into immediate application. 3. The time for implementation of the principle of self-determination would be a subject for discussion between the British government and the representatives of the Cypriot people who would be elected on the basis of this constitution". (Kranidiotis 1987, p. 17. For what follows here see Kranidiotis 1987 and Kranidiotis 1981, pp. 112-180).

In the negotiations that followed, the British positions gradually came to approximate the abovementioned plan of the Greek Cypriots.<sup>9</sup> The positions were as follows: the British a) agree to recognize the Cypriots' right to self-determination, b) detach the non-immediate cession of that right from British and NATO interests, simply evoking the "situation in the Mediterranean" as a reason for delay, c) accept the formula that the agreement is to be presented as a "unilateral declaration" of the British government and not the official text of an agreement, d) accept that the time for implementation of self-determination should be contingent on securing (through implementation of self-determination) of the interests of "all sections of the community" (a formulation proposed by the Greek government) rather than the initial "when self-government is proven to be an arrangement that can function satisfactorily", e) provide verbal guarantees that in the arrangements for self-government there will be provision for a Greek Cypriot prime minister, a Greek Cypriot ministry with participation of only one Turkish Cypriot minister and that in the parliament there will be proportional representation of the two communities. Verbal guarantees are also to be provided that there will be an amnesty for the EOKA fighters. f) The British Governor will exercise the function of "regulator of the polity". Above and beyond that the Governor will retain powers over questions concerning external policy and defence and will also continue to exert powers in relation to "public security", "for such time as this is considered necessary".

This framework for resolving the Cyprus problem was accepted both by the "Ethnarchy" (see, for example, Kranidiotis 1987, pp.167-70 and 92-94) and by the Greek government (op. cit, pp. 27 and 57-58). But Makarios was continually demanding clarification and insisting on improvements to the text, in writing, almost all having to do with the "constitutional regime of self-government". This led finally to breakdown of the talks. There followed declarations both from the "Ethnarchy" and from the Greek government officially rejecting the Harding Plan.

The reasons for the failure of the negotiations and the ultimate rejection of the British proposals, despite the essential acceptance of their content by the Greek and Greek Cypriot side, are to be situated almost entirely in the internal balance of forces both in Cyprus and in Greece.

It was on the basis of two considerations that the "Ethnarchy" and Greece refused to accept the final Harding Plan:

a) That it was impossible directly to challenge British power in Cyprus and force the British to withdraw.

b) That the international and domestic balance of forces precluded elimination of the Turkish Cypriots and the Turkish factor. Given the non-existence of a single "Cypriot people", the principle of self-determination, which was the most feasible in the context of the given power balance, would most likely be interpreted as self-determination of each nationality separately, that is to say "dual *enosis*" and partition of Cyprus. This solution was now openly supported by the Turkish Cypriots and Turkey. To the Greek argument that twofold self-determination was "unenforceable" because there was no territorial separation of the two nationalities, so that there would have to be population displacement, there was the Turkish counter-argument of Turkey's defence requirements. Cyprus is only forty miles away from Turkey and is five hundred miles

---

<sup>9</sup> On the Greek Cypriot side the negotiations were conducted by Makarios and N. Kranidiotis, General Secretary of the "Ethnarchy". The Greek Foreign Ministry was also extremely active behind the scenes.

from Greece. Annexation of all of Cyprus by Greece without any concessions to Turkey would amount to a radical alteration of the strategic balance between the two countries. Through this transitional phase of self-government Greek strategy therefore aimed at effecting this radical change in the strategic balance between the two countries (first of all in Cyprus), so that *enosis* – without any trade-offs with Turkey – would become feasible.<sup>10</sup>

Nevertheless, on the basis of the Harding Plan the Greek, and above all the Greek Cypriot, leadership was for the first time discussing something different from *enosis*, and even from “self-determination”.

In the meantime, as negotiations continued, conflict was escalating to unprecedented levels in Cyprus. On 26<sup>th</sup> November 1955 a state of emergency was declared “on account of the tension from the terrorist violence” and AKEL and all the trade union and other mass organizations linked to it were outlawed. The Left newspapers *Neos Dimokratias* (*New Democrat*) and *Anexartitos* (*Independent*) were closed, as too was the Turkish Cypriot Left newspaper *Inkilapsi* (*Transformation*). But the mass rallies, demonstrations, clashes with the police, and the activity of EOKA, all continued. On 28<sup>th</sup> November 1955 M. Karaolis was sentenced to death (he was hanged on 10/5/1956).

Under these conditions Makarios was inclined to accept the Harding Plan only on the basis of prior acceptance by the Greek government. But this was not possible for two reasons: a) It would shift the question back from being a British-Greek Cypriot disagreement to a new “tripartite” arrangement, because it would undoubtedly trigger a new intervention from Turkey. b) It would have a significant effect on the political scene in Greece, which was in a pre-election period (elections were scheduled for 19<sup>th</sup> February 1956). All the opposition parties had declared themselves unconditionally in favour of “exercise of the right of self-determination within a specified and reasonable time-span” as the only acceptable solution to the problem of Cyprus.

Rejection of the British initiative therefore came as a result of the dynamic of the existing balance of political forces in Cyprus and in Greece. With failure of the negotiations there came a sharpening of the conflict between the British administration and the Cypriot political leadership, with an accompanying rapprochement between the different tendencies of the Greek Cypriot Right (the “Ethnarchy” on the one hand and the “hard-liners” of Kyrenia on the other).

---

<sup>10</sup> The later Acheson Plan of 1964 was a plan for *enosis* of Cyprus with Greece. Under its terms a military base was granted to Turkey as the only concession, without ceding sovereignty but placing it on a fifty-year lease. A minority regime was provided for the Turkish Cypriots, similar to the arrangements in Western Thrace. The Acheson plan was submitted in an international political conjuncture much more favourable for Greece than the conjuncture of 1955-56. It was also formulated subsequent to the violent suppression of the Turkish Cypriot community through force of arms (the events of December 1963, see Tsekouras 1985). Political marginalization of the Turkish Cypriots on such a scale would have been inconceivable in a “self-government” regime with a “regulatory role” assigned to the British Governor as in the Harding Plan. It is therefore the Acheson Plan and not the Harding Plan that exposes the limit of Turkish concessions and the limit of Greek gains. However, if *enosis* did not become possible this is attributable primarily to the way Greek Cypriot independence strategy was structured from 1957 onwards, something we can well imagine happening under the “Harding self-government regime” also.

That the Turkish Cypriots had been excluded *de facto* from the discussions between Harding and Makarios does not by any stretch of the imagination mean that the Greek view on “self-determination” of the “Cypriot people” as a whole had been adopted by the British or that the scenario of “dual self-determination” had been categorically excluded. The opposite occurred in fact, that is to say the question was purposely kept open, so that it could be evaluated by participants in future political alignments. In the British parliament the Foreign Minister Harold MacMillan put forward the following argument in November 1955: Given that there is disagreement between the three parties (Great Britain, Turkey and Greece) on the subject of self-determination why don't we all agree to cooperate in implementation of self-government and avoid insisting on a precise definition of every word and phrase concerning our different ways of handling the final phases of discussing the question? (Kranidiotis 1987, p. 45). But “Makarios was basically uninterested in securing a definite time-frame for implementation of self-determination and left it open how the transitional stage should be handled” (Kranidiotis 1987, p. 67), evidently anticipating a conjuncture after implementation of “self-government” that would be more favourable for the Greek Cypriots.

In March 1956 Makarios, the Metropolitan of Kyrenia and the Secretary to the Metropolitan of Kyrenia Polykarpos Ioannides were arrested and exiled to the Seychelles (“in the interests of the promotion of peace and order”).

It was in this climate that on 19<sup>th</sup> December 1956 the Radcliffe Plan was announced, with accompanying relaxation of the emergency measures in Cyprus. This was a draft constitution for “self-government” under which the Governor would be given increased powers. There was provision for a cabinet with six Greek ministers and only one Turk (for Turkish affairs). But the Governor nevertheless retained the decisively important power of appointing the Prime Minister. The most significant element in the British initiative was not so much the framework for “self-government” in itself as it was the now explicit clarification by the British Government that the Cypriot people’s future “self-determination” would have the character of a “dual self-determination” (“self-determination” of each nationality separately) (Kranidiotis 1981, p. 239 ff).

The Greek government rejected the British plan without any discussion. The Cyprus question was discussed in February 1957 in the United Nations General Assembly, with Britain, Greece and Turkey reiterating their customary positions. The General Assembly adopted a resolution expressing the hope that “a peaceful, democratic and just solution” would be found and the hope “that negotiations for that purpose would be resumed and continued” (Kranidiotis 1981, p. 245).

On 20<sup>th</sup> March 1957 the British government announced its intention to release Makarios, declaring that it was examining a new plan for resolution of the problem of Cyprus within the framework of NATO. The decision for the release of Makarios (and the Kyrenia leaders) was taken finally on 28<sup>th</sup> March 1957. The AKEL and “Ethnarchy” political prisoners being held in Cyprus were released at the same time.

But the failure of the “constitutional compromise” now made it inevitable that the balance of political forces in Cyprus would be exposed for all to see, in relation both to the British colonial power and to the Greek-Turkish conflict. It became clear that a) British domination in Cyprus would be brief in its duration and b) that irrespective of the territorial solution that would ultimately be adopted, the 90,000 Turkish Cypriots had not “agreed” to submit to the power of the Greek state. On the contrary, they had the power to demand (and to impose) their own “self-determination”.

The release of Makarios and his arrival in Athens (where he was to remain until the signing of the Zurich and London treaties) inaugurated a new phase of the Cyprus question. The Greeks and Greek Cypriots in their political strategy faced the conjuncture and the political balance of forces just described. In their attempt to transform the political balance to their own advantage they were finally to adopt the solution of “independence”, thus seizing the political initiative. The problem was that in the final analysis they did not have a single shared strategy. For the Greek state, “independence” was nothing more than a transitional regime pending *enosis*. For the Greek Cypriot political leadership and its power-political strategies the idea of independence emerged gradually as the “ultimate desideratum”, as the new strategy for acquisition of political power. Of course up until the establishment of the Cypriot state, and even after that, the divergence between the two strategies remained to some extent hidden, partly because both of them were framed in reference to the same opponents: on the one hand the British Empire (whose colonial policy was disintegrating to the advantage of American international political hegemony and the common strategy of NATO), on the other (and most importantly) the Turkish Cypriot political strategy and the Turkish international political and diplomatic presence.

### **3. Second phase: Independence and “independence”.**

#### **The shaping of new strategic options (April 1957 - August 1960).**

*3.1. From the release of Makarios to the Zurich and London agreements. The transitional period (April 1957 - February 1959).*

With the release of Makarios, the Leftist leaders and the cadres of the “Ethnarchy” it had now become evident that the British wanted to impose a “common consent” settlement in Cyprus which, while remaining in harmony with Western/NATO interests would nevertheless end British colonial domination over the island.

The Greek and Greek Cypriot political leadership was thus initially oriented towards a cessation of the armed struggle in exchange for resumption of the negotiations on the basis of the proposals that had been outlined in the past in the Harding Plan.

a) The negotiations were to be conducted between the British Government and the “Ethnarchy”, without the participation of the Turkish Cypriots. b) There would be a demand for establishment of a transitional regime of self-government. c) “Self-determination” was to be recognized as the final solution, without its content being made explicit however, leaving the question of “self-determination” in the hands of the transitional regime of “self-government”.

But as early as mid-April 1957 it became evident that the existing Greek-Turkish balance of forces both in Cyprus and internationally was not such as to make a settlement of this kind feasible. The Turkish Cypriots’ demand that they too should be “self-determining” as a separate nationality from the Greek Cypriots and that there should therefore be “dual *enosis*” was already being recognized by Great Britain and to some extent also by NATO as the only solution that could provide prospects of long-term peace on the island (given the international legal order shaped by resolution of the “Indian problem” in 1947).

In May 1957 the Greek side therefore adopted a twofold tactic of a) continuing the activity of EOKA, b) internationalizing the Cyprus question (through the UN) with parallel rejection of the NATO framework for resolution of the dispute, i.e. tripartite talks, etc. (a solution being urged both by the British and by NATO) given that the NATO framework represented partition as the only viable solution (Grivas 1961, pp. 169-174, Kranidiotis 1981, pp. 265-276).

But a potential impasse confronted this policy also, because as in 1955-56 it did not appear capable in itself of bringing about the required transformation in the relations of forces. Each of the poles among which the strategy of Athens and Nicosia was being elaborated started on its own account to seek new directions, though always within the framework of their shared strategic option: a) The Greek government tended to favour direct dialogue with Turkey, hoping in this way to sideline not only Britain but also the Turkish Cypriot political leadership, so as to achieve de facto retreat of the Turkish side from the position of “dual self-determination”. b) The “Ethnarchy” attempted initially to turn EOKA chiefly against the Turkish Cypriots, seeking through large-scale massacres of the Turkish Cypriot population to weaken the resolve of their political leadership. Above and beyond the letters from Makarios to Grivas, the following letter is also entirely characteristic. It was sent to Grivas in June 1958 by the Metropolitan of Kition, key exponent of the views of Makarios in Cyprus following the exile of the Archbishop: “To avert any weakening of our position at the United Nations and avoid giving cause for closer collaboration between Britain and the Turks in Cyprus, we should confine our attacks to the Turks, indeed inflicting upon them as much damage as possible. They must be dealt with mercilessly because only in this way will they be frightened into minding their own business” (Grivas 1961, p. 276).<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> “If gangs of Turks should wantonly enter the Greek sector, as they are in the habit of doing, either following orders from Ankara or simply to make a disturbance, we shall be obliged to deal with them. I am of the opinion that we should throw one or two hand-grenades into their midst from some rooftop and in that way give them a good

But this “Ethnarchy” policy of physical extermination of Turkish Cypriots was not to be put into practice until the establishment of the Cypriot state, because it did not meet with the approval of the Greek government. The Greek government judged that large-scale massacres of Turkish Cypriots would deprive Turkey of any ability to compromise and would lead inevitably to partition, as well as very likely triggering Turkish reprisals against the Greeks of Istanbul. c) At the diplomatic level the “Ethnarchy” was from the beginning of the period under examination already focusing on independence as an alternative solution to the Cyprus problem in the event that “self-determination” (in its Greek interpretation, naturally) should prove unattainable. As early as 15/5/57, in an interview for an American television network, Makarios was saying that “in the course of exercising their self-determination the Cypriot people will have the option of choosing either a) *enosis* with Greece, b) the establishment of an independent state, or c) independence within the British Commonwealth” (Grivas 1961, p. 179).

The Greek government opted for “independence” on the calculation that it offered the best prospects as an indirect route towards *enosis*. On 25<sup>th</sup> July 1957 the Greek Consul General in Cyprus A. Vlachos sent Grivas the following information: “There are indications that the Archbishop is optimistic and that he is tending in his thinking to favour the solution of ‘independence’ (...) It emerges that the Turks are again opposed to any such development because they perceive that the idea of independence has gained ground and no international body would be in a position to hold back the natural evolution of independence into *enosis*. *Of course when ‘independence’ emerges as a possible solution, one of the greatest difficulties will be presentation of the whole plan to Greek public opinion*” (Grivas 1961, p. 191, our underlining).

The Greek government was holding behind-the-scenes talks with the Turkish government on the solution of independence. Turkey however rejected independence as a solution on the grounds that: “a) the independent state will sooner or later be united with Greece. b) no independence guarantee can withstand changes in international conditions (...) c) when the Cypriot state becomes independent it will be dominated by fanaticized Greek Cypriots and whatever guarantees it might give to the minority, they will not enjoy security”. (Letter from Averof to Grivas, 26/8/57, Kranidiotis 1981, p. 283).

The political balance of forces both in Cyprus (opposition from AKEL but more significantly also from within the “Ethnarchy”, from the Kyrenia group, see Kranidiotis 1981, pp. 286-290) and from Greece (unity of the opposition around the slogan of “self-determination” and preparation for overthrow of the Karamanlis government through the “apostasy” of G. Rallis and P. Papaligouras) for the moment discouraged the Athens-Nicosia political centre from publicizing its new strategic proposal of “independence”. Thus at the 12<sup>th</sup> United Nations General Assembly in September 1957 Greece again supported the solution of self-determination (Kranidiotis 1981, pp. 299-303).

In Cyprus, perceiving the great political influence exerted by AKEL in the cities, Grivas initially attempted physical extermination of the Communist leadership through assassination of cadres. When this policy was suspended following intervention by the Greek government, he reoriented towards creation of a “patriotic political party” and organization of passive resistance

---

lesson so that they will not again dare to gather in their gangs” (Letter from Makarios to Grivas, dated 3/3/58. Grivas 1961, p. 258). “I think it would be possible for one or two hand-grenades to be thrown at the Turkish gangs. The same thing should happen in the other towns. (...) It would be good, if we had at least two of our people, armed, in the villages where there are Turks...” (Letter from Makarios to Grivas, dated 18/4/58. Grivas 1961, p. 273). “The murders of leftists make me uneasy, because they create a situation that gives the English a grounds for speaking of civil disturbances (...) As I am informed, they have promised they will adopt the slogan that the Archbishop is the sole representative of the Cypriot people” (Letter from Makarios to Grivas, July 1958. Kranidiotis 1981, pp. 327-328). “In the face of this leadership of traitors (meaning AKEL), an abstentionist stance on our part is a crime against the nation. I have done my duty and am sounding the alarm, even if I receive slander from ‘Eleftheri Ellada’ (‘Free Greece’) for doing so” (Grivas’ answer to Makarios. Grivas 1961, pp. 275-276).

by the Greek Cypriot population to the British political and economic presence in Cyprus. At the same time he declared to the Greek government that he disagreed with the prospect of “independence”, instead proposing the withdrawal of Greece from NATO and its entry into the non-aligned group of countries as a means of pressuring for solution of the Cyprus problem. (Grivas 1961, pp. 285-286, also see Grivas 1961, p. 291: “It is preferable for us to live independently, honourably, even if poor, than to live on American dollars and lose our national independence, hostages to the will of the dollar owners”). In long letters from the Greek Foreign Minister E. Averof, the Greek government informed Grivas of the international political and economic situation of Greece (see for example Grivas, pp. 286-98). It was only when, towards the end of the period under examination, Grivas attempted to buttress the “passive resistance” with open armed terror against Greek Cypriot importers of British products that he would meet with open disapproval from the Greek government. “We find ourselves up against an unholy alliance of bad Capital and Communism. Two totally different categories which neither know a Fatherland nor stand for principles, because for them everything is material” Grivas was to assert in defence of his policy (Grivas 1961, p. 370).

But while passive resistance appeared to yield certain results, at least in economic terms, the organization of a political party under Grivas failed because he never obtained practical support from the “Ethnarchy” and the Greek government. Nevertheless, the close political relationship between the three poles of official Greek policy on Cyprus (the Greek government, the “Ethnarchy” and Grivas) enabled Grivas, whatever disagreements he may have had, to function in Cyprus as the highly active support base for the exiled Makarios. “My endeavour to secure recognition of the Archbishop as sole representative of the Cypriot people (...) was entirely successful, despite the fact that considerable discontent was initially expressed about the Archbishop, both in Cyprus and among Cypriots in Athens” (Grivas 1961, pp. 175-176).

The operational headquarters in Athens and Nicosia thus remained entirely united politically, whatever individual political initiatives may have been taken by each of the three poles during this period and whatever changes may have been foreshadowed from May 1957 to move official policy from “self-determination” to “independence”.

But in the meantime the political initiative for resolution of the Cyprus problem remained in the hands of the British government. In January 1958 the new British governor of Cyprus, Hugh Foot, released to the public a plan for resolving the Cyprus problem which provided for a) a transitional period of self-government lasting between five and seven years, b) guarantees that at the end of this period a definitive solution would be sought that would be acceptable to both Greeks and Turks, c) immediate lifting of the emergency measures and the return of Makarios to the island, d) the commencement of negotiations with the leaders of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot Communities to work out a constitution for self-government (Kranidiotis 1981, p. 307). This plan (the Foot Plan) was rejected by the Turkish Cypriots and by Turkey, which refused any form of “self-government” under the control of the “Ethnarchy” of Makarios, insisting on the solution of partition. But a little later it became known, off the record, that Turkey was prepared to retreat from the demand for “separate self-determination of the Turkish Cypriots” (partition) if the Greeks would allow it a military base on the island. After consultation with the “Ethnarchy” the Greek government rejected this demand also (Kranidiotis 1981, pp. 308-311, Grivas 1961, p. 230).

AKEL officials also participated in discussions with the British authorities on the Foot Plan.

With both inter-communal strife and civil conflict (between Greek Cypriots) intensifying, Britain in June 1958 put forward a new plan for resolution of the Cyprus problem (the Macmillan Plan), in which dual *enosis* was clearly being projected as the final solution (linkage of Cyprus to Britain, Greece and Turkey, participation in a transitional government by representatives of the

Greek and Turkish governments, dual nationality for the Cypriots – British and Greek for the Greek Cypriots, British and Turkish for the Turkish Cypriots, etc. (for details see Kranidiotis 1981, p. 320 ff.). The Greek government immediately rejected the plan, but ordered Grivas to call a new EOKA ceasefire. He, of course, complied. Notwithstanding the Greek rejection, the British government announced its decision to implement the Macmillan Plan with all means at its disposal.

Intensive diplomatic activity developed over the following months, in the framework of which the initiative for mediation by the NATO Secretary-General Paul-Henri Spaak was of particular significance. This initiative in essence amounted to active American involvement in the Cyprus problem and appeared in principle to support a solution to the question more favourable for Greece than partition. Greece accepted Spaak as an intermediary, pressuring Makarios to accept also.

On the eve of Spaak's visit to Athens, where the NATO Secretary-General was to table his proposals for resolution of the Cyprus problem, Makarios in an interview with the vice-chairperson of the British Labour Party Barbara Castle came out for the first time publicly in favour of the independence solution (22/9/1958).

On 23/9/1958 Spaak in Athens put forward his proposals for resolution of the Cyprus problem. A seven-year transitional government with a Greek majority, a single parliament and two subsidiary assemblies for unequivocally communal issues, a five-member conference (Britain, Greece, Turkey, Greek Cypriot community, Turkish Cypriot community) to determine the final arrangements for the island. The Greek and Greek Cypriot side accepts the Spaak proposals, declaring support for independence as the ultimate solution. But finally Spaak's attempted mediation failed because it was rejected by Britain and Turkey.

On 27<sup>th</sup> September 1958 Makarios officially communicated the proposal for independence to the British government. From that point onward independence was to constitute the official political strategy both of the "Ethnarchy" and of the Greek government. Of course while for the Greek government it was, as indicated, a matter of political manoeuvring, for "independence" as a transitional stage towards annexation of all of Cyprus within a reasonable time frame of one or two decades, for the Cypriot political leadership independence was now posed as the final goal of its constitution as political (state) power.

But what deserves to be noted here is that the new conjuncture that arose out of Britain's attempt to impose the Macmillan plan for partition: It became for the first time possible to legitimate the new political strategy of independence, both in Cyprus and in Greece. Despite the reaction both from the Kyrenia group and from AKEL (and correspondingly the opposition parties in Greece), independence no longer had the appearance of "betrayal of the struggle" but rather a "more realistic" (or at least more conciliatory) political tactic against the "impasse" of implementing the Macmillan Plan. It is characteristic that Grivas, who on 29<sup>th</sup> September 1959 declared "my opposition to the general policy being pursued on the Cyprus problem is definitive, but will not be manifested outwardly in any specific way", had absolutely nothing to say in response to the Metropolitan of Kition, a Makarios supporter, who several days later remarked to him: "I have no hesitation in saying that this new position on the Cyprus problem does not represent an abrogation of our national claims as many, including our colleagues in Kyrenia, seek to present it. It would be pure utopia if, faced with the most serious dangers that threaten us, we should insist on the slogan '*enosis* and only *enosis*'". (Grivas 1961, pp. 306 ff).

But the Greek Cypriot and Greek plan for independence encountered categorical refusal from Britain (Kranidiotis 1981, pp. 346, 347, 348, 349, 354. Grivas 1961 pp. 307-308). At the 13<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of the UNO the Greek government supported the solution of independence, in this way sidelining the Turkish positions on *dual enosis* but not achieving anything more than that.



Now taking the political initiative, the Greek government embarked on bilateral talks with Turkey, not including Britain, on the basis of the independence plan. The Turks initially insisted on being given a military base on the island because they considered that “whatever guarantees are given and whatever type of polity is established, Cyprus will become united with Greece at the first sign of any relaxation from Turkey, and Turkey wants at least to be certain that they will retain a base for purposes of their own security”. (Letter from Averof to Grivas, 4/2/1959, Grivas 1961, p. 353). They also asked that the new state be named “Greek-Turkish Republic of Cyprus”. The Turks eventually abandoned these demands.

On the basis of the draft agreement between the two countries a tripartite conference (between Britain, Greece and Turkey) was held, starting on 6<sup>th</sup> February 1959, which on 11<sup>th</sup> February 1959 finalized the well-known Zurich Agreement (between Britain, Greece and Turkey). 19<sup>th</sup> February 1959 saw the signing of the London Agreement (between Britain, Greece, Turkey, the Greek Cypriot community and the Turkish Cypriot community). The Zurich and London agreements of February 1959 established the framework for the independence regime of the Republic of Cyprus.

### *3.2. From the Zurich and London agreements to Independence. Beginning of the parting of the ways between the two strategies (February 1959 - August 1960)*

The Zurich and London agreements provided for a presidential republic with a Greek president and a Turkish vice-president, in which the Greek Cypriots would exercise executive power<sup>12</sup> (seven of the ten members of the Cabinet, a corresponding majority in the administration of the state and of the police, etc). The Turkish Cypriots would be provided with a number of guarantees against Greek Cypriot power (requirement for a separate Turkish Cypriot majority for draft legislation on economic matters, and for amendment of the Constitution, Turkish vice-president’s right of veto on defense matters, foreign policy and public security). The Turkish Cypriots were thus acquiring a higher level of representation in the government, the parliament, public administration, the army, etc. (30%) than their demographic strength in the Cypriot population (18%). Finally Greece, Turkey and Great Britain were designated guarantor powers for the agreements, with Britain being ceded military bases under its sovereignty on the island, covering an overall area of 99 square miles. (For more details on the Zurich and London agreements see Kranidiotis 1981 pp. 373-378 and 534-556).

The Zurich and London agreements were dismissed out of hand by the Greek opposition, who denounced them as monstrous and unenforceable, primarily because of the additional powers acquired by the Turkish minority, which would lead to a “dual-power” regime “without international precedent” and incapable of functioning (see for example the speeches of opposition leaders in the Greek Parliament, “The Greeks struggled...”, etc. 1959. Similar views are upheld to this day by most Greek writers on the Cyprus question.

Such views are entirely mistaken, for two principal reasons:

a) At the judicial and constitutional level, which is normally the level at which agreements are ratified, it is not true to say that what was instituted was a dual power regime without international precedent. The historical example of Switzerland, where German Swiss comprise 78% of the population, French Swiss 18% and Italian Swiss 4%, suggests that one necessary prerequisite for a multiethnic state to function as a multiethnic state (and not as a state

---

<sup>12</sup> The Greek Cypriots retained the legislative power. The House of Representatives included 35 Greek Cypriot and 15 Turkish Cypriot deputies. The Turkish Cypriot Community Assembly (like the corresponding Greek Cypriot Community Assembly) had decision making power only over religious, educational, etc. questions that were the exclusive concern of Turkish Cypriots (or Greek Cypriots, respectively).

of a single ethnic group, within which there are other group ethnic minorities) is that the minorities should be “over-represented”.

b) Turkish Cypriot “over-representation” was in no way incompatible with the possession of executive power by the Greek Cypriots, an advantage enabling them to interpret and deploy the constitution and the existing treaties in a manner that effectively denied Turkish Cypriots not only essential access to political power but also every kind of internal guarantee that their rights would be upheld. As we saw in the preceding section of this article, the Greek and Greek Cypriot political leadership from 1957 onwards favoured the solution of independence on the basis of an awareness that if political power passed into the hands of the Greek Cypriots they would be the ones to dictate the final solution to the Cypriot question “irrespective of the type of political power or the form of the polity” (E. Averof to Grivas, Grivas 1969 p. 353). Moreover the possession of executive power by the Greek Cypriots enabled them as early as December 1963 to abolish the internal provisions of the Zurich-London, provisions which in any case were interpreted and implemented from the outset in accordance with Greek Cypriot political strategy.

For the Greek state the Zurich-London agreements were the first step towards *enosis* of Cyprus with Greece. It had of course been accepted that the “final solution” to the Cypriot problem, (*enosis*) could no longer be an immediate goal, but rather a medium-term goal. *Enosis* would thus emerge out of a step-by-step smooth hellenization of the Cypriot state and the “peaceful” political, economic and cultural marginalization of the Turkish Cypriot community. As later noted by E. Averof: “With 80% of the population, 96% of the wealth, 90% of the landed property, with the mines in Greek hands, with education 90% Greek, to the extent that we had difficulty finding Turks to occupy their 30% of the civil service position, with all these elements, it was certain that in 30 years Cyprus would be more Greek than it was then”. (Averof 1988, p. 39).

But for the Greek Cypriot political leadership, or at least the dominant group in it, the “Ethnarchy”, the independence regime was on the contrary not an intermediate goal but the final goal. The Greek Cypriot political leadership was therefore seeking immediate confrontation with the Turkish Cypriot community and a crushing political victory over the latter, so that, with parallel exploitation of the international political power balance, the international political status of an independent Greek Cypriot republic might be secured. Characteristic here is the interpretation Makarios gave to the Zurich and London agreements which officially inaugurated a Greek-Turkish state in Cyprus: “I considered myself duty-bound to sign the agreement, by means of which an end was put to British domination of Cyprus and *a little Greece was established in the Eastern Mediterranean* (...). The rights that are ceded to the Turkish minority are aimed exclusively at securing the interests of the Turkish minority (...). The guarantees concerning the international relations of the Cypriot state aim at impeding for the future any relationship or alliance with states belonging to the Communist bloc. As for stationing of Greek and Turkish troops on the island, I venture to point out that such stationing is a consequence of the alliance that is being contracted between Cyprus, Greece and Turkey. In the event of dissolution of this alliance, *no Greek or Turkish soldier will remain in Cyprus*”. (Letter from Makarios to Grivas, 20/2/1959, quoted in Kranidiotis 1981, p. 380, our underlining). As become evident in the following years, the strategy of the Greek Cypriot leadership was for *hellenization* of the Cypriot state, through violation and de facto abolition of the agreements on the basis of which it had been established (which provided for a *Greek-Turkish* state), while simultaneously retaining independence from Greece. But this combination of nationalism on the one hand and on the other spurning of the pretensions of the “national centre” for absorption into the main body of the “national state” proved to be an exceptionally inflammable political mix.

With the signing of the agreements, the political initiative passed almost entirely into the hands of the “Ethnarchy”. The first problem that was posed was that of securing the unity of

Greek Cypriots and their consent to the agreements, given the already formulated disagreement not only of the Kyrenia group and AKEL but also of Grivas with the “solution of independence”.

A decisive role was played at this point by the Machiavellian political activity of the Archbishop, who with his perennial theatrical posturing claimed at some times to disagree with the agreements at others to be prepared to agree only on condition that they be amended, in this way entertaining the reservations and disagreements of “Ethnarchy” officials (see Kranidiotis 1981, pp. 344-346 and 366-371). But developments were also very much influenced by the irresolution and political inadequacy of Grivas, who despite his opposition to the agreements did not inform EOKA members of this attitude but instead preferred to remain silent for a whole month, a stance he justified with the argument that he “was not familiar with the full text of the agreements”. Finally, following a deluge of letters from the Greek government and Makarios (Grivas 1961, pp. 347-410) Grivas was obliged on 9<sup>th</sup> March 1959 to declare “suspension of the struggle” and to call upon the Greek Cypriots “all together, to rally round their Ethnarch” (Grivas, 1961, p. 403). He even agreed to amendments to the text of his final declaration in response to the Makarios’s comments on it, so as to camouflage his disagreement with the Archbishop (op cit).

It would not be right, however, to interpret the ability of the “Ethnarchy” strategy to impose its hegemony within the Greek Cypriot community as a reflection of the political adequacy or inadequacy of one or another political leader. It is much more the outcome of the objective balance of forces that took shape in Cyprus in the two years between 1957 and 1959. This political balance of forces and the consequent hegemony of Archbishop Makarios emerged essentially out of two elements:

a) The fact that independence was the only feasible solution for Cyprus, given that Greek Cypriots rejected the solution of dual “self-determination”.

b) The fact that independence could under certain conditions comprise the stage prior to *enosis*.

This second factor indeed enabled Makarios to establish contact with basic cadres of EOKA, sidelining Grivas, initially securing the unity of the “patriotic party” while at the same time isolating the extreme right-wing faction in Kyrenia. The political strategy of Makarios thus imposed its political hegemony on Cyprus by virtue of a tactical compromise with one section of the Cypriot right that supported *enosis*: As early as March 1959 Makarios was founding a new political party (the United Democratic Front for Re-creation - EDMA) in which most of the EOKA cadres participated. On 2<sup>nd</sup> April 1959 the first provisional government was formed, including seven Greek Cypriot minister, four of whom were EOKA officials (P. Georkatzis, A. Georgiadis, T. Papadopoulos and Gl. Clerides).

The opposition (of the *enosis* supporters and Grivas) to the political leadership of Makarios was thus initially concealed and only became manifest in the summer of 1959, but again in a desultory fashion (with only a section of them withdrawing from the political party supporting Makarios). Finally the dissenting Grivas supporters, the Kyrenia activists and other nationalists supporting *enosis* came to an arrangement with Ioannis Clerides, former mayor of Nicosia, who was supported by AKEL, and on 17/1/1959 (that is to say a few weeks before the elections) they formed a political movement supporting *enosis*, the “Democratic Union of Cyprus”.

On 13/12/1959 the first presidential elections were held, in which the party of Makarios secured 67.8% of the Greek Cypriot vote. Immediately afterwards AKEL withdrew its support from the pro-*enosis* “Democratic Union” and began to collaborate with Makarios. In the subsequent parliamentary elections the Makarios party secured 30 of the 35 Greek Cypriot seats and AKEL 5. The political isolation of the pro-*enosis* Cypriot right-wing was consummated. Pro-

*enosis* policies could henceforth be promoted in Cyprus only from within the Makarios party and only in relation to attempted annexations of Cyprus originating in Greece.

But the essential differentiation between the strategy of Makarios and the strategy of the Greek state emerges most clearly over the question of interpreting the agreements and elaborating the new Cypriot constitution. Here, whereas the Greek side sought as much as possible to efface the separate institutional arrangements through negotiations with all parties involved (e.g. common organizational structure for the Cypriot army, not divided into Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot companies, common municipal government in the big towns, etc.), Makarios preferred to institute separate arrangements with a view to then not implementing these arrangements in practice. In this way he sought from the outset to introduce conflict into the relations between the two communities and then, supported by the power of the Greek Cypriots, proceed to abolish the provisions in the Zurich and London agreements guaranteeing the political existence, and proper representation, of the Turkish Cypriots.

The bone of contention here was primarily organization of local government in the big towns. The Turkish Cypriots favoured separate municipalities (a Greek Cypriot one and a Turkish Cypriot one) in each town, a position which could however (like many other Turkish Cypriot proposals) be rejected if it encountered Greek and Greek Cypriot opposition. But let us see how E. Averof, at that time foreign minister of Greece, describes the question of the municipalities: "I fought to the bitter end against the idea of separate municipalities. And leaving for my final meeting with Zorlu (the Turkish foreign minister) I asked that there should be a meeting for this purpose chaired by Karamanlis. The meeting took place at Karamanlis' house. Anthimos of Kition was also there, and another priest also, and Angelos Vlachos, and the ambassador Christopoulos. But at the meeting Makarios succeeded in imposing the separate municipalities, overriding my vehement opposition. And he said to me at the end: 'Pardon my saying so, Minister, but you have no say in this. The Greek government says that it will do what we want. We want separate municipalities'. And he gave reasons for his view. My reply was this: 'I have tried to impose unity on all the divisions that exist de facto. In this case I cannot do that. There is division in the territorial sense'" (Averof 1988, p. 40).

Finally, despite the constitutional protection extended to the separate municipalities, Makarios refused to establish them (asserting that the proposed separation must be "functional" not "territorial"), thus provoking intense reactions from the Turkish Cypriots and heightening of tensions in Greek/Turkish relations (Kranidiotis 1981, pp. 408, 458-61, 435). The prerequisites were thus created as early as 1959-60 for the intercommunal "war" that several years later culminated in ostracism of the Turkish Cypriots by the Cypriot state and confinement of the overall Turkish Cypriot population to "enclaves" whose total area did not exceed 5% of the territory of Cyprus.

Proclamation of the Republic of Cyprus took place on 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> August 1960. The evolution of the newly established state was to be determined by the political conflicts and the political balance of power that had become consolidated during the transitional period of 1959-1960, as outlined above.

#### **4. "Partition" and independence. An interpretation.**

The preceding analysis makes it clear that the Greek Cypriot strategy of independence for Cyprus but also the Greek strategy of "independence" (as intermediate stage prior to *enosis*) emerged as the outcome of a political balance of forces in Cyprus as well as an international

balance of forces that made unconditional “*enosis*” between Cyprus and Greece impossible . On the other hand the balance of forces internally and internationally clearly rendered “dual self-determination”, i.e. partition of Cyprus between Greece and Turkey, something entirely feasible. Indeed in a subsequent phase, a few years after the establishment of the state, at the beginning of the 1960s, an evolution in the balance of forces to the advantage of Greece made *enosis* conceivable, simply in exchange for concession to Turkey of a military base, the extent of which as a proportion of the overall territory of Cyprus would have been much smaller than the proportion of Turkish Cypriots in the Cypriot population.

These solutions were rejected by the Greek state because of the categorical refusal of the Greek Cypriot political leadership to accept any territorial concession to Turkey.

The strategy of “independence” eventually adopted by the Greek state was indeed “maximalistic” in the sense that as final solution it aimed at the most ambitious objective of *enosis* without offering anything of any importance to Turkey in return. But the strategy also entailed the risk of “total defeat”, with all Cypriot territory remaining outside of Greek jurisdiction, as indeed occurred, after the failed Greek military intervention and the Turkish invasion of Northern Cyprus in 1974.

It was awareness of this risk that led the Greek political leadership to discuss the solution proposed by Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot community of dual *enosis*, under the precondition, of course, of minimization of Turkish demands. In October 1956 and again in June-July 1957 the Greek government sounded out the Turkish government over the possibility of partition or of *enosis* with concession to Turkey of a military base. These discussions were abandoned because of the “Ethnarchy”’s opposition to them.

At the same time the solution of partition, always counterposed to independence, was adopted by all the Greek opposition parties. To quote some extracts from parliamentary speeches of 1959 from the political leaders of the opposition: “And we will give some thought to whether partition might not be a clearer solution and one more conducive to calm and security”. (I. Iliou, leader of the Left opposition party EDA, quoted in *The Greeks struggled...*, 1959, p. 36). “At most it would end up something like what happened in India, with the Indians and the Muslims of Pakistan, on a proportional basis. (...) It would not be the most unpleasant outcome if we were to lose a part of Cyprus and win at least the remaining four fifths. (...) That solution would be much preferable to definitively losing all of Cyprus”. (Markezinis, leader of the Centre-Right party of “Proodeftikoi” [“Progressives”], op. cit. p. 10). “Given that the Government was resolved to abandon the demand for self-determination and proceed to a closure of the question, it had abundant opportunity to shoulder its responsibilities and accept the Harding-Radcliffe solutions that have been put forward on a number of occasions and which are much more in the interests of the nation than what is being signed today”. (S. Venizelos, leader of the Centre party of Fileleftheroi [the Liberals], op. cit. p. 24).

It is easy to understand why the Greek political leadership, if it had not faced categorical refusal from the Greek Cypriots, would have been willing to negotiate a solution to the Cyprus problem on the basis of partition. Greece would be annexing at least 80% of the territory of Cyprus, while at the same time the movement of the populations would eliminate the factor that had led to the sharpening of tensions between Greeks and Turks. And Cyprus, now included in the territory of Greece and Turkey, would be incorporated into NATO, thereby appeasing Western international political interests in the area.

The question thus arises of why the Greek-Cypriot political leadership rejected out of hand any idea of negotiation on the basis of “dual self-determination”.

One answer to the question would perhaps be the assessment that the “Ethnarchy” was already oriented toward the strategy of independence, even if it projected (for tactical reasons) the slogan of “*enosis* and only *enosis*”. It was not inclined to accept any solution other than

independence. It therefore persisted in the essentially unachievable demand for *enosis* without concessions, pending emergence of the opportunity to project the independence solution. The Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs at the time, E. Averof, seems to be hinting at something like this when he says: “I don’t know when, at the leadership level, Cyprus abandoned the idea of *enosis*. There are many factors at work there, and much deviousness also. But in any case they abandoned the idea, definitively and officially, when the MacMillan plan began to be adopted” (Averof 1988, p. 39).

But we do not find such an interpretation entirely convincing. Political strategy is not the expression of the “self-consciousness” of some subjects or other (political leaders, the bourgeois class) who are aware of their “objective and long-term interests” and promote them consistently under all conditions. Political strategy emerges out of class struggle and always in accordance with the continually shifting political and class balance of forces.

The preceding analysis has shown us that the Greek Cypriot political leadership was initially oriented towards *enosis*, for which it struggled, irrespective of the fact that *enosis* would eliminate the capacity of this political leadership to constitute itself as an autonomous state power and would lead to absorption of Cypriot capital by Greek capital, etc. (something also true, of course, in the case of the Septinsular Republic or Crete prior to their incorporation into Greece). The subjugation and absorption of individual (political, economic, ideological) interests by the overall national (bourgeois) interest is a process that can be arrested only exceptionally and under highly specific circumstances.

The Cypriot exception cannot be explained either by the existence of a Greek Cypriot bourgeoisie as such, much less to the will of the Greek Cypriot political leadership. It emerged in our opinion out of a) the historically inherited mode of political organization (the pre-existing Greek-Cypriot political “power structure” and b) the specific drift of post-war political conflict in Cyprus (the prospect of partition).

The political system in Cyprus, as developed under the rule of the Ottoman Empire and as continued in broad outline under the British colonial administration, was based on the existence of a Greek-Cypriot political “power”, subordinate to the foreign overlord but nevertheless with considerable autonomy, the “Ethnarchy”, whose domain included *all of Cyprus*. This Greek-Cypriot “power”, as a (potential) form of Greek rule, tended on the one hand objectively to seek to join forces, or unite in *enosis* with the Greek state, on the other as an autonomous power covering all of the territory of Cyprus, to oppose any cession (to Turkey and/or the Turkish Cypriot community) of any part of its dominion.

The entire Greek Cypriot “power structure” was pervaded through and through by this contradiction, as it was evident that liberation from British domination would necessitate loss of part of the territory over which it had authority. This contradiction did not concern the Greek state, whose strategy was to annex as a large a part of Cypriot territory as possible.

If the Greek state was able to bargain on the basis of the principle of partition, so as to achieve the annexation of as a large a part of Cyprus as possible, for the Greek-Cypriot “power structure” it was impossible to cede a section of its already existing “territory”.<sup>13</sup>

The contradiction under which the Greek Cypriot political leadership laboured was stretched to the limit when British plans for partition were set in motion. The solution of “independence” resolved the contradiction in the sense that it averted any Greek Cypriot territorial concessions.

But when immediately afterwards the Greek Cypriot virtual power took shape as real state-political power (with the Zurich and London agreements and the declaration of

---

<sup>13</sup> “For Makarios (...) the aim has become maintenance of the island’s Hellenic character and its unity: Hellenism comes before Hellas!” (Kranidiotis 1981, p. 49).

independence) the ground was prepared for definitive separation of Greek-Cypriot from Greek political power.

Thus, if the period between 1957 and 1959 represents a transitional phase for the differentiation between the Greek strategy of “independence” and the Greek Cypriot strategy of independence, the period from 1959 to 1960 marks the point of no return in the differentiation process between the two strategies.

The evolution of the two strategies was also to set its imprint on the following period of 1960-1974. Both strategies would continue in parallel to be determined in accordance with the movement of the same internal and international contradictions.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AKEL. (1952): “The Road To Freedom – A Minimum Programme of AKEL, for Establishment of a United Front in the Liberation Struggle” in L.T. AKEL, Psyroukis (1977), pp. 29-64 (in Greek).
- Antoniou B., Kyprianidis T., Milios G. and Tsekouras T. (1987): “Myths of the Aegean”, *Theseis*, No. 20 (in Greek).
- Averof E. (1988): “An understanding with the Turks is possible”, *Pages of Kathimerini*, 17<sup>th</sup> July 1988, pp. 36-42 (in Greek).
- Axelos A., Vergis D., Hatzipavlou P. (1980): “Cyprus: From self-determination-*enosis* to internationalization-partition”, *Tetradia*, No. 1. (in Greek)
- Great Hellenic Encyclopaedia*, (1934) Vol. III, entry on Cyprus, pp. 767-770, Athens (in Greek).
- Grivas-Digenis G. (1961): *Memoirs of the EOKA. Struggle. 1955-1959*, Athens, (in Greek).
- The Greeks struggled, the Turks won* (1959), publication of the youth sections of the Progressive party, the Democratic Union EDA and the New Agrarian Union, Athens (in Greek).
- Koumoulides J.T.A. (1971): *Cyprus and the War of Greek Independence 1821-1828*, EKKE, Athens.
- Kranidiotis N. (1981): *Difficult Years. Cyprus 1950-1960*, Estia, Athens. (in Greek)
- Kranidiotis N. (1987): *The negotiations between Makarios and Harding 1955-1956*, Olkos editions, Athens (in Greek).
- The Cyprus Question – and the Internationalist Duties of Greek Cypriot Revolutionaries* (1988), publication of Workers’ Democracy, Nicosia (in Greek).
- L.T., AKEL, Psyroukis (1977): *Three Texts on Cyprus*”, Working Group publications, Athens (in Greek).
- Mastrogiannopoulos P. (1981): *Cyprus, the Socialist Prospect is the Only Way Out for The Unsolved National and Social Problem*, Xekinima publications, Athens (in Greek).
- Milios J., (1988): *Kapitalistische Entwicklung, Nationalstaat und Imperialismus. Der Fall Griechenland*, Kritiki Verlag, Athens.
- Psyroukis N. (1975): *History of Modern Greece*, Epikairota Publications, Athens (in Greek).
- Psyroukis N. (1977): *Strife in the Aegean*, Epikairota Publications, Athens (in Greek).
- Servas P. (1980): *The Cyprus Problem – Responsibilities*, Grammi Publications, Athens (in Greek).
- Servas P. (1988): *The Cyprus problem: “strategy” and strategy*, Polytypo Editions, Athens (in Greek).
- The Cyprus Question – and the Internationalist Duties of Greek Cypriot Revolutionaries* (1988), publication of Workers’ Democracy, Nicosia (in Greek).
- Tsekouras T. (1984): “The Cyprus question. From Enosis to Zurich”, *Theseis*, No. 7 (in Greek).
- Tsekouras T. (1985): “Notes on the class struggles in Cyprus”, *Theseis* No. 10 (in Greek).