
TRANSCRIPT

Dr. Klearchos A. Kyriakides
Senior Lecturer and Solicitor
University of Hertfordshire

11-09-2009

THE CRESCENT OF CRISIS, THE KALEIDOSCOPE OF CONFLICT AND THE STRATEGIC ROLE OF CYPRUS

I'm particularly pleased to see so many old friends and colleagues in the audience before me. I always think it's important for an event such as this to have a sense of history. It's impossible to understand the present day unless we go back and examine how history has unfolded.

Exactly seventy years ago, the Second World War was beginning to take shape. Indeed, exactly seventy years ago today, on the 11th of September 1939 Time magazine marked the outbreak of the Second World War with a series of interesting reports. One of these included an evocative assessment of the implications of the Second World War for the Mediterranean, which Time magazine referred to as "the great tideless, embattled sea of antiquity". And according to Time, the Mediterranean was a decisive theater of war. But it was also a maze of variables which was crisscrossed with conflicting currents. Focusing on the east of the Mediterranean Time magazine added that "the currents in the east were marked by the rush of opposing interests and they were threatened by netted variables, each as dangerous, each as explosive as a floating mind." And it's tempting seventy years later to say that nothing in substance has changed. That description of the Mediterranean, the east of the Mediterranean is as valid today as it was back then.

It's also rather sobering to recall that during the Second World War up to six hundreds Greek Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots, Armenians, Maronites and Latins were killed in action, including two hundreds also missing presumed dead. As the Allies prepare to commemorate the 70th anniversaries of the great battles of the Second World War, let us hope that the contribution of those servicemen will be properly acknowledged.

More to the point so far as this conference is concerned, the Cypriot contributions to allied forces highlights a fundamental point: when the chips are down and when Western values are at risk, Western interests are best served if the island of Cyprus is united not just politically, but in the willingness of its citizens to cooperate with the West in defense of those values.

The West is a loose association, a loose grouping of states which have shared values. European Union is a representative, I submit, of the West. The European Union, according to its treaty, is founded on liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the

rule of law - principles which are common to the EU member states including the Republic of Cyprus. And I've always emphasized to my students: we in this hall and in the UK are beneficiaries of one of the most cherished of human rights, the qualified right to freedom of expression within the law. All of us today will be exercising that fundamental human right. Ray has asked me to be provocative. I shall be provocative, and I shall be provocative in a way that I think reflects that cherished right to freedom of expression. And I shall be provocative without fear of being arrested by the authorities, without fear of being thrown into jail by the courts, and without fear of being ostracized by society. That's because the Republic of Cyprus today, at least in the government-controlled areas, has been transformed into a Western liberal democracy which espouses and protects fundamental freedoms and the rule of law. And I'm reminding here of the great observation of Adlai Stevenson, the American politician who unsuccessfully ran for the presidency. According to Adlai Stevenson, a free society is one where it is safe to be unpopular. By the end of my forty five minutes or so contribution I may be unpopular in some parts of this room. But I'm going to exercise my human right to freedom of expression in that regard.

My objective this morning, ladies and gentlemen, is threefold. The details are set out in the draft paper that you have in front of you. My three objectives are: Firstly, to look at the history of the Republic of Cyprus and highlight the degree to which it has been transformed from a republic that was in the non-aligned movement, and not really considered part of Europe, let alone the West, into a unique pillar of the West and Western values. It's not yet a perfect pillar, but it's very much I would submit a pillar of the West. My second objective is to draw attention to this so-called "crescent of crisis" and the "kaleidoscope of conflict", two phrases which entered the lexicon of international relations, and consider what sort of role Cyprus already performed, and what role it may perform in the future. And in the third and final part of my talk I'm going to grapple with the elephant in the room, the Cyprus question, and submit to you that the present negotiations are inappropriate, to say the least.

Let's begin therefore with the transition of the Republic of Cyprus from a non-aligned state into a unique pillar of the West. I thought it was appropriate to begin with a bit of literature, from Lawrence Durrell. In "Bitter Lemons", the magnificent book he wrote, recalling his experiences on the island, he describes his journey in 1953 from Venice to Cyprus. And he remarks in a wonderful passage, when he arrived in Cyprus, "It was time to say good-bye to Europe." That was the attitude of the 1950s. Cyprus wasn't really part of Europe. It was close to Europe, but it wasn't really part of Europe. And I'm afraid the colonial period very much contributed to that perception. Hence, as we all know, the failure in the post-war period to apply democratic principles properly to this island. That of course gave rise to the troubles of the 50s. And the settlement of 1959-60 which allowed three NATO allies to maintain control of this island, but at the same time it established a Republic of Cyprus that was not put into the NATO alliance. That's quite important for my thesis. It's important for my thesis, because back in 1959 Greek and Turkish governments considered seriously and, indeed, they agreed in principle, that the Republic of Cyprus should join NATO alliance. For various reasons the idea was kicked into dungeon, and the Republic was established in 1960 as a state, outside the framework of NATO. And in 1961 the first president of the Republic Archbishop Makarios applied to the non-aligned movement, and became a member of the non-aligned movement. And this - I'm not going to go into any details here - this created the perception, or rather underlined the perception in certain circles in Washington in particular, that the Republic of Cyprus was not part of the West. If you look at the declassified papers of the United States administration from the period, you can encounter this wonderful poem written by Samuel E. Belk, who was in the Eisenhower administration. This is what he said in December 1959, in a poem: "Cyprus line in the sea, Could

your future lumia be? Divided and torn from East to West. What a mess!” It's easy to speak with hindsight, but in hindsight, was it the best decision for the Republic to join the non-aligned movement and cavort with characters such as Castro, Nasser, Sukarno and Tito? I know, here the consensus in the 60s and 70s was that was a good idea, but in hindsight, if you understand the realpolitik of the period, and if you understand American thinking, perhaps that wasn't a wise idea.

The point is that the non-aligned movement, to all intents and purposes, was a third world alliance which cut little teeth in the international environment. There was no equivalent in the non-aligned movement of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty. There's no self-defense mechanism. So, when crisis erupts, the non-aligned movement is incapable of springing to your defense.

And we all know what happened in the immediate post-1960 period. Internal tensions erupted in the 60s, and those internal tensions gave rise to military intervention from Turkey, initially in 1964 and then with the fully fledged invasion in 1974. I'm not going to go into the details. The point is that the invasion and partition of the Republic in 1974 was partly a consequence, partly a consequence of the isolated fragile status of the Republic of Cyprus within the international system. It was isolated, caught between the East and the West with friends in the non-aligned movement, who had no power and no ability to spring to the Republic's defense.

What are the lessons, therefore, from that pre-1974 period? There are various ones and I'm going to just single out. The first one is that the government and citizens of the Republic of Cyprus really have to treat the world as it is rather than as they would wish it to be. Secondly, they need to fully appreciate the geopolitical framework of which their homeland forms part. Thirdly, they need to take appropriate decisions to protect their interests, and they must never be too insular. To quote what we said earlier: you need to look over the horizon and not just look at what goes on within the parameters of this island. But perhaps most significantly of all, the government and citizens of the Republic, in my view, need to understand that for any ship of state, if I can use a navy analogy, for any ship of state to pass through the dangerous waters of international relations, it needs shrewd captaincy together with the united disciplined crew, which is on the lookout for rocks which are visible, as well as icebergs which are not. And given the presence of so many risks it's sometimes safer for a small ship to form part of the formidable powerful flotilla, rather than try and make its own way on its own.

So, in 1974 the Republic found itself shipwrecked, isolated, with very few friends around the world, a Republic that had been torn in two, its northern areas occupied militarily, its populations demographically split and pretty much in a very bad place.

So that was the position in '74. Now, let's just move forward since 1974 and see what's happened. In that post-1974 period the Republic, by hook or by crook, has managed to progress from being a de facto partitioned shipwrecked state into a modern liberal democracy with a flawed, but nonetheless functioning democratic political system and membership of the European Union. This is a profound importance to the West and to this Republic, and I don't think it's been fully realized in either the West or the Republic that this transition has happened. And I don't think the implications in this place, in particular, have been fully grasped. The Republic of Cyprus is now part of the West. I live in England, I watch RIK - the Cyprus broadcasting service and its political programs - and I often hear politicians talking about the West as if it's some organizational body over there. The Republic is part of the West and it's something that people here need to grasp. Western values are essentially Mediterranean, Eastern Mediterranean values.

Many of those concepts that I referred to earlier, democracy and the rule of law, have their philosophical origins in ancient Athens. These are not alien concepts, these are not alien values. These are values that are inextricably part of the culture and the framework, and I would add the mindset of the people in this part of the world. So that is of fundamental importance and needs to be grasped.

By the same token I would add that in the West we don't often regard the Republic of Cyprus as part of the West. Often, when you read international relations' articles, there's a sort of sentence mentioned in which Cyprus is mentioned in the context of the Cyprus question, or as an offshoot of Turkey, or as part of the Middle East - maybe part of the Middle East, as I would put it, an island off the Middle East. But it's also been inextricably part of the West. And there needs, therefore, be a mindset change of gear, I would submit, both in the West and in that part of the West that is known as the Republic of Cyprus.

Now, let's just go back to the history. In that post-74 period, the Republic of Cyprus had a choice as it were. It could - have the circumstances being different - have chosen the path of, say, the Palestinians after the 1948, or 1967 or indeed 1973 Middle Eastern wars. The Republic could have embarked upon a military campaign, either on an official basis, or using paramilitary forces. It could have engaged in a hijacking of aircraft and all those other dreadful things that we saw in the 70s and 80s in a different context. The Republic and its citizens chosen not to go down that path. Arguably, they didn't have a choice of doing it, but the fact is I don't even think it came to anyone's mind to pursue that approach. They chose the path of cooperation with the West, even though they had been let down badly by the British in particular, and by the Americans. So they chose the part of cooperation with the West, they chose to shun confrontation, and they chose to shun any form of violence, with a view to securing political objectives.

At the last, as far as I can see, the last episode of that sort of violence here in Cyprus occurred with the assassination of the US ambassador in August 1974. But that was at the height of the troubles. Since then violence has not form part of the agenda of the Republic or its citizens.

Now, this path of cooperation has got - as far as I can see, as an outsider looking in with a limited access to official documents and other materials - as far as I can see, this path of cooperation is operating on two levels. On the softer level there are things such as educational links between the Republic and the West. As a lawyer I'm obliged to say this, that the legal links between the Republic and the UK are profound. According to the Cyprus Bar Association, as many as 64% of registered lawyers in the Republic studied law or qualified as lawyers in England, before coming back to the Republic to practice law. And that speaks volumes for the quality of legal education in the UK. But it also says something about the common law legacy of colonialism, and it also says something about the underlying - how can I put this - love/hate relationship between the Republic and its citizens and the United Kingdom. So that, on one level, there are cultural, educational, trade and other links, that have been built up between the Republic and the UK. But on another level there has been this path of cooperation, as I put it, that has also affected the military sphere, which is something I've written about extensively in different contexts.

But in that post-1974 period, the Republic remained a non-aligned member, remained non-aligned, but at the same time it offered its territory to Western military forces at certain times. A good example occurred in the post-74 period of the U-2s. The Republic of Cyprus did not object to the continuing presence of American U-2 aircraft at Akrotiri. In 1982, when the Lebanon crisis erupted - or one of the many Lebanon crises erupted - the Republic put its territory at the disposal of the US Marines and other US forces. Larnaca Airport was used,

Limassol port was used as well as the SBAs. They could have said to the Americans, no, sorry, in view of what you did in '74 we're not going to cooperate. But they chose to cooperate. They made a decision back then under President Kyprianou to cooperate and the Lebanon operation was facilitated by the use of both, the Republic and the SBAs.

With regard to the SBAs, the Republic - for as far as I can tell - has maintained a policy of cooperation with the SBAs. They may not have been in that post-74 enthusiastic about the continued British presence, but they haven't put, as far as I can see, any major obstacles on the part of the British, and they try to cooperate so far as possible with them. So that policy of cooperation with the West in that period in the '70s and '80s is quite profound.

But the turning point, ladies and gentlemen, the turning point I would submit just looking at the post-74 history, perhaps came in 1990. In 1990, just as the Berlin Wall... The dust was beginning to settle and as the Cold War was beginning to end, two events happened of profound significance to the orientation of the Republic of Cyprus from the non-aligned movement to the West.

In 1990 the Republic of Cyprus in July of that year submitted its formal application to join the European Economic Community, as the EU was then known. July 1990 was the application made to the EEC. That was a bold and ultimately successful move which signaled that the Republic was heading in a westerly direction. They didn't make any applications in NATO, but they made an application to the European Union. And given the history of the European Union and its symbolic status as a pillar of the West that was of profound significance, which ultimately bore fruit 14 years later.

The other thing that happened in 1990 was in August, and I was here when it happened having a summer holiday. The Iraqis invaded and occupied Kuwait. And the British particularly used their Sovereign Base Areas to go in support of the Kuwaitis - initially the Americans called it a Desert Shield and then Desert Storm. The Republic could have kicked up a fuss as they did in 1973 when the Americans used, or tried to use but were prevented by Heath, tried to use the SBAs in support of Israel. The Republic of Cyprus did not kick up a fuss. So the British were able to send in hundreds of aircraft into Akrotiri and send their forces to and from the Gulf without any obstacles put in their path by the Republic. Now, that may be in part because the operation in the Gulf had UN support. But nonetheless, it was a reflection of how the Republic was moving away from this sort of non-aligned mindset that had colored its policies in the 60s and 70s. So in my view 1990s were quite critical.

Three years later we had the publication in Foreign Affairs of that historic article by Samuel P. Huntington "The Clash of Civilizations". Now, Huntington I don't think spent much time thinking about Cyprus or writing about it, although Cyprus crop up in both his article and his subsequent book on this subject. Now, that should remind ourselves what Huntington said back in 1993. He argued that as the Cold War was ending,

"World politics is entering a new phase. (...) The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future. (...) The central axis in world politics in the future is likely to be, (...), the conflict between 'the West and the Rest' and the responses of non-Western civilizations to Western power and values."

And Huntington proceeded to identify several major civilizations including the Western, Confucian, Japanese, Islamic, Hindu, Slavic Orthodox, Latin American and - as he put it - possibly African.

Now, where did the Republic of Cyprus fall in this categorization articulated by Huntington back in 1993? Was it an integral part of the Western civilization? Was it an integral part of the Slavic Orthodox civilization? Was it part of the Islamic civilization? Or was it one of the so-called 'torn countries', a phrase that Huntington used in that article? Now, Huntington reached the view back in 1993 that the Republic of Cyprus, or Cyprus as he put it, was part of the Slavic Orthodox civilization. Looking back on the history I would probably argue that was an inappropriate (inaudible) on Huntington's terms, if we are to accept Huntington's terms. It's more accurate to say that in the 1990s the Republic of Cyprus was still a torn country: it had a foot in more than one civilizational camp. It was a torn country in the sense that it was also historically a part of the Ottoman Empire, and thus the Renaissance and many of the other developments of Western Europe had bypassed it. I hope you can see where I'm getting at here. This was the mindset of the 1990s, as the Balkans were set ablaze. But the point is, Huntington reflected I think American thinking at the time: the Republic was not part of the West. It was part of the Islamic Orthodox block, or at best a torn country.

Things, ladies and gentlemen I would suggest you, have changed since 1993. And what's changed in particular since 1993 is the accession of the Republic of Cyprus to the European Union. The Republic now, I would argue, in Huntington's terms - if one accepts Huntington's terms - is indeed part of the Western civilization. It is a modern liberal democracy, has by and large a free market economy, it espouses and cherishes Western values, and it is to all intents and purposes a part of the West, as I defined it earlier. It still has some of the trappings of the torn country syndrome, and it still has the trappings of what Huntington describes as the 'kin country' syndrome. Do you watch Eurovision song contest and the voting patterns at the end of the Eurovision song contest? That's nothing I watch, the songs are generally dreadful. But the Republic of Cyprus always grants twelve points to Greece, however good or bad the song is. And it also often gives high marks to Armenia or other Orthodox countries. And that's a reflection of this sort of "kin country" syndrome.

The serious point though is that in substance the Republic has become part of the West, that's my argument, subject to these lingering attachments to Orthodoxy, and, at least in the occupied areas, to Islam.

Now, let's move on a bit, and I'm conscious at the time, and let's look at the period since 2001 onwards and try and bring this story up to date. Well, what's happened since 2001 is that the Republic of Cyprus without much fanfare, without actually making a fuss about it, without even trying to - as far as I can see - gain too many political or financial rewards has essentially put its territory at the disposal of Western, and primarily US and UK military forces, in connection with Iraq and Afghanistan. That is of fundamental importance and yet I don't think too many people in this Republic have gained any political or financial dividend from it.

In the immediate aftermath of September 11, 2001 - which of course occurred exactly eight years ago today - more than 2,700 people were killed in devastating circumstances. And before the dust had come to settle at the three crash sites, the attention turned to Afghanistan, the Taliban and Osama bin Laden. That quite clear, not just from the media reports, but from the diaries of, for example, Alastair Campbell who was the Prime Minister's press spokesman in the UK at the time. Alastair Campbell's diaries revealed that Tony Blair spent the previous summer reading the Quran - I think that's quite interesting (inaudible). But the point is that the - as we all know - the neo-cons in America seized their moment. And those who accepted the Huntington thesis had a (inaudible) day. They saw this as the apotheosis of the Huntington vision. I was struck by

an article in The Jerusalem Post on the 24th of September, it seemed to encapsulate this train of thought. This is what an opinion piece said in the Jerusalem Post on the 24th of September 2001:

“It's beginning to sink in that what happened on September 11th was not a single terrorist attack on a single country, but the Pearl Harbor of Islamism in its war against the West. In 1941 the Americans were surprised by the Japanese attack. At least they knew what and where Japan was. In retrospect, the great defeated ‘-isms’ of the last century, Nazism and communism, were well understood. Now, we are groping for an understanding of the new ‘-ism’ that has declared war on us.”

Now, the neocons seized their moment, America went into Afghanistan - still is today - and went into Iraq. The point is - and it was little reported at the time - Republic of Cyprus opened its airspace and territory to the United States. And from what little information we have in the public domain it's pretty clear that this was not a total ingestion. The Americans seized the opportunity to make use of the airspace and territory of the Republic of Cyprus. And indeed, in 2002 I understand that the US and the Republic signed a mutual legal assistance treaty in relation to the legal and commercial aspects of the so-called “Global War on Terror”. But also there was an agreement made in connection, a separate agreement made in connection with cooperative efforts in response to terrorism, humanitarian assistance, US Navy ports visits, US aircraft landings and other agreed activities. In other words, the Republic of Cyprus in 2001 and 2002 effectively opened its territory to US military forces. And that's a profound development, if you think about the non-aligned history of the Republic.

As a consequence of that we now know the American forces used the Republic and the SBAs of course, the British used the Republic and the SBAs of course, and the invasion of Iraq took place. This isn't the place to go into the pros and cons of the invasion of Iraq. For what it's worth, I was on that demonstration in London in February 2003 demonstrating against the forthcoming - or I could see (inaudible) all those others. We were ignored. That's another story. The point is the Republic of Cyprus was there for the West to use and the West in the form of the US and the UK used the Republic.

What did the Republic gain in return? You're in a better position to know than I. Did it gain any financial assistance? I don't know. (*Voice from the audience*) *The Annan Plan!* They were given the Annan Plan! (*Laughing*). And I cannot understand the mindset in both Washington and London. Here you are, you have a territory that is at your disposal - the Republic of Cyprus - you have next door Turkey that has said ‘no’ to you. Remember, in 2003 Turkey said ‘no’. On Huntington's terms, Turkey may have said ‘no’ because of the so-called ‘kin country’ syndrome with regard to Iraq, partly - if you accept Huntington's thesis - because Turkey is heading in Islamist direction. Whatever the reason, Turkey said ‘no’. The Republic of Cyprus said ‘yes’. And you would think the Republic would have gained some political dividend - they didn't. They were presented with this document that was a travesty. It was procedurally defective and it was substantively disastrous as well. And I written about this in a different context.

In fact, my argument here - a very important point I'm going to make - my argument here... And I'll just show you a couple of maps because there's the dodgy dossier from 2002 which alleged that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction which were capable of reaching British bases in Cyprus and Israel and elsewhere. The point is, the point that I'm making to you here is that the Annan plan was not in Western interest. This was a counter-Western document. It was promoted, as we know, by President Bush and Prime Minister Blair. I don't know whether they read the Annan Plan, whether they just read what was given to them by their officials. But the point is that the Annan Plan was not in Western interest.

And I'm going to just draw your attention to one provision of the Annan Plan which doesn't really attract much attention. And it's the provision to do with international military operations. Under the Annan Plan we would have had a Greek Cypriot constituent state and the Turkish Cypriot constituent state operating under the umbrella of a very weak federal government. It beggars belief that under the plan the Republic of Cyprus or the UCR - the United Cyprus Republic - would not have been permitted to put its territory at the disposal of international military operations without the support of not just the United Cyprus Republic, but other parties: the Greek Cypriot constituent state, the Turkish Cypriot constituent state, Greece and Turkey. Now, I'm not the world's leading expert on military strategy but I'm aware of what Sun Tzu said: "Speed is the essence of war." If speed is the essence of war, is it invested interest for the consent of five entities to be obtained before you're able to pass through the airspace of the Republic or make the use of ports, or territory, or air bases? I can't understand the mindset of President Bush and Tony Blair back in 2004, why they agreed to this. The British, of course, have a Treaty of Establishment to fall back on the SBAs. But President Bush didn't have that luxury. And in the event of the Annan Plan going through, the United States would have been left in the position whereby they would have required the consent of Turkey, Greece and these two constituent states to make use of the Republic of Cyprus, and if one of them said 'no', the Americans couldn't use the Republic, and they would be dependent on the British and the SBAs, should they need the SBAs. And as we know from 1973, the British are not guaranteed to always say 'yes' to the Americans. And as we've discovered over the Libya and Lockerbie case over the last few weeks, the British can sometimes upset the Americans in extraordinary circumstances. My point is the Annan Plan was counter-Western. It was a counter-Western document. And beside that narrow strategic point, it would have transformed the Republic of Cyprus into an apartheid, racially flavored and racially divided so-called federal republic.

So that brings me to the second part of my talk, which is a "crescent of crisis" and the "kaleidoscope of conflict". Let's look at the future therefore. What is it that the Republic can do to assist the West in this broader region? Chris Pelagias has already drawn attention to the article in Time magazine which in caps first of all drew attention to this phrase: 'The crescent of crisis'. It's been subsequently reported and used in this book that was written by three authors. Two of them have been serving in the Obama administration. So it's a phrase I think we need to treat seriously and regard with some degree of respect and care. The Republic is, as we can see, situated - I would put it this way - off of the Middle East, it's not really a part of the Middle East. It's now of course part of the European Union. But it's beautifully positioned in one sense in order to enable Western forces militarily to gain access to that region, of course, it's dependent, as far as naval forces are concerned, on the Suez Canal, and as far as air forces, it's dependent on air space clearance from other states in the region. But geographically it's in a beautifully positioned location.

But leaving aside the hard military aspects of this. Cyprus is also beautifully positioned in another sense. It's culturally close to this region, the people of this island understand the mindset of the people in the so-called 'crescent of crisis', there are existing trade links, there are new educational links with the various universities here. The Republic is in a beautiful location to assist the West in dealing with this region on not just the military level, but perhaps more importantly on the soft political and cultural level too.

Let me just wrap up for the next five minutes or so by just throwing your attention to the 2006... Sorry. Let me just refer to the "kaleidoscope of conflict". This is a phrase that was coined by General Dannatt who has recently retired as the Chief of the General Staff of the UK. He was a

politically astute general who was not afraid to speak his mind and upset New Labour politicians. But he offered a number of thoughtful ideas as regards the future of Western military and political strategy around the world. And according to general Dannatt, the West faces two major trends. The first major trend is the threat of al-Qaeda-fueled Islamist extremism. That's the first trend as part of this "kaleidoscope of conflict" that he refers to. We have a major threat and it perhaps can be confronted partly with military power, but perhaps more importantly with non-military soft power as well.

And the second trend that he refers to focuses on the so-called 'information campaign': the way in which the world's problems are going to be addressed requires good use of information. I presume what he means is intelligence gathering in one sense, but also communications, broadcasting, education, the promotion of values in another sense as well. (*inaudible*) the Republic of Cyprus is beautifully positioned in regard to assisting the West as regards both trends. Let's look at the military aspect from one point of view. We had the Lebanon crisis in July 2006. The Republic hosted – I forget the figures, is it 15,000? – American fugitives from Lebanon. Several thousand Brits were evacuated here. The French used the island. The Australians used the island. They used Turkey as well to some extent. But the main thrust of the operations was here. So Cyprus is perfectly positioned to assist in humanitarian military operations in that sense. But in another sense, BBC has these transmitters still I think in Zygi. Cyprus is valuable in terms of broadcasting, it's valuable in terms of Education, and perhaps more can be done in that regard.

Let me now come to my third and final part of my talk. I've tried over the last forty minutes or so to explain to you, firstly, how the Republic of Cyprus has progressed from being a pillar of the non-aligned movement into a unique member of the Euro-Atlantic alliance and of the West. It hasn't joined NATO alliance or indeed Partnership for Peace, and as far as I'm aware it hasn't even made any applications to join. But what it has done, it has joined the European Union, it's cozied up to the Americans and it's trying to maintain its friendship with the United Kingdom and other Western players. So there's quite a profound transformation.

Today we find ourselves confronting this - as our national security strategist in the UK has put it - threat of Islamist extremism and terrorism, and we have other problems as well with WMD and threats of more traditional nature. In fact, this week before I left England, the newspapers reported this ghastly crown court case which involved the conviction of three UK-born gentlemen of Pakistani origin who were involved in plotting to blow up - I don't have to say that allegedly anymore because they were convicted - they were convicted of plotting to blow up seven or more airliners flying from the UK over to the United States. It was referred to by The Times's "An airline plot to rival 9/11." And The Independent referred to it as "Potentially Britain's 9/11." But this threat of Islamist extremism it's not something that... I was a bit skeptical when I started reading about this. But now we're seeing the court cases and the convictions and the evidence that's presented to court. We're beginning to see that this is a genuine and real threat. And it is a threat the West should treat seriously and it should act accordingly. The Republic is perfectly positioned to enable the West, if it needs to engage in military operations, to engage in those military operations in areas - and it looks as if this plot had a Pakistani element - in areas to the east where these threats emerge.

The problem is that the two leaders here on the island, they are engaged in a so-called peace process which is going to - if it succeeds - result in the establishment of a bi-zonal bi-communal federation consisting of the two political communities. It's going to turn this Republic into a basket case which the West will not be able to use properly. Furthermore, as I see there is a risk

of Islamist extremism entrenching itself in the occupied areas of the north. I've read over the summer that – I may be wrong, and perhaps a Turkish Cypriot here can correct me if I am wrong - but I read that compulsory Quran classes are being introduced in the schools in the occupied areas. That's partly the product of the influence of the so-called secular Turkey. I also read this week that a cleric in the occupied areas has called for the old part of Nicosia to be transformed into an Islamic canton, where Sharia law prevails. Are we thinking about these things carefully? Does the bi-communal settlement really going to enable the Republic to remain a Western entity? Or is it going to fulfill Huntington's thesis and see a Christian-dominated south and a Muslim-dominated north? Do we really want to have racially and religiously defined zones - a phrase relevant to Germany and the postwar period - do we really want to have racially and religiously defined zones in the Republic of Cyprus as the future unfolds? Do we really want Turkey, which is itself militarily progressing in a neo-Ottoman direction and perhaps politically progressing in an Islamist direction, do we want Turkey to maintain a permanent military presence in the Republic of Cyprus, or in whatever entity it turns into in the future? Do we want to have that provision that we had back in 2004 with the Annan Plan whereby Turkey has a veto over how the territory of this place is used? I've put these points in the form of questions so we can maybe discuss them afterwards. But I would argue that the interests of the West are not served by any Annan Plan settlement. And I would go one step further and say the whole concept of bi-zonality and bi-communality is alien to the West, it's contrary to the Western interest, it undermines Western values and it ought to be consigned to the dustbin of history, together with partition and enosis.

If the Republic is to serve the West, and play a role in the West, and to help construct bridges into the 'crescent of crisis', in my view it needs to be a democratic, unitary, united Republic which is stripped of these 1960 arrangements.

Which brings me finally to the British. The British have tried to go about things in Cyprus in a rather different way. Whereas Turkey, for example, has used brute force to acquire territory, the British are engaged in this wonderful practice that William Mallinson first used: "elginism". It's a practice which I refer to in my paper. It's rather like the practice of acquiring the Elgin Marbles or the Parthenon Marbles, which are in the British Museum. This is my definition of "elginism": "It may be described as a peculiarly British process of securing a prima facie a legal title over property or territory but in circumstances which raise awkward questions, if not also the possibility of a legal challenge to the provenance of the title." So the British have this wonderful presence here on the island through the Sovereign Base Areas and the Treaty of Establishment which I would argue is "elginistic" in its characterization. But perhaps the Republic ought to think seriously about how to deal with the British presence in the future. perhaps it should be restructured under a new treaty with different arrangements, bilateral rather than quadrilateral, and British bases are folded into the new security apparatus which protects the interests of the people here more than the interests, or as much as the interests, if not more, than the interests of the outsiders. And much more broadly the Republic ought to consider what it is doing in the global security architecture. Should it further engage with the West? Should it apply to the security structures which now exist? Is it going to fulfill its destiny in the Western direction by joining any of those organizations? And I would argue these questions ought to be resolved now, before there's any settlement, not after the settlement has been reached. Because if a settlement is reached and you have disagreements on something as fundamental as this, you can have deadlock. And nothing is going to happen and the system and the state will (inaudible).

I think my time is up ladies and gentlemen. But I hope I fulfilled the mission that was given to me by Ray and I have been provocative. And I noticed I hadn't been arrested yet which suggests that this place is still a liberal democracy.

* * *