



NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY

**INSTITUTE OF APPLIED
AND SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY ON CYPRUS
1960-1974**

İlksoy Aslım

Master Thesis

Department of International Relations

Nicosia - 2001



İlksoy Aslım: American Foreign Policy on Cyprus: 1960 – 1974

**Approval of Director of the Institute of
Applied and Social Sciences**

Prof. Dr. Fakhraddin Mamedov

**We certify that this thesis is satisfactory for the award of the
degree of Master of Arts in International Relations**

Examining Committee in Charge:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jouni Suistola, Chairman of Committee, Head of the
International Relations Department, NEU

Asst. Prof. Dr. Zeliha Khasman, International Relations Department, NEU

Asst. Prof. Dr. Erdal Güryay, Vice President of the Graduate School of
Applied and Social Sciences. Coordinator of
Faculty Master Programs, NEU

PREFACE

The trigger for my thesis, American Foreign Policy on Cyprus, was the course of "the Cold War" that I got from Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jouni Suistola. It was an attractive, wonderful course that I learned very much. Furthermore, after getting a chance to participate a program in Washington DC., I felt the need for a historical and analytical study on American foreign policy.

My investigation involved research through the books on American, Great Britain, Greek and Turkish foreign policy and the books tell the history of the events in Cyprus.

Reaching through the books, I had many difficulties, but there were many people to mention, who have helped me to reach the resources. I would like to offer my thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenol Bektaş, Asst. Prof. Dr. Zeliha Khashman and Asst. Prof. Dr. Hasan Kasapoğlu who were very helpful to me. I wish to express my deep appreciation to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jouni Suistola for his constructive and thoughtful comments which helped to improve both the substance and the form of this study.

Words are inadequate to thank my wife, who gave full support and assistance towards the moment when this study could become a reality.

Mine is the sole responsibility for the interpretations and the errors.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	Page II
CONTENTS	III
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. THE AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE TOWARDS THE 1960 SYSTEM OF CYPRUS	13
3. THE BREAKDOWN OF THE 1960 SYSTEM	15
3.1. The American Attitude Towards the 1963 Crisis	17
3.2. The NATO Peace Plan	19
3.3. US Versus USSR on Cyprus Politics in 1964	23
3.4. American Acceptance of the UN Force to Cyprus	24
3.5. US Mediation in Cyprus Conflict and Johnson's Letter to İnönü	27
3.6. USA's Acheson Plan	29
4. THE 1964-1967 PERIOD	33
4.1. An International Community Concern On Cyprus: Plaza's Report	33
4.2. Soviet-Turkish Rapprochement: A Clash of US Policy?	34
4.3. US Relations with Cyprus during 1964-1967	35
5. THE 1967-1974 PERIOD	37
5.1. Junta in Greece: A Major Opportunity for USA on Cyprus Settlement	37
5.2. The 1967 Events in Cyprus	39
5.3. The Intercommunal Talks and US Attitude	42
5.4. The Greek Junta's Coup: An American Action?	46
6. TURKISH MILITARY INTERVENTION IN 1974	51
6.1. The Impacts of the Turkish Intervention in Cyprus and USA's respond.	56
7. CONCLUSION	64
8. APENDIX	71
9. REFERENCES	75

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an attempt to understand the American foreign policy in general, in Middle East and especially in Cyprus between 1960-1974.

It is clear that the American foreign policy in the Middle East and in Cyprus was a reflection of the American global foreign policy. The global and regional strategies of the United State have great implications in Cyprus. The USA did not have separate Cyprus policy. She acted in Cyprus Question because of greater issues.

After the Second World War the Soviet Union and the United States emerged as two superpowers in the world arena. Claiming that the Soviet Union was running expansionalist policy, the United States aimed to contain the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe, in the Middle East, in Asia and elsewhere.

After the Second World War the replacement of Great Britain by United States in Middle East showed that the USA was heading towards to be the leading power of the world. During the Cold War, "containment" referred to a specific American policy of containing the Soviet Union so as to promote a liberal economic and political world order elsewhere. Between 1945-1947 Great Britain, contributed significantly to contain the Soviet Union, but in February 1947 the note from Britain to United States revealed the weakness of the Great Britain. The note was announcing the British intention to end their responsibility for the defense of Greece and Turkey "come what may". Through the replacement of Great Britain by the USA in the Middle East, both Greece and Turkey came under the American influence. Receiving American assistance, Turkey and Greece became part of the American Security Strategy in containing the Soviet Union. They were treated as a part of the so-called Northern Tier zone which covered the area from the Balkans to the Central Asia confronting the Soviet Union.

The intercommunal problems and national ties of Greece and Turkey with Cyprus began to weaken the NATO's southeastern flank in the Cold War period. This was a handicap for the American foreign policy and she had to balance the interests of both Greece and Turkey. From this perspective the best solution at the time, at least for the USA and NATO, was the formation of the Republic of Cyprus in 1960. After the

intercommunal crises of 1963-64 the United States aimed at preserving its position in the Eastern Mediterranean and at keeping Greece and Turkey in the security system.

The competition between the Soviet Union and the United States and between the distinctive economic systems - communism and capitalism - coloured international relations.

Although the Soviet Union was the other superpower, the US was the leader of the world during the period of 1960-74. The period of 1960-1974 was a critical period of the Cold War. The peak of the Cold War was between 1960-1970 as reflected in the international politics of that period.

As the most influential superpower and having great strategical interests in the Middle East, the United States policy has greatly influenced Cyprus. Between 1960-74 USA did not specifically try to involve directly with the Cyprus problem. Instead she effectively influenced Great Britain, Turkey and Greece. The clash of Greece and Turkey in Cyprus after 1963, resulted in the division of Cyprus into two parts in 1974. The two communities in Cyprus, Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot have their motherlands, Turkey and Greece respectively. The motherlands also have special relations with the United States of America. In this context, in this thesis I will analyze the American foreign policy towards Cyprus vis à vis western strategic interests.

The American foreign policy can be outlined in three major paradigms. These are liberal, Marxist and realist paradigms. The liberal paradigm claims that the United States with her democratic institutions enhances peaceful international relations and, thus, she is a moral actor in world affairs. For liberals the United States fights only when it is first attacked. The liberal paradigm also claims that USA protected the freedom and self-determination of the nations in the World Wars and in the Cold War because of the American values: well-being, freedom and happiness of mankind.⁽¹⁾ Marxist paradigm argues that the dynamism of American economy requires expansion and that the aim of the United States is to make the world safe, not for democracy, but for capitalism. For example, the Marshall Plan was simply a way to expand the

⁽¹⁾ Krieger, J. (1993), p.23. Spainer J. (1988), p.l.

American economy and penetrate the European markets. Americans always favored an open door policy in the international economy because it was mainly for their benefit.⁽²⁾ A third paradigm claims that the United States is an ordinary country, pursuing self-interest and power politics as every great power has done. This paradigm calls relatively little attention on political democracy or capitalist economies as the driving forces in international relations, rather it sees the anarchic character of world politics as dictating the basic behavior of any international actor: all such actors are bound to behave the same fashion.⁽³⁾ The behavior of the international actors is more defined by the anarchic character of world system.

In 1823, President James Monroe declared in his message to Congress that the United States would remain aloof from European quarrels because its democratic and social system differed from the autocracies, which conducted a "democratic" foreign policy.⁽⁴⁾ The aim of the Monroe Doctrine was that USA would not involve herself with European politics and in response European States would not interfere with the American continent, i.e. American sphere of influence.

While Europeans spoke of bringing the benefit of civilization to benighted races of the world, Americans, on the other hand, often implied they differed from the Europeans in having the best interests of the world at heart. Americans proclaimed that the United States had entered the race to prevent the "bad" Europeans from conquering the world. Instead, the United States, richer and more republican than everyone else, could do more to mediate disputes among countries than any other imperial state.⁽⁵⁾

During most of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, the United States was able to preserve its historical isolation because Britain maintained the balance of power on the European continent. Germany's unification in 1870 and its rapid industrialization forced the United States to end its isolation. The impact of Germany's growing strength was the decline of the relative British power. The

⁽²⁾ Nye, J.Jr. (1997), p.101.

⁽³⁾ Krieger, J. (1993), p.23.

⁽⁴⁾ Schulzinger, R.D., (1998), p.3; Spainer (1988), p. 4-5.

⁽⁵⁾ Schulzinger R.D., (1998), p.4.

early years of World War I showed clearly that even with British power thrown in on the side of France and Russia, the three allies could barely contain Germany. After its victory in World War I the United States retreated into its customary isolationism. It began to play a political role again only when the balance of European power was upset once more by the eruption of World War II in 1939 and by the unexpected defeat of France in 1940. The United States faced the possibility of Britain's defeat and the control of Eurasia by Germany, Italy and Japan, all antidemocratic states. The United States began to involve world politics because she could not survive as an island in a totalitarian sea. The principles of the global political leadership were defined before the end of the World War II. After the Pearl Harbor, the USA ceased her isolationist policy. By the end of the Second World War, State Department and Council on Foreign Relations drove the general lines of the American foreign policy. In that perspective the USA had foreseen a 'Grand Area' ⁽⁶⁾ for its investors and exporters. This needed the collapse of colonialism and the political rationalization the self-determination policy.

World War II was the most lethal and destructive war in human history. In Europe it began with Nazi Germany's attack on Poland in September 1939, and ended in Asia with the defeat of Japan in September, 1945. The nuclear bomb was important in finishing the war and shaping the postwar world. ⁽⁷⁾

During the war a huge part of Europe had fell into the hands of the Soviet Union, creating a bloc of pro-Soviet regimes, which extended from the Baltic to Balkans. As Churchill had warned, an iron curtain had felt across Europe. For Great Britain, the Soviet expansionist aims had no limit. Wherever the opportunity arose she would

⁽⁶⁾ According to Bostanoglu, the concept of Grand Area is a project of Council on Foreign Relation. For CFR defeating of the Germany and her allies was not enough for the USA which needed an integrated liberal economic area to survive. For the integration the old colonialism and Great Britain must be dissolved. The Council supported liberal trade in the Grand Area, an open door policy for American investments and internationalization of the concepts of New Deal. (Stephen Gill (1990) p.126)

⁽⁷⁾ Williams, W.C.Mc & Piotrowski, H. (1993) p.11.

Historians are... in disagreement over the impact of the atomic bomb on the Cold War. Did the Truman administration actually attempt to employ nuclear diplomacy after the war? If it did, it is safe to say that it did not work. The nuclear threat, implicit in the exclusive Anglo-U.S. possession of the atomic bomb, did not seem to produce any significant change in Soviet behavior and policies anywhere. But it did, no doubt, affect attitudes on both sides that contributed to Cold War mistrust. Possession of the bomb caused its leaders to be more demanding and less flexible in dealing with the issues. (Mc Williams, Wayne C. & Piotrowski, Harry, (1993) p.21.

expand her power. The British also feared that the Soviets would next try to sweep through southern Europe and to shrink British influence. Although the USA was against the division of the spheres of interest (until 1946), Stalin and Churchill had a summit in Moscow to decide the percentage of influences through the eastern Europe and Balkan states. This was a dimension of the British containment of Soviet Union; i.e. to limit the Soviet sphere of interest and keep it there. The question of the legal government of Poland was another clash with the Great Britain and the Soviet Union. Although there was a government in exile in London when Soviet Union invaded Poland she formed another government in Lublin. Because of this kind of problems Great Britain became more suspicious of the aims of the Soviet Union and tried to contain it between 1944-1946.

In 1946, George Kennan⁽⁸⁾ tried to warn the United States about Stalin's true nature and intentions and Churchill delivered a famous speech in Fulton, Missouri, warning that an "iron curtain" had felt across Europe.

Since the 19th century the British had been influential in the Eastern Mediterranean, the Middle East and Central Asia confronting Russia. After the Second World War, several developments took place. First, the Soviet Union started to put pressure on Turkey, its neighbor in the south, and the Greek communist supported by the Soviet Union seemed to win the civil war in Greece. Moreover, the Soviets refused to remove their troops from northern Iran in March 1946. Once again, the Soviets did not keep their promises and the West believed that they were expanding.

⁽⁸⁾ During the Cold War years (1947-1950), Kennan was a prominent policymaker in Washington. In this period he wrote the so-called "X Article", which was published (July 1947) in the Foreign Affairs. In this article Kennan elaborated upon themes from the Long Telegram, and advocated measures to check and neutralize Soviet international ambitions: the containment policy. Kennan was an American Specialist on the Soviet Union. He was stationed in Moscow during much of the 1930s and between 1944 and 1946. While serving as the embassy's chargé d'affaires in 1946, Kennan composed the "Long Telegram", a seminal Cold War document that helped to alert President Harry S. Truman's administration to ideological and security problems posed by the Soviet Union. Krieger, J. (1993) p.500.

The Cold War, which is sometimes called the Long Truce, was a period of intense hostility without an actual major war. Fighting occurred, but it was in the periphery and not directly between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Cold War offers a unique perspective on international relations. Especially it illuminates the dynamics of containment and its practical choices. During the Cold War the nuclear deterrence was the main instrument in keeping the balance. It also forced the superpowers to set the rules of behavior. The concept of deterrence was linked to the policy of containment. During the Cold War, containment was the core of the American policy in dealing with the Soviet Union. The aim of the policy was to promote the liberal economic and political world order.⁽⁹⁾

Britain, weakened by World War II, felt it could no longer provide security in the Eastern Mediterranean and elsewhere. The United States had to decide whether to let a vacuum to develop or to replace British power by providing assistance to Greece and Turkey. After the Second World War the Near East, due its oil resources, became an important investment region for the USA. To secure US influence in the area was a vital American strategic goal. In this context the geopolitical importance of Greece and Turkey increased. The geographical location of both countries enabled the US to control the Eastern Mediterranean. Both countries could offer military bases for the US military operations in the region.

President Truman, in his speech in Congress on March 1947 asked the Congress to support the assistance program to Greece and Turkey. The speech gave birth to the famous Truman Doctrine where Greece and Turkey were seen as a bulwark against the Soviet Union. When Truman explained the policy change, he did not talk about the need to maintain a balance of power in the Eastern Mediterranean by supporting Greece and Turkey. Instead, he talked about the need to protect free people everywhere.⁽¹⁰⁾

After the Second World War the Western European countries could not sustain economic recovery. In June 1947, Secretary of State George Marshall announced a plan

⁽⁹⁾ Nye, J.Jr. (1999) p.99.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Nye, J.Jr. (1999), p.107

for aid to Europe. Marshall's speech contained an offer of US funds for cooperative European recovery program (ERP). Originally Marshall invited the Soviet Union and the Eastern Europe to join the program. Because of the Soviet pressure the countries of Eastern Europe could not participate the program.⁽¹¹⁾ Stalin saw the Marshall plan as an attack against his security barriers in Eastern Europe.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was found in 1949 and the same year the Soviet Union exploded an atomic bomb, much sooner than the Americans thought they could and the Chinese Communist Party took control in China. The tension increased. One of the most important American documents of the early Cold War was the National Security Council Document 68 (Nsc-68) which forecasted a Soviet attack as a part of a plan for global domination, and called for a vast increase in the U.S defense expenditure.⁽¹²⁾ In this context NATO became an essential part of a new European security order that aimed to contain the Soviet Union. NATO's military strategy in 1950's and 1960's was heavily reliant on the threat of massive nuclear retaliation as response to the possible aggression of (conventional or nuclear threat) by the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies.

In 1952, Dwight Eisenhower was elected President on a campaign pledge to end the Korean War and to roll back communism. Until 1952, the US strategy in the Middle East had to some length, rested on the assumption that the security of the area was primarily a British responsibility. This view was no longer valid by July 1953 when the Secretary of State Dulles had a tour in the region. It was realized that British influence had vaned and the policies of Britain and France in the region were damaging US interests. "From the military point of view, two years of efforts for a regional defense structure hinged on a strong British presence in Egypt had come to nought. From then on, while maintaining Anglo-American co-operation to the greatest extent practicable, the United States should be prepared to act either with local powers, Turkey in particular, or on its own. The "Northern Tier" – comprising Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Pakistan – had grasped Dulles' imagination as the best defense arrangement against

⁽¹¹⁾ Sander, O. (1993), p. 100.

⁽¹²⁾ Gaddis, J.L. (1982), p.p. 89-126

Soviet expansionism".⁽¹³⁾ Consequently, Britain, Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Pakistan formed Bagdad Pact in this context in 1955.

By the end of 1957 Eisenhower stated that the US would fill the vacuum in the Near East. The Eisenhower doctrine emerged. It gave full authority to the American President to use military power, to protect the territorial integrity and independence of those countries, which were under the threat of communism.⁽¹⁴⁾

Britain and France generally supported the plan. Communist China and the Soviet Union condemned it as a "substitution for British and French imperialism". The Moslem countries were divided: Syria was hostile, Iraq and Saudi Arabia were cautiously critical, while Turkey, Pakistan, Lebanon and Iran saw the doctrine as the best possible guarantee of peace.⁽¹⁵⁾

By 1960 the confrontation of two superpowers and the containment actions of the USA against the Soviet Union reached the peak. In the disintegration process of the British Empire a new independent state, Republic of Cyprus was established. Until then the policy of the United States in Cyprus had been to maintain it in the United States' sphere of influence.

Continued negotiations between the parties concerned in the Cyprus dispute finally produced an agreement in 1959 on the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus. A series of accords, announced in Zurich on February 11th by the Greek and Turkish foreign ministers Evangelos Averoff-Tossizza and Fatin Rüstü Zorlu, was signed in London on February 19th by the prime ministers of Turkey and Greece and by representatives of Britain and the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities.

⁽¹³⁾ Stefanidis, I.D. (1999), p. 184.

⁽¹⁴⁾ "The existing vacuum in the Middle East" I told the leaders, "must be filled by the United States before it is filled by Russia". Time was the essence: I believed the first session of the 85th Congress, as its first order of business, should authorize a special economic fund and the use of military force if necessary in the Middle East". – Eisenhower, D.D. (1965). pp.177-178

⁽¹⁵⁾ Eisenhower, D.D. (1965), p. 181

In addition to the establishment of the republic, the pacts provided a Treaty of Guarantee, under which Great Britain, Greece and Turkey guaranteed the independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus, and a Treaty of Alliance between Greece, Turkey and Cyprus, which provided a system of defense against any aggression directed against the island republic.⁽¹⁶⁾

Cyprus was declared a republic in August 16th, 1960, under the presidency of Archbishop Makarios the leader of the Greek community and the vice presidency of Dr. Fazıl Küçük, leader of the Turkish Cypriot community.

According to Joseph "the greatest irony, however, was that neither of the Cypriots communities nor their respective motherlands were asking for an independent Cypriot state... Greece and the Greek Cypriots were asking for enosis, while Turkey and Turkish Cypriots stood for partition. It was the dynamics of Greek - Turkish antagonism, i.e. external intervention, which shaped the settlement. The fettered independence granted to the island reflected a compromise aimed at neutralizing the conflicting ethnopolitical goals of enosis and partition. The two mainlands, in an effort to neutralize their mutual suspicion and rivalry at least on paper, put their ethnic-based territorial claims on Cyprus. Moreover, the new republic undertook to maintain its independence and territorial integrity and not to seek enosis or partition under any circumstances".⁽¹⁷⁾

For Reddaway bi-communalism was certainly a dominant feature of the settlement and undoubtedly this was bound to give rise to difficulties and complication in sharing of power between two communities.⁽¹⁸⁾

The constitution provided for a 'Presidential' system of government, but in fact it calls for the President and Vice-President sharing the executive powers almost on an equal basis. The Council of Ministers was to be appointed jointly by the President and Vice-President and made up of seven Greek and three Turkish Ministers. Decisions of

⁽¹⁶⁾ Tamkoç, M. (1988) p.65

⁽¹⁷⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997), p.38

⁽¹⁸⁾ Reddaway, J., (1986), p.129

the Council of Ministers had to be made by majority vote, but subject to the joint or individual veto of the President and Vice-President.⁽¹⁹⁾

The National Cypriot army was to consist of 2,000 men, 60 percent Greek Cypriots, and 40 percent Turkish Cypriots, and 70:30 ratio was to be applied in all state departments.

The Cyprus settlement seemed to have satisfied both Turkey and Greece and their allies, the UK and the American President Eisenhower endorsed the Agreements as a victory for common sense, and imaginative and courageous act of statesmanship and a splendid achievement.⁽²⁰⁾ The Greek Cypriots, too, seemed satisfied. At the conclusion of the negotiations, Archbishop Makarios made the following statement: "Sending cordial good wishes to all the Greeks and Turks of Cyprus, I greet with joy the agreement reached, and proclaim with confidence that this day will be the beginning of a new period of progress and prosperity for our country".⁽²¹⁾ The Turkish Cypriots, on the other hand regarded the Zurich compromise as an end in itself.⁽²²⁾

The method pursued in this thesis is historical –analytical. The hypothesis is that USA is *primus inter pares* in the international relations since the end of the Second World War. Secondly, that the position of Cyprus question in the American foreign policy should be seen in the framework of the American Global policy in general and the Middle eastern policy in particular; i.e. the United States did not have any special Cyprus policy but her policy here was just a function of wider considerations. Thirdly, also as a part of wider considerations, the second main consideration of the US was to prevent any conflict between the NATO partners, Turkey and Greece, on Cyprus or any other issue.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Tamkoç, M., (1988) p.62

⁽²⁰⁾ Reddaway, J., (1986) p.124, Sonyel S.R., (1977) p.11

⁽²¹⁾ Sonyel, S.R., (1997), p.11 "Makarios, on 16 August 1960, the very day the republic was inaugurated, declared: Independence was not the aim and purpose of the EOKA struggle. Foreign factors have prevented the achievement of the national goal but this should not be a cause for sorrow. New bastions have been conquered and from these bastions the Greek Cypriots will march on to complete the final victory." (See also Stavrinides (1999) p.37

The strategical interests of the USA can be mentioned here. The global conduct of the USA was to contain the Soviet Union and all her policy during the Cold War was based on this understanding. The reflections of this global policy could be seen in the Middle East. The USA sought to find new allies in the region to confront the Soviet Union. Stability of the Middle East was important for the USA. This was also an important issue because of the oil interest of the USA. From 1938 to 1963 oil production in the Middle East increased dramatically. The oil production increased from 6 million tons to 163 million tons and especially Europe relied heavily on Middle East. Also the American oil companies had major interests of the Middle East oil. The security of the American allies in the region was important and the USA foreign policy was designed accordingly.

American influence was not like the influence of the Great Britain. It was based on the voluntary acceptance of the allied or partner states, which assessed the situation also advantageous for themselves. Turkey and Greece, although moving to more independent policy after 1960 were not shifting out of the American sphere of influence, it was rather a shift from loyalty to autonomy which could be acceptable also for the United States. In short, all actors in the region acted inside the lines that United States had driven.

The main sources/books used in the preparation of this study are Michael Attalides', "Cyprus Nationalism and International Politics"; Halil Ibrahim Salih's "Cyprus, The Impact of Diverse Nationalism on a State"; Joseph S. Joseph's, "Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics. From Independence to the Threshold of the European Union"; Robert D. Schulzinger's, "US Diplomacy since 1900 and Nasuh Uslu's, *Türk Amerikan İlişkilerinde Kıbrıs*". All these books gave me some hints in understanding the "realities and truths". One has to be careful on evaluating the Turkish and Greeks claims about the American attitudes can be evaluate in this context.

Attalides and Joseph's books can be considered as being pro-Greek Cypriot whereas Salih and Uslu's studies as pro-Turkish Cypriot. Their books do not specially focus on

⁽²²⁾ Sonyel, S.R., (1997), p.12

the American foreign policy in general and its reflections on Cyprus but have many dimensions such as nationalism, ethnic conflict and Turkey and European Union. In my study I would try to give a picture of global American foreign policy and its influence on Cyprus during the period of 1960-1974.

THE AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE TOWARDS THE 1960 SYSTEM OF CYPRUS

Immediately after the independence of Cyprus the American foreign policy on Cyprus was based on four goals which reflected American national interest in the Eastern Mediterranean. Firstly, the Republic of Cyprus should develop political stability and join together with Great Britain, Greece, and Turkey to form a solid bulwark against communism. Secondly, Cyprus should stress economic development, free democratic institutions, and a pro-Western orientation. Thirdly, the U.S. should enjoy use of the existing communication and surveillance facilities on the island. Fourthly, the British Sovereign Base Areas should remain inviolated and available to any Western nation for any purpose. ⁽¹⁾ All the goals are actually parts of the same big strategy against the Soviet Union. We have to keep in mind that this was the toughest period of the Cold War, for example, the Berlin Wall was build in 1961.

During 1950's the USA pursued a passive foreign policy towards Cyprus. The British presence in Cyprus was enough for the USA in conducting the Western policies. From the American point of view, Cyprus had a great strategic importance and British presence there was a sufficient bulwark against the enemies in the region. ⁽²⁾ USA assessed the Cyprus dispute to be solved between Turkey and Greece in delicate balance. This was necessary because of the Cold War competition. The role of the USA has been mainly to support a solution of the Cyprus issue between her NATO allies. Consequently, it would not have been a positive step to internationalize the Cyprus dispute, because it might have been "sponsored by Moscow and international communism, which stood to benefit from the airing of inter-allied differences at the UN" ⁽³⁾ For this reason the London-Zurich agreements pleased the Americans. The USA practically reached all the above-mentioned goals with these agreements. ⁽⁴⁾

⁽¹⁾ Adams, T.W. and Cottrell, A.J., (1968), p.56

⁽²⁾ Uslu, N. (2000), p.35

⁽³⁾ Stefanidis, I.D., (1999), p.179

⁽⁴⁾ Uslu, N. (2000), p.35

As mentioned above President Eisenhower endorsed the Agreements as a victory. Americans, to run their policies on Cyprus, always stressed their goodwill and gave economic assistance to Cyprus. In 1962, Vice-President Johnson visited Cyprus to reaffirm the U.S. friendship. He urged a speed-up in Cyprus's economic development and expressed the American concern over the growing communist influence in the island. Johnson warned the Cypriot leaders to take into account the threat presented by a strong indigenous communist movement and urged them to act to deter its further growth.⁽⁵⁾

The visit of Mr. Johnson underlines the main concerns of the American foreign policy in the region and in Cyprus. The exceptionally strong support of the communist party in Cyprus was naturally a worrying fact for the USA. The Americans certainly saw it as a part of the Soviet popular front strategy where as the first step the government was formed around the communist party and as the second step the other parties were closed down. The strategy had been successful in the Eastern Europe but failed in the Western European countries like France or Italy.

The vision of the possible communist take-over in Cyprus was also connected to another threat: the starting Soviet orientation of President Makarios. When Makarios visited Washington in May 1962, Kennedy pressed Makarios to form his own political party to provide some effective political opposition to the communists.⁽⁶⁾

Publicly, the best the USA could do in Cyprus in 1960-1963 was to support the economic growth and give some aid to further the western leaning of the government and to oppose at the same time both communism and the eastern leaning.

⁽⁵⁾ Adams, T.W.; Cottrell, A.J. (1968), pp.59-60

⁽⁶⁾ O'Malley, B.; Craig, I. (1999), p.88

THE BREAKDOWN OF THE 1960 SYSTEM

It is generally accepted that the Greek Cypriots and President Makarios bear the responsibility of the breakdown of the 1960 system. The Akritas Plan was drawn up by the Greek Cypriot leadership in cooperation with Greek Army officers in 1963. It was classified by the authors as top secret and was first published in the Greek Cypriot newspaper *Patris* on 21st April 1966.

The plan was in fact a conspiracy to dissolve the Republic of Cyprus. It had three objectives: to get rid of the 1960 Treaties and to re-open the way to Cypriot Greek self-determination and eventual Enosis; to create the impression that the Constitution was unworkable and as a result to amend it on this pretext in order to eliminate the powers it conferred on the Cypriot Turks and to reduce them to the status of a politically impotent minority; and to suppress "immediately and forcefully" any Turkish reaction and create a *fait accompli* before any external intervention; if widespread clashes occurred, the suppression of the Turkish Cypriots would be completed at once and would be accompanied by an immediate declaration of enosis.⁽¹⁾

For Reddaway, the breakdown of the 1960 constitution has been attributed to three causes: firstly, that the constitution itself was inherently unworkable; secondly, that even if it was theoretically workable, it could not be made to work because it depended on a degree of goodwill of the leaders of both communities and because in the event, that necessary goodwill was lacking; and thirdly, that it was deliberately wrecked either by the Greek Cypriots in the continuing pursuit of Enosis or by the Turkish Cypriots in the continuing pursuit of partition, or by both. These causes do not exclude each other; several causes could have contributed to the breakdown.⁽²⁾ Crawshaw explains this situation as: "The Greek Cypriots pursued discriminatory policy towards the Turkish Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots asked extreme constitutional rights".⁽³⁾

President Makarios, on November 30, 1963, submitted thirteen proposals to amend the constitution. These amendments were: the final veto of President and Vice – President were to be abolished. The Greek President and Turkish Vice – President of the

⁽¹⁾ Reddaway, J. (1986), pp. 133-134

⁽²⁾ Reddaway, J., (1986), p. 64

⁽³⁾ According to Uslu; Crashaw, N. (1978), p.365

House of Representatives were to be elected by the House as a whole not separately. The Constitutional provisions regarding separate majorities were to be abolished. Unified municipalities were to be formed. The numerical representation of the two communities in the public service and in the army was to reflect the ratio of Greek and Turkish population. The number of members in the Public Services Commission was to be reduced and they would render decision by a simply majority vote. The Greek Communal Chamber was to be abolished, but if the Turkish community desired to retain the Turkish Communal Chamber, such a course was a possibility.⁽⁴⁾

As expected by the Greek leadership, these proposals were rejected by the Turkish Cypriot community and by the Turkish Government.

Joseph evaluates the rejection of the Turkish Government of the proposals as the major external interference in the politics of the young Cyprus republic. To quote: "It is worth mentioning that the proposed amendments were referring to provision of a domestic nature and did not affect the international status of the republic or the rights of the guarantor powers".⁽⁵⁾

Greek and Turkish Cypriots engaged in armed clashes throughout The island in the period of December 21 – 26, 1963. Acting British High Commissioner Dennis Cleary issued an appeal to the Greek and Turkish communities to remain calm at a meeting with Makarios on December 22. The British officials expressed "the grave concern of Her Majesty's government" as the fighting continued. In a message sent to Makarios on December 22, the Greek Government urged the President to end the communal strife.⁽⁶⁾ As the casualties began to mount, Turkey warned Makarios that, unless a cease-fire was implemented immediately, she would take action on behalf of the Turkish Cypriots.

Britain called on Greece and Turkey on December 23rd, to join herself in an appeal to Makarios to end the fighting. On December 25th, the Greek, Turkish and British troops, stationed in Cyprus, in accordance with international agreement, tried to restore

⁽⁴⁾ Kyriakides, S., (1968), p.107

⁽⁵⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997), p.43

⁽⁶⁾ Kosut, H., (1970) p.73

order.⁽⁷⁾ During the attempts to restore order in Cyprus, the parties had already begun to get prepared for a long struggle.⁽⁸⁾

The establishment of the ethnic-based alliances between the Cypriots and their respective motherlands was manifested not only on the military front, but also on the diplomatic and political fields. While the two mainlands were smuggling troops, arms and supplies into Cyprus, their diplomatic services were fully mobilized to gain international support for their respective local ethnic groups.⁽⁹⁾

Turkish and Greek troops, ignoring the cease-fire arrangement, moved out of their bases near Nicosia on December 25, to participate in the fighting.⁽¹⁰⁾ As Joseph wrote; "this was the first time in NATO's history that troops from two member states were fighting one another".⁽¹¹⁾ That, of course, was a vital challenge for the USA.

The American Attitude Towards the 1963 Crisis

In several points Cyprus foreign policy disturbed the United States. U.S global policy was to contain Soviet Union. Nevertheless, Cyprus instead of forming an anti-communist barrier with Greece and Turkey, gave political role to the local communists in Cyprus politics. After the independence, Cyprus government had signed a series of trade agreements with the Soviet Union, which did not please the State Department. The President of Cyprus attended the conference of the non-aligned nations in Belgrade in 1961. He also developed close relations not only with Tito but also with Nasser, who was not in favour of the protection of the British bases in Cyprus. Up to 1963 Makarios stated several times that he would react if the bases were to be used against the Arabs. Also in 1963, at the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization Executive Committee meeting in Nicosia, Makarios reaffirmed his intention to reject all military alliances, and this caused a wave of concern in the State Department.

⁽⁷⁾ Sonyel, S.R., (1997) p.57

⁽⁸⁾ Ehrlich, T., p.58

⁽⁹⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997) p.46

⁽¹⁰⁾ Kosut, H., (1970) p. 74

⁽¹¹⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997) p. 81

The major problem arised at the end of 1963. During the intercommunal fighting and threats of Turkish intervention the Cyprus Government rejected mediation or peace-keeping by NATO and appealed for assistance to Greece, the Soviet Union, Egypt and to the United Nations. As the area was seen as a part of the American sphere of influence it was presumable to expect more American attention to Cyprus politics.

Since the 1963 outbreak of the violence on the island, US policy aimed at to contain the problem inside Cyprus and to prevent it to become internationalized. In the legalistic US view, both communities should hold to the terms of the Zurich-London agreements in order to allow Greek and Turkish negotiators discuss the matter diplomatically. The United States wished to support the three guarantor powers and the leaders of the two ethnic communities in all efforts to establish a permanent political settlement in Cyprus, but she also tried to avoid an excessive national commitment in any solution attempt.⁽¹²⁾

President Johnson, in a telegram to President Makarios and Vice President Küçük in December 1963, indicated his displeasure over the fighting between the two communities. He wrote :“I will not presume to judge the root causes, or rights or wrongs as between Cypriots of two communities. This is in any case, inappropriate when innocent human lives are at stake. I hope that tomorrow will find all Cypriots living at peace with one another and with the three nations, which have special treaty responsibility for the security of Cyprus”.⁽¹³⁾

President Johnson's letter shows a clear effort to avoid the American involvement in Cyprus question as a party. As a result the letter takes no stand regarding the causes of the problem. Nevertheless, the humanitarian dimension of the conflict is a typical American approach. Finally, the letter considers the wider framework of the conflict, the Greco-Turkish relations and the British role as the third guarantor power. Here we see already the main ideas of the American Cyprus policy, to prevent the Greco-Turkish clash over Cyprus to harm NATO and to support the British positions in Cyprus.

⁽¹²⁾ Adams, T.W. & Cottrell, A.J., (1968)

⁽¹³⁾ Sonyel, S.R. (1997) p. 58 ; Salih, H.I. (1978) p. 35

In a letter to President Cemal Gürsel of Turkey dated December 26, 1963, President Johnson stated that the United States was ready to support any and all actions proposed by the three guarantor powers, which offer any reasonable hope for assisting in peaceful solution.⁽¹⁴⁾ Both letters also stressed the American indirect role in the Cyprus question—it was the role and responsibility of the guarantor states to deal with the issue. Because the same theme is repeated in both letters and it can be seen also as a slight pressure towards the guarantors.

Again, the USA tried to further a solution based on an accord between its NATO partners.

The NATO Peace Plan

The constitutional dispute remained unresolved in the beginning of 1964 and offered a high possibility of communal fighting. The clashes mounted in intensity, threatening Cyprus with full-scale warfare. Faced with this risk, international leaders increased efforts to put an end to the fighting. The first attempt was made jointly by Britain and the US. This meant that the USA was taking a more direct and active role in the Cyprus dispute. There were two reasons behind the policy change. Firstly, the crisis was getting more serious and secondly the obvious disability of the guarantors to find a solution.

Already in January 1964, following the emergency session of the NATO Council in Brussels, the NATO Commander in Europe, General Lyman Lemnitzer, rushed to Athens and Ankara to warn the two governments of the grave consequences which a Greek - Turkish war would have for the south-eastern flank of NATO and the security of the region. As we see the NATO dimension was again included in Lemnitzer's message which was natural for a NATO commander. Lemnitzer's mission obviously prevented a unilateral Turkish intervention and supported the promotion of a political settlement of the problem.⁽¹⁵⁾

⁽¹⁴⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978) p. 35

⁽¹⁵⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997) p. 82

Ever since the Cypriot civil war began in 1963, the United States has been interested in helping to maintain peace on Cyprus. Therefore, the British Government asked US Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, then in London, to convey to Washington a request to contribute troops to keep peace in Cyprus along with Great Britain, Turkey and Greece. At first (on January 25) United States was reluctant to get involved in the Cyprus dispute. The Under-Secretary of the State George Ball, the Secretary of Defense Robert Mc Namara and President Johnson shared the view. Cyprus problem was a serious problem, which might create troubles between to allies, Greece and Turkey. As a result, the first proposal of US to Great Britain was that USA would contribute in the formation of a NATO force in Cyprus. The American contribution would not be military but diplomatic and logistic.⁽¹⁶⁾ After a short time the USA had to change her view because the situation in Cyprus was turning worse. The core of the new view was that the USA assessed it necessary to get directly involved in Cyprus problem, because the situation was clearly getting more serious.

The main consequence of the new American attitude was that the British were finally and definitely replaced as the main outside arbitrator by the United States. As George Ball, the Under-Secretary of State and President Johnson's mediator put it: "The British wanted above all to divest themselves of responsibility for Cyprus." Henceforth, it was to be in Washington rather than in London where the major external decisions were taken.⁽¹⁷⁾ On January 29th 1964, the United States offered to provide troops for an international peace keeping force on two conditions: 1) The Cyprus Government must accept the offer; 2) the guaranteeing powers, Great Britain, Turkey and Greece must agree to abstain from any unilateral intervention for a period of three months. The second point was unacceptable to Turkey because the suspension of the Treaty of Guarantee of 1959 could have meant the abrogation of the treaty.⁽¹⁸⁾

The American diplomatic corps took the initiative in trying to find a solution, which would be acceptable to all parties concerned. The main provisions of the NATO (American) plan were the following: 1- the United States would contribute men to a special peace-keeping force collected from several NATO countries, 2- the duration of

⁽¹⁶⁾ Uslu, N., (2000) p. 63

⁽¹⁷⁾ Hitchens, C., (1984) p.56

⁽¹⁸⁾ Salih, H.I., (1968) p.112-113

mission of the force in Cyprus was to be three months, 3- the parties to the Cyprus dispute were to agree on the appointment of a mediator for a solution of the Cyprus problem.⁽¹⁹⁾ According to the plan, the peace-keeping force would have consisted only of NATO troops, in the core of which there was the American contingent. As we see the change in the American policy has increased the American role from the diplomatic and logistic services to military presence in Cyprus. This was an essential change of American policy. The US acting in this manner thought that it would prevent the Turkish intervention. Moreover, when Turkey accepted the NATO military presence during three months the dangerously increasing tension would decrease and the probable Greco-Turkish war would fail.

This proposal was accepted by Turkey but turned down by the Makarios regime. George W. Ball, the Undersecretary of State of the United States serving as President Johnson's personal envoy to help resolve the crisis, explains Makarios's rejection of the NATO Plan: "Makarios's central interest was to block the Turkish intervention so that he and his Greek Cypriots could go on happily massacring Turkish Cypriots".⁽²⁰⁾ But this was not a good explanation for the rejection because the presence of an American peace keeping force in Cyprus would have prevented the Turkish intervention. So, the reason of the rejection of Makarios was more to prevent the American troops to come to Cyprus.

Ankara deplored the negative attitude of President Makarios in respect to the American proposal for an international force to keep the peace in Cyprus. Besides, the Prime Minister of Turkey, Ismet İnönü, proposed the creation of a federal government in Cyprus.⁽²¹⁾ Andreas Papandreou the Prime Minister of Greece, opposed the idea of a federal state because it would have been an acceptance of the permanent partitioning of Cyprus. In February, 1964, in a speech to the Greek Cypriots, Papandreou said: "For the sake of democracy and peace in Cyprus, and to preserve our alliance with our neighbour

⁽¹⁹⁾ Joseph S.J., (1997) p. 83 ; Salih H.I., (1968) p. 113

⁽²⁰⁾ Tamkoç M., (1988), p. 74

⁽²¹⁾ "The Turkish proposition was for a federal system, with a central government having two geographically separate administrative areas, under which the Turkish Cypriots would hold 38 percent of the island. The dividing line would be from the village Yalia on the North-western coast through the center of Nicosia and Famagusta on the east coast." Salih H.I., (1968) p. 125

Turkey, it is imperative to revise these treaties in conformity with the principles of international justice.⁽²²⁾

On February 12th, 1964, Makarios stubbornly rejected all arguments and assurances that the NATO members' objective was to maintain the status quo of the Cyprus Republic. Despite all the pressure on Makarios, Ball's mission was a failure. The Cypriot President was unwilling to compromise or accept any settlement that indicated that NATO had overriding supranational interests above those of the Greek Cypriots. Makarios had a clear anti-American leaning. He was in a central position in the Non-alignment movement with the same attitude. He also showed sometimes sympathy towards communism and the Soviet Union. Although, both Greece and Turkey had accepted the American proposals, President Makarios rejected it. President Makarios demanded that the international peace-keeping operation should be under the supervision and control of the United Nations Security Council, since he feared that any NATO settlement would be in favour of the Turks.

According to Salih, Makarios was under the illusion that the United Nation involvement would enable him to unilaterally suspend the 1960 treaties permanently and prevent any settlement by the NATO members that would favour partitioning Cyprus.⁽²³⁾ As Suistola correctly concludes "the arrival of the UNFICYP to the island in 1964 happened in questionable circumstances. It meant that the peace-keeping forces to some length became a party in the conflict and a partner of Greek Cypriots: furthermore, the UN Resolution 186 in 1964 paved the way for the Greek Cypriot administration to become the internationally recognized government of the Republic of Cyprus."⁽²⁴⁾

⁽²²⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978) p. 34

⁽²³⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978) p. 33

⁽²⁴⁾ Suistola, J., (2001) p. 11

US Versus USSR On Cyprus Politics in 1964

Because the goal of the new American orientation was to establish an American military presence in Cyprus and to secure the American conduct of the Cyprus question it is understandable, that the Soviet response came soon. We have to keep in mind that in 1964 the Cold War was still in full gear and, as mentioned before the main aim of the foreign policy of the USA was to contain the Soviet Union. On January 30th, the Soviet News Press Agency TASS published an official Soviet statement condemning the London Conference on Cyprus, warning the West not to interfere in the internal affairs of the island and declaring that it was the responsibility of the UN Security Council to safeguard the independence of Cyprus.⁽²⁵⁾

Some days later, on February 7th, 1964, the Soviet Union warned that she would not tolerate intervention in Cyprus by the Western powers. The Soviet Union claimed that the proposals for the establishment of a joint peace-keeping force were motivated by a single aim: "...place this small neutral state under NATO's military control." The Soviet warning was delivered in parallel notes sent by the Soviet leader Nikita S. Khrushchev to President Johnson, President Makarios, British Prime Minister Arthur Douglas-Home, French President Charles de Gaulle, Greek Premier John Paraskevopoulos and Turkish Premier Ismet İnönü.⁽²⁶⁾

Nikita Khrushchev, in a note to the United Nations, wrote that "certain powers" are at present attempting to impose on the people and the Government of Cyprus a solution of their own interest. The purpose of all these alternative plans is basically the same; the de facto occupation by NATO armed forces of the Republic of Cyprus.⁽²⁷⁾ In the light at the American intentions, we can say that the Soviets got the point. The Soviet Union also declared that "if a foreign armed intervention takes place in Cyprus, the Soviet Union will help Cyprus to defend its freedom and independence... and is willing immediately to start negotiations on this matter".

⁽²⁵⁾ Adams, T.W. & Cottrell A.J., (1968) p.35

⁽²⁶⁾ Kosut, H., (1970) p. 87

⁽²⁷⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978) p. 38

American Acceptance of the UN Force to Cyprus

Following Makarios' rejection of NATO proposals for an international military force, Britain and Cyprus, on February 15, 1964, requested an emergency meeting of the UN Security Council to explore the matter further.⁽²⁸⁾ The Council opened a debate on February 18th and voted on March 4th to create a multi-nation UN force to keep peace in Cyprus. The US, which earlier on had opposed a Council session, changed her position as well.

Michael Moran in his book explains the changes of the American policy and the reasons for it. According to Moran returning the Cyprus issue to the UN did not please the British or the Americans and they tried to do everything they could to prevent it but they could not. The USA at first tried to control the problem under NATO umbrella at London Conference but Makarios rejected the American plan and applied to the United Nations Security Council.⁽²⁹⁾ The USA put to the UN Council a different resolution to block the Greek Cypriot attempt that would challenge the legitimacy of Makarios' totally Greek Cypriot government. But because of the Makarios' manoeuvres they could not push hard enough. The Greek Cypriots tried to find political supporters among the permanent and non-permanent members of the Security Council. Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia could not strongly support them in the U.N. because they were the suppliers of the arms to the Greek Cypriots. For Moran the Greeks got the major contribution from the UN Secretary General U Thant. He was impressed by the Greek case because of Makarios' respected position in the Non-aligned Movement" and he wrote an 'Aide Memoire on a New Approach on the Situation in Cyprus' just like a document that the Greek Cypriots had suggested he should produce.⁽³⁰⁾

Furthermore the Greek Lobby in the United States was very active. Perhaps above all the Americans and the British allowed U Thant's plan to go through because the 4th March resolution number 186 did not directly affect the Anglo-American interests. Although the UN force was not a NATO force it would include contingents from NATO countries but not from the Soviet Bloc.

⁽²⁸⁾ Attalides M., (1979) p. 141

⁽²⁹⁾ Moran, M., (1999) pp.30-31

⁽³⁰⁾ Moran, M. (1999) p.30

For the USA this was "the second best option". Although it was a compromise (which satisfied the Soviet views) it gave the USA almost all she wanted. The Turkish intervention would be prevented and the stability in Cyprus would become a reality, and there would be no war between Greece and Turkey.

The United Nation force became operational at the end of March 1964, and reached its planned level (about 7,000 men) in May.⁽³¹⁾ The Finnish ambassador to Sweden and the former premier of Finland, Sakari S. Tuomioja, was appointed by Secretary General U Thant on March 24th, 1964, as the United Nation mediator in Cyprus.

While international efforts were being pressed for a peaceful solution of the Cyprus question, fighting on the island increased in intensity during February-March 1964. Britain began to deploy new reinforcements to Cyprus as the increased fighting strained the ability of British security forces to maintain peace.⁽³²⁾

Violence spread to the South-west coast of the island on March 7th, with heavy fighting in Paphos. UN Secretary General U. Thant had warned Cyprus, Greece and Turkey on March 9th that continuation of the clashes can only lead to even more tragic, widespread and doubtful consequences.⁽³³⁾ Turkey called on March 19th for a halt of the new outbreak of fighting. Turkish Premier Ismet İnönü asserted on March 20th that large-scale preparations are made and large-scale fighting is imminent in those areas of Cyprus where none has occurred previously. İnönü warned that if heavy fighting resumed and the Turkish minority faced annihilation, such development would leave Turkey no choice but to intervene.⁽³⁴⁾

An accordance of goals and policies also existed between the Turkish government and the Turkish Cypriot leadership. Those goals and policies could be summarized as follows:

1. A solution of the Cyprus problem should be based on the partitioning of the island,

⁽³¹⁾ Ehrlich, T., (1974) p.61

⁽³²⁾ Kosut, H., (1970) p.99

⁽³³⁾ Kosut, H., (1970) p.98

⁽³⁴⁾ Kosut, H., (1970) p.99

2. The 1960 Treaty of Guarantee should continue to be valid
3. The Makarios government is unlawful and should be treated as such. ⁽³⁵⁾

Turkey also started to put pressure the Greeks living in Turkey, mainly in Istanbul, in retaliation.

After the eruption of violence and the internationalization of the problem through the UN and other international conferences, the Greek government and President Makarios officially dismissed enosis, which had been their explicit common goal until 1963, and adopted a policy of independence and non-alignment for Cyprus.

The main goals of the policy change were to gain the support of Third World and Eastern bloc countries at international fora, especially the UN; not to give an excuse to Turkey to invade Cyprus. The new official policy of Athens and Nicosia was outlined in widely publicized joint statements issued in Athens and Nicosia.

When the Turkish Air Force began its bombing operation to stop the Greek-Cypriot advances, Makarios appealed to Greece, the Soviet Union and Egypt for military help. Soviet leader Khrushchev expressed willingness to negotiate military assistance, but he also urged Makarios to use all efforts to prevent bloodshed.

More significantly, Greece did not send her air force to confront the Turkish jets. Andreas Papandreou described the position of his father's government of the time as follows: "Makarios demanded that we dispatch our Air Force to provide his cover. We did not, not because we did not wish to, but because it was technically impossible. Cyprus was far from the Greek air-bases, and our fighters would have had no more than two minutes flying time over Cyprus. We would therefore only have provoked Turkey into further action without offering substantive aid to the Cypriot ground forces." ⁽³⁶⁾

⁽³⁵⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997) p.48

⁽³⁶⁾ Papandreou, A., (1977), p.177

US Mediation in the Cyprus Conflict and the Johnson's Letter to Inonu

On May 4, 1964, US President Johnson sent Senator J. William Fulbright on a mission to convey the United States continuing concern over the Cyprus crisis. Senator Fulbright visited London, Athens and Ankara to inform these governments of the sense of urgency felt in the United States regarding the need for a restoration of order on the island: "A major reason for the Fulbright mission was to report President Johnson the impression of the Greek and Turkish governments concerning Cyprus. The White House emphasized that Senator Fulbright would not attempt any mediation effort or submit any suggestion on behalf of the United States for a political settlement."⁽³⁷⁾ Nevertheless, Senator Fulbright's mission was clearly to pressure the parties towards a peaceful settlement. In his visit Fulbright declared the American concern on the Cyprus problem and defined the American aim to prevent a clash between two NATO allies.

The likelihood of a wider war with Greece and possibility of Soviet intervention on the side of Greek Cypriots troubled İnönü. Furthermore in 1964 the Turkish Army did not possess landing crafts for an operation in Cyprus. But it was clear that "since the beginning of the December 1963 crisis Turkish leaders were under pressure from Turkish-Cypriots, opposition parties and public opinion to aid their compatriots on the island".⁽³⁸⁾ Finally on June 4th, 1964 İnönü informed the United States about his government's decision to intervene.

While final landing preparations were carried out and an intra-alliance war seemed imminent, the USA intervened to prevent a military clash that would blow up the south-eastern flank (of NATO). President Johnson, in a letter to Turkish Premier İnönü, which Ball has characterized as "the most brutal diplomatic note I have ever seen" called for restraint and warned of the grave consequences that a unilateral Turkish action on Cyprus would have. The American President urged Turkey to consult fully in advance with the USA before taking any action involving the use of military force.⁽³⁹⁾ In his letter Johnson stressed: "I must tell you in all candour that the United States cannot agree to the use of any United States supplied military equipment for a Turkish

⁽³⁷⁾ Adams, T.W. & Cottrel, A.J. (1968) p.63-64

⁽³⁸⁾ Bahçeli, T., (1990) p.63

⁽³⁹⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997), p.85

intervention in Cyprus under present circumstances".⁽⁴⁰⁾ But from Ankara's perspective, the most aggravating statement in Johnson's letter dealt with American (NATO) obligations to Turkey in case of Soviet intervention by a Turkish action in Cyprus. To quote President Johnson: "I hope you will understand that your NATO allies have not had a chance to consider whether they have an obligation to protect Turkey against the Soviet Union if Turkey takes a step which results in Soviet intervention without the full comment and understanding of its NATO allies".⁽⁴¹⁾

The letter was a shock to the Turkish Government. Until that day Turkey believed that her security issues could be solved under the umbrella for NATO and at the first time Ankara realized that it might not be so. The tone of the letter was very characteristic of President Johnson. He was an outspoken person and used often even brutal language. Nevertheless, the letter was a logical continuation of the American pressure explained before. What made it different was the extremely tough tone of the letter. Without any doubt the toughest part of it was the direct threat that NATO would not help Turkey if a war was going to break with the Soviet Union. The letter stressed the seriousness of the American concern regarding the situation in the Eastern Mediterranean. It clearly shows how serious the situation was from the American perspective. The USA assessed it necessary to have a recourse to such an extreme diplomatic act.

The Johnson letter was a turning point in US- Turkish relations. The US attempt to prevent Turkey from acting upon an issue considered vital to her national interests raised serious question about Turkey's pro-Western foreign policy. From then on there could be to expect Turkish moves to open up relations with Soviets and third world countries in order to increase room for manoeuvre for the country in international relations.⁽⁴²⁾

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978), p.145

⁽⁴¹⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978), p.145

⁽⁴²⁾ Alemdar, S., (1993), p.81

Simultaneously with the above development, according to O'Malley and Craig a plan was discussed between US and UK, which permitted Turkey a limited invasion to Cyprus. This was to get prepared for a situation where Turkey would have continued her invasion preparations. To allow Turkey to realize a limited operation would have saved the face of Turkey and would have still given an opportunity to control the situation without any further escalation. As O'Malley and Craig note: "Faced with dire solution of Turkish action, leading to a war with Greece that might easily spread, disastrously damaging America's strategic interests and weakening NATO, the Americans needed a fall-back plan in case their peace keeping force proposals failed. Before Ball left for London on 8th February, he consulted Johnson and Washington officials drew up an astonishing contingency plan to allow Turkey to invade Cyprus and occupy a large area of the north of the island and, if necessary, an additional enclave in the west to protect Turkish Cypriots. If the Turks ... decided to intervene, the Americans would first try to buy time, before the Turks entered Cypriot air space or territorial waters, for the British to send reinforcements. Controlling the crisis immediately became an emergency priority in the talks being held between Johnson and Douglas Home in Washington ... Douglas-Home told Johnson that the main worry was that a full Turkish invasion would be followed by the near certainty of Soviet intervention ... Consequently, Britain surprised the UN with an urgent plea for a meeting of the Security Council to consider a request for a peace keeping force." ⁽⁴³⁾

USA's Acheson Plan

After the "shock-therapy" of Johnson letter American diplomatic efforts continued. President Johnson, acting as a top-level mediator in the Cyprus dispute held separate meetings in Washington with the Turkish Prime Minister Ismet İnönü on June 22-23, 1964 and Greek Prime Minister George Papandreou on June 24-25. Johnson's mediation efforts aimed at bringing about direct Turkish-Greek negotiations over Cyprus to prevent a war between the two countries. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara kept the pressure on the Greeks by reminding Papandreou of possible Turkish attacks against Greece. McNamara said the powerful Turkish airforce would literally burn up the Greek countryside, and the United States would do nothing the

⁽⁴³⁾ O'Malley, B. & Craig, I., (1999), pp.94-100

stop it.⁽⁴⁴⁾ Relations between the United States and Greece⁽⁴⁵⁾ entered a sour phase, as indicated by Papandreou's reply to the American officials' implied threat: "In 1940 we were asked to surrender or face attack. The Greek nation said no to fascism then. We regret deeply that in 1964 we must also say no to democratic America, for the choice you offer us is no different that offered to Greece by Mussolini."⁽⁴⁶⁾

The United States, in order to initiate the bilateral talks, proposed to Secretary General U Thant in late June 1964 that the Greek and Turkish delegates would meet at Camp David under the chairmanship of Dean Acheson. U Thant suggested that Geneva would be more conducive location for the talks, under the chairmanship of Sakari Tuomioja.⁽⁴⁷⁾ Ankara agreed the bilateral talks, but Athens rejected the proposal.

President Johnson handed the Greek Ambassador the outline of the Acheson plan. The proposal was again rejected on the grounds that the Greek Parliament would not accept it. Johnson's reaction was clear indication that the President had run out of patience with Greeks: "Fuck your parliament and your constitution. America is an elephant, Cyprus is a flea. Greece is a flea. If these two fellows continue itching the elephant, they may just get whacked by the elephant's trunk, whacked good. If your Prime Minister gives about democracy, parliament and constitution, he, his parliament and his constitution may not last very long"⁽⁴⁸⁾

Papandreou's answer where he compared the USA with fascism and Mussolini was really tough. I think it was the only time when an allied state has used such a language about the USA. This kind of "discussion" is really unique between two allied and democratic states. Clearly, one reason was Johnson's personality but the most important reason was that the Greek rejection of the USA mediation. As the American effort was to find a solution on Cyprus crisis which would be beneficiary to NATO, Greek attitude

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Theophylactou, D.A., (1993), p.36

⁽⁴⁵⁾ After the Truman Doctrine the US aimed for complete control over the Greek state. According to the State Department statement the US Embassy had the following rights in Greece; a) All initiatives for creation of the Greek Cabinet. b) The initiative for the changes in the Greek military. C) The control of the size of the Greek army. D) The coordination of cooperation between Greek, Turkish and American officers. E) The control of Greek relations to the US and other countries. F) The control of Greek government's relations with Trade Unions and political parties. (Kizilyürek, N., (1994) p.55.)

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Papandreou, A., (1997), p.176

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978), p.47

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Hitchens, C., (1984), pp.61-62

was not helpful. Having no choice in the matter, Greece reluctantly agreed to participate in the talks and to send its representative to Geneva. The American government's interest was to find a solution to the dangerous situation that would be satisfactory to both of its allies. The continued confrontation between the two NATO members could seriously damage the United States interests in the eastern part of the Mediterranean.

The Turkish and Greek delegates accepted the proposals as the basis for negotiations, which resumed on July 20. In sum, Acheson's proposed plan was:

- 1) Cyprus to be given a choice between independence and enosis.
- 2) On the Carpas Peninsula a territory was to be given to Turkey over which it would have sovereignty and which would be regarded as an indivisible part of Turkey,
- 3) The Turkish Cypriots who continued to live in the areas that were to be governed by Greeks were to have right of "local self-administration".
- 4) A central Turkish Cypriot administration was to be established for the protection of the rights of the Turkish Cypriots in other parts of the island.
- 5) The Turkish Cypriots residing in the areas under the Greek administration were to be citizens of that government and were to enjoy the minority rights.
- 6) An international commissioner was to be appointed either by the United Nation or by the International Court of Justice to observe whether or not the Turkish Cypriots' communal and individual rights were respected
- 7) The Island of Meis would be given to Turkey ⁽⁴⁹⁾

In early August the Greek government refused to accept the "Acheson Plan". On August 20, Acheson submitted a new proposal hoping that it would be in the best national interest of two parties. The major change was; " Turkey was to have the right of maintaining for fifty years a military base on the Carpas Peninsula "but not to be given a sovereign territory. The renting of a base was strongly rejected by Turkey. So both parties rejected the proposals.

Joseph criticized the process as follows: "It is interesting to note that while Acheson was trying to advance his plan (August 1964), the Turkish air force, for the first time

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978), pp.47-48

and with (the American toleration), was vehemently bombarding Cyprus. The Turkish action was in harmony with the American objective of bringing Makarios to his knees and making him receptive and conciliatory to Western proposals... (but) following tactics of Byzantine manoeuvring and tightrope international diplomacy, he appealed openly and formally to Kremlin for military assistance (which) was welcomed in Moscow".⁽⁵⁰⁾

The first version of the plan was seen to be Turkish oriented. Six paragraphs out of seven were discussing the position and gains of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots. Nevertheless, we must distinguish the first paragraph. The first paragraph gave a choice between independence and enosis. An independent Cyprus plus the other six paragraphs created a balance with Turkey and Greece (Greek Cypriots) which would please the USA. The enosis solution also was a favour of the USA because the island would be partitioned between Turkey - Carpas peninsula would be given to Turkey – and Greece. Also the partitioning of Cyprus would give another gain to the USA, i.e. Makarios would turn to be a local politician instead of the President of the Republic of Cyprus and Cyprus would be a NATO island. So the final solution was not pro-Turkish but pro-American.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997), p.66

THE 1964 – 1967 PERIOD

As the mediation efforts continued on the Cyprus problem, General George Grivas, who had led Greek Cypriot resistance during the British occupation of the island, arrived in Cyprus on June 12, 1964.

Turkish Cypriot Vice President Dr. Küçük had challenged Grivas's return to Cyprus on June 24th in a cablegram to UN Secretary General U Thant. Grivas was appointed as the commander of Cyprus National Guard on August 13th. In addition to the guard command, Grivas was also given the complete control over the Cyprus's security forces.

An International Community Concern on Cyprus: Plaza's Report

Galo Plaza Lasso, who had succeeded Ambassador Tuomioja after his death on September 9th, 1964, submitted a report on his activities to Secretary General U Thant on March 26th, 1965. This report dealt with the causes of the constitutional crisis and the two communal political attitudes. Against the objections of Turkey, Plaza offered his own solution to replace the Zurich and London Agreements.

The Greeks received Plaza's report more positively than the Turks, who even objected his role as a mediator. Plaza was critical of the 1960 Constitution and the Treaties of Alliance and Guarantee, considering them to be unworkable and a major hindrance to the smooth functioning of a sovereign government. He also ruled out the ideas for enosis, taksim, and the federation proposals made by the Turks. For the eventual settlement of the dispute, he stressed the need for talks between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

Due to the Turkish government's opposition to the report and to his role as mediator, Plaza resigned. The USA's attitude towards the rejection of the Plaza Report was to act in a silent manner. As it has been discussed above the Americans first option on Cyprus problem was to solve it under NATO umbrella and not to internationalize the problem. The USA in that period did not think that an UN mediation would solve the Cyprus problem. So when Galo Plaza resigned the US did not work hard for a new UN

mediator. Ankara, while rejecting the United Nation mediator's report, proposed bilateral talks between Greece and Turkey. Despite the opposition from Makarios, Greece and Turkey began talks in May, 1965, at the meeting of the NATO foreign ministers in London. The talks between the two nations continued until July, 1965, but because of a domestic political crisis in Greece, the talks became paralyzed.

In Greece, rumours began to circulate that the new King of Greece, Constantine, was maneuvering to get rid of the Papandreou's government in order to form a government of national unity, which would proceed to liquidate the Cyprus question on the basis of the Acheson Plan.⁽¹⁾

As it can be seen in the Turkish government actions, the search for autonomy from American influence in the beginning of the 1960's was also characteristic of Greek foreign policy. George Papandreou, especially with anti-American feeling in Greece, adopted a more nationally oriented foreign policy. It was a general belief in Greece that national interests had been sacrificed for the general interests of the Western Alliance. Therefore, Greece and Turkey adopted a new course of politics after the Cyprus crisis. As Kizilyürek states "it is irony of history that both countries believed their interests had been neglected in relations to Cyprus".⁽²⁾ So the Greek government applied her new approach by rejecting the Acheson Plan.

Soviet-Turkish Rapprochement: A Clash of US Policy?

Almost twenty years after the Johnson Letter, in 1985 Süleyman Demirel made the following evaluation: "Cyprus is in regards to Turkish American relations a very important issue, it's an issue for itself. Cyprus has been the testing ground for Turco-American relations. In fact Johnson's letter has caused the first crack in Turkish-American relations...The stance of America against such a loyal ally in relation to a

⁽¹⁾ Vanezis, P.N., (1974) p.165

⁽²⁾ Kizilyürek, N., (1994) p.63

national cause such as Cyprus has caused a shock to Turkey. At that point Turkey felt the need to look at new horizons".⁽³⁾

In this respect the Turkish politicians began to search the Soviet Union support for the Turkish politics towards Cyprus, and created economic ties with the Soviet Union.

The de Gaullean discourse, which stated that the US was using its allies for its own sake found support among Turkish politicians. Therefore Turkey's trust in the US and NATO was clearly decreasing.⁽⁴⁾

Turkey's feeling of isolation had strengthened her ties with Soviet Union. The Soviet Union also showed willingness for a rapprochement. Turkish Foreign Minister Feridun Cemal Erkin, paid a visit to Soviet Union in October 1964 and Nikolai Podgorny, reciprocated the visit in January 1965. But according to Salih, the Kremlin continued to supply Makarios with arms and other material without creating strains on its relations with Turkey, undermining the United States strategic and diplomatic interests in the area.⁽⁵⁾

US Relations with Cyprus during 1964-67

The aims of the US foreign policy in Cyprus have remained the same since early 1964. The USA seek to insure that: The conflict between the Greek and Turkish communities on the island shall not become the cause of a war, and the protracted political disorder on the island shall not be paramount in US bilateral relations with either Greece or Turkey. Continuously, the US was forced to play the role of "honest broker" in the dispute between the two allies over Cyprus, but this posture often resulted in making no friends and two enemies.⁽⁶⁾

The United States, although she was not a formal or legal guarantor, had extensive treaty commitments with Greece and Turkey, and maintained a large embassy in

⁽³⁾ Altan, M. (1986), p.132

⁽⁴⁾ Sönmezoglu, F., (1995) p.35; Kizilyürek, N., (1994) p.61

⁽⁵⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978) p.57

⁽⁶⁾ Adams, T.W., & Cottrell, A.J., (1968), p.67

Cyprus. She was also using the British 'sovereign' bases with the tacit approval of Makarios, to overfly the Middle East with U-2 and other aircrafts. ⁽⁷⁾

US relations with Greek Cypriots in particular were strained for several reasons. In 1965 in the UN General Assembly, the United States voted against a resolution emphasizing respect for the sovereignty of the Greek Cypriot Government and condemning foreign intervention in its affairs. Also ships sailing under the Cyprus flag were observed unloading arms and supplies in North Vietnamese ports. A new difficulty in US relations with Makarios government occurred after the visit to Washington of the Turkish President Cevdet Sunay in April 1967 when President Johnson, in a joint communiqué, came out in favour of the two community concept in Cyprus. ⁽⁸⁾

The change in the American foreign policy can again be explained by two factors. Firstly, in a bigger perspective Turkey in the end was (and still is) more important for the USA than Greece or Cyprus. Secondly, it reflects the American dislike at Makarios' left leaning and orientation towards Moscow. It can also be seen as some kind of appeasement gesture towards a sincere ally after the Johnson letter. Finally, the USA was not happy with the government in Greece.

The displeasure of the USA was for the Greek government attitudes. Firstly, Papandreou, though, had agreed with Makarios that the United Nations, and not Greece and Turkey, could legitimately involve itself in the settlement of the dispute. Secondly against the NATO's Permanent Council decision, the Greek government was sending large numbers of troops and equipment to Cyprus. Thirdly, Papandreou did not prevent Makarios to use the Soviet card whenever Turkey threatened intervention. Finally the Greek government had good relations with Arabic countries.

⁽⁷⁾ Hitchens, C., (1984), p.69

⁽⁸⁾ Adams, T.W. & Cottrell, A.J., (1968), pp.68-69

THE 1967-1974 PERIOD

Junta in Greece: A Major Opportunity for USA on Cyprus Settlement

As mentioned before, in 1965 rumours of an American-backed military coup circulated in Athens. On 15th of July, King Constantine asked for the resignation of the Center Union government following an attempt by the Greek Prime Minister George Papandreou to reorganize the Ministry of Defense. The Greek Prime Minister stood against King's plans and, before the 1967 elections, Papandreou demanded basic changes in the structure of power. ⁽¹⁾

During this period a political faction under the Prime Minister's son, Andreas Papandreou supported most of the positions of the Cyprus government (as well as many reforms in the internal affairs of Greece and its international alignments). This faction was an anathema both to the Greek establishment and to the U.S. interests in Greece.

Attalides claims that "In 1967 at the strong urging of the CIA station chief in Athens and some officials at the American embassy, Ambassador Philips Talbot recommended White House to authorize the expenditure of one hundred thousand dollars in "black" funds to finance opposition to Papandreou."⁽²⁾ The general elections in Greece was due in May 1967. But the elections never took place. Instead of the elections, the Greek military made a coup d'etat and seized power on April 21, 1967. The coup of army officers established a military dictatorship in Greece, which ruled the country for seven years, until the Turkish intervention in Cyprus on 20 July 1974.

According to O'Malley and Craig CIA station chief in Athens feared that the general elections held in May would give George Papandereou a massive majority. They were worried that this would leave Andreas Papandreou, whom they blamed for Greece's rejection of the Acheson proposals, and who was becoming increasingly anti-American, a dominant figure in the Government. A senior CIA official warned that Andreas

⁽¹⁾ Theophylactou, D.A., (1993) pp.36-37

⁽²⁾ Attalides, M., (1979) pp.146-147

Papandreou would close down the US bases and communications facilities in Greece and pull the country out of NATO. CIA officials in Athens believed that Papandreou's victory would seriously damage American interests and exacerbate tensions between Greece and Turkey.⁽³⁾

In these circumstances a military junta seized power in Athens in a bloodless coup. The coup was led by right-wing colonels. O'Malley and Craig claim that the leader of the junta, Colonel Papadopoulos, had been on the payroll of the CIA since 1952, and had acted as the senior liaison officer between the Greek secret service and the CIA.⁽⁴⁾

For United States, the military junta was a better choice compared the Papandreou family. It seemed that the junta was very willing to cooperate closely with the United States. The main reason for the Junta's aim to corporate with US was its domestical unpopularity and its international isolation.

The United States not only welcomed the Greek junta, but also helped to keep it in power. The junta leader, Colonel George Papadopoulos, said that the military control was to save the nation from the communism. To quote Theophylactou: "Papadopoulos was among three of the five conspirators in the coup who worked for the Greek Intelligence KYP and collaborating with CIA".⁽⁵⁾

Ankara was one of the first governments to recognize the junta, and Turkish leaders hoped that prospects of a Greek-Turkish settlement on Cyprus would be easier with a regime that controlled the press and kept a tight control on the opposition. A few months after seizing power, the leader of the junta, Colonel Papadopoulos, accepted Turkish Prime Minister Demirel's proposal for a summit meeting in September 1967, at which he offered Turkey a military base in Cyprus in return for Turkey's acceptance of Enosis.⁽⁶⁾ Demirel responded with the demand for an area big enough to accommodate most of the Turkish Cypriots. For Turkey, a military base alone was unacceptable. What

⁽³⁾ O'Malley, B. and Craig, I., (1999) p.126

⁽⁴⁾ O'Malley, B. and Craig, I., (1999) p.126

⁽⁵⁾ Theophylactou, D.A., (1993) p.37

⁽⁶⁾ On September 9th 1967 the prime ministers of Greece and Turkey, Constantine Collias and Süleyman Demirel, met at Kesan, a small Turkish town near border; on September 10th, both men met again at Alexandroupolis, Greece. Salih, H.I., (1978) p.57

the Turks wanted was too much for Greece's new rulers to pay. The talks ended in failure.⁽⁷⁾

The 1967 Events in Cyprus

After the collapse of the summit talks, an unexpected crisis in Cyprus almost resulted in Turkey's military intervention. In Cyprus, the Greek Cypriot National Guard attacked on a strategically placed Turkish Cypriot village. The National Guard at this time was under the control of General Grivas. He had stated that he accepted no orders from the Cypriot Government, but only from the Greek government.⁽⁸⁾ The Turkish government reacted by sending its jets on warning flights over Cyprus.

As public demonstrations took place in Istanbul and Ankara asking military intervention on the island, Turkey mobilized her forces for possible action. The Turkish Parliament authorized the government "to go to war with Greece should the Cyprus situation deteriorate further". The Greek ambassador to Ankara was presented with a diplomatic note containing five demands.

1. The immediate recall from Cyprus of General Grivas.
2. Withdraw from the island an estimated 12.000 Greek regulars illegally infiltrated into Cyprus.
3. Compensation for the Turkish Cypriot victims in Ayios Theodoros and Kophinou.
4. A relaxation of the restrictions on Turkish Cypriots.
5. Effective guarantees against any further assaults on Turkish Cypriot community.⁽⁹⁾

When Greek government refused to accept the Turkish demands, the USA had to intervene on the Cyprus dispute. The first goal of the USA again, was to avert a war between Greece and Turkey. The same day President Johnson appointed former Deputy Secretary of Defence Cyrus Vance as a special envoy to help in mediating the dispute.

⁽⁷⁾ Bahçeli, T., (1990), p.72

⁽⁸⁾ Attalides, M., (1979) p.98

⁽⁹⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978), p.58

Also on that day the United Nations Secretary General appointed his Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs, Jose Rolz Bennet as a special representative in the crisis. NATO's Secretary General Manlio Brosio, also tried to mediate to solve the problem.

During this period the American attitude could be explained as follows: Clearly, the USA returned back to conventional diplomacy firstly by collaborating with one of the guarantor powers, England and secondly by appointing Cyprus Vance as a mediator. The Cyprus question was again heating up after a small break but at the same time the USA was getting more involved in Vietnam. On 22nd November 1967, the United States chose to join England and Canada in proposing a settlement formula. In essence, it provided that:

1. Greek and Turkish troop strengths would be reduced to the Treaty of Alliance levels.
2. The United Nation Force would be enlarged;
3. Turkish Cypriots who suffered losses in the attacks would be compensated and the future security of the Turkish Cypriot areas assured; and
4. Turkey would guarantee not to intervene in the future. ⁽¹⁰⁾

Cyrus Vance began in the classic mode of a mediator. He first sought time to manoeuvre. The key step was the Greek Government's agreement to withdraw its troops. The technique apparently used by Cyrus Vance and the other mediators was to press Greece and Turkey to some settlement, and then to put the Archbishop in the position of either accepting the settlement or being isolated because of a continuing crisis that threatened to explode at any moment. ⁽¹¹⁾

The United States' political reaction to the Turkish intervention threat was not this time as strong as the respond of 1964. Perhaps it was because the White House did not wish to further strain its relations with the Turkish government. Both in Athens and in Ankara there were new governments, which were more willing to listen to the USA.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Ehrlich, T., (1974) p.110

⁽¹¹⁾ Ehrlich, T., (1974) p.112

Now the stumbling block was Makarios with his Soviet backing. The United States asked Greece to pressure Makarios to change his policy against the Turkish Cypriots because the United States was unwilling to continue deterring the Turks from invading the island. As Joseph points out "the American envoy was successful in resolving the crisis by exercising pressure on the Greek military junta, which was largely responsible for the crisis, and satisfying most of the Turkish demands".⁽¹²⁾

An agreement was reached between Panoyotis Pipinelis, the Greek Foreign Minister and İhsan Sabri Çağlayangil, the Turkish Foreign Minister on 30th November, 1967.

The important points of the agreement were:

1. The demobilization of the Turkish armed forces that had been poised for war.
2. The gradual withdrawal of the Greek and Turkish troops from Cyprus in excess of the 950 man Greek contingent and 650 man Turkey contingent as permitted by the 1960 Treaty of Alliance.
3. Compensation for the Turkish Cypriot victims in Ayios Theodoros and Kophinou villages.
4. The expansion of the size and the powers of the UNFICYP
5. The dismantling of the 20,000 member Greek Cypriot National Guard.
6. The recall of General Grivas to Athens⁽¹³⁾

It was easy for Vance to deal with the weak, domestically unpopular and internationally isolated Greek military junta. The Soviet-backed Makarios refused to dismantle the Cypriot National Guard, which was largely equipped with Soviet arms, but accepted the removal of Grivas and the Greek troops who were controlled by the military regime of Athens.

By accepting to withdraw her force as part of the settlement, Greece lost a very important deterrent against Turkey's future military intervention on the island. Also the withdrawal of the Greek forces could be evaluated as a major step away from enosis. Of course the withdrawal of the Greek forces gave Makarios more room for manoeuvre.

⁽¹²⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997) p.69

⁽¹³⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978) p.59

According to Nancy Crawshaw, the Kophinou crisis was a turning point in the island's post colonial history. The Greek-Turkish dialogue that had started before the November crisis had failed to bring about a Cyprus settlement. One of the most important consequences of the 1967 crisis was a period of disengagement from the affairs of the island by Greece and Turkey and the assumption by the two Cypriot communities of the major responsibility in search for a settlement.⁽¹⁴⁾

There is a saying in Turkish, "if you do not wish to solve the problem, transfer it to the sub-commission". It was clear that the Cyprus problem exhausted both Turkey and Greece, but such a complex problem could not be solved by the Cypriots only.

The Intercommunal Talks and US Attitude

In the presidential elections held in February 1968, Makarios was again the winner taking the 95 percent of the votes. His rival was a strong pro-enosis man. Makarios had now a strong government, and the international community asked him to make conciliation with the Turkish community. Consequently, the restrictions were removed on the movement of the Turkish Cypriots over the island and also on the movement of goods to and from the Turkish areas.⁽¹⁵⁾

A different view comes from Attalides. According to him, the basic thrust of U.S. policy on Cyprus becomes clear by examining the attitude of the government to the intercommunal talks and the various forces that tended to disrupt them. The U.S. official position was to support the intercommunal talks. The trend of the discussions was such that had they succeeded without outside intervention, they would have removed the last stumbling block to complete the independence for Cyprus, with substantial guaranties for the Turkish Cypriot minority. But it seems that U.S. attitude was not that the Cypriot interlocutors should come to a solution, but that the talks should legitimize an agreement on Cyprus reached by Greece and Turkey.⁽¹⁶⁾ This still reflects the American tendency to discuss with Ankara and Athens after the

⁽¹⁴⁾ Bahçeli, T., (1998) pp.74-75

⁽¹⁵⁾ Denktash, R., (1998) p.53

⁽¹⁶⁾ Attalides, M., (1979) p.162

governmental changes in Turkey and Greece in 1967. After the 1967 crisis, discussions, which took place between Athens and Ankara, generated some optimism in solving the bilateral disputes.

Papadopoulos' conciliatory statements encouraged Turkish officials, but the improved climate in the mainland governments' dealings failed to further the intercommunal negotiating process in Cyprus. As usual, the Greek-Cypriot leadership was very sensitive to the possibility of a Greek-Turkish deal over the heads of the Cypriots and an imposed solution.⁽¹⁷⁾ Since coming to power, the junta's relations with Makarios worsened day by day.

By 1967 Johnson administration was not happy at home. The American foreign policy was criticized in the works of the historians. William Appleman William's "Tragedy of American Diplomacy" became a standard of a new school of revisionist writers. College campuses erupted into violent riots fueled by student disgust with the Vietnam War and fear of the military draft. The student's demonstrations were attacking American foreign policy in Vietnam and around the world. Even Congress, which had offered its support questioned Johnson's assumptions about world politics and threatened to develop a foreign policy of its own.⁽¹⁸⁾

The Arab-Israeli war in 1967 also fueled the clashes in the Middle East. Having serious problems in the Far East the last thing that the United States wanted was a clash between her allies i.e. Turkey and Greece.

A resolution of the Cyprus problem in terms of an agreed division of influence between Greece and Turkey would be ideal in the sense that it would be satisfactory to all concerned other than the Cypriots. A large proportion of Cyprus controlled by Greece would do for the Junta's prestige, virtually any proportion would do for Turkey's strategic need to control access to its southern ports, and the US would have a double gain.⁽¹⁹⁾ As it is mentioned before Cyprus question should be seen in the

⁽¹⁷⁾ Bahçeli, T., (1990) p.80

⁽¹⁸⁾ Schulzinger, R.D., (1998) p.276

⁽¹⁹⁾ Attalides, M., (1979) p.132

framework of the American global policy in general and the Middle Eastern Policy in particular. In this context the US was to prevent any conflict between her NATO partners, Turkey and Greece on Cyprus or any other issue.

Partition of the island between to allies would be beneficial to NATO because there would be direct NATO control on the island. Turkish military in the north and Greek military in the south with British Bases would guarantee the satisfaction of the NATO (American) interest towards the Soviet Union. The collapse of the Republic of Cyprus also would prevent the probable penetration of Soviet Union to Cyprus. An irritating dispute between allies would disappear and there would be no scandal or resistance to a gradual transformation of the British bases of Cyprus into bases to be at the disposal of the US for their Middle East strategy.⁽²⁰⁾

According to Attalides the main problem up until 1971 was that Greece and Turkey had not agreed on the terms of the division. This was finally achieved in a secret agreement during the NATO Foreign Ministers conference in Lisbon in June 1971... If a Greek-Turkish agreement could obviate this possibility, then the liquidation of the Cypriot state could proceed without danger to the West.⁽²¹⁾ Nevertheless this agreement was not acceptable to the Makarios' Government. In fact there was now more common ground between the Greek Junta and Turkey than between the Greek Junta and the Cyprus Government. Makarios made his last visit to Greece in September 1971 and the war of the Greek Junta on the Republic of Cyprus became open.

Since then the strategy of the Junta was to use the slogan of enosis to weaken and, if necessary, overthrow Makarios. It seems that Papadopoulos believed that Makarios was dedicated to remaining the leader of an independent Cyprus rather than working toward the island's union with Greece.

General Grivas would have been strong instrument in the hands of the junta in the struggle against Makarios. Grivas was under house arrest in Athens. Two months after the Lisbon agreement it was announced that he had escaped and was hiding in Cyprus.

⁽²⁰⁾ O'Malley, B. & Craig, I. (1999) p.153; Attalides, M., (1979) p.132

⁽²¹⁾ Attalides, M., (1979) p.132

As Salih notes: "Grivas re-entered the island secretly in 1971 and formed EOKA-B, which was an extreme right wing, pro-enosis terrorist organization. Soon the struggle between pro-Makarios and pro-Grivas forces turned into bombings and shootings, the latter assisted by the mainland Greek troops staffing and commanding the National Guard ." On February 18, 1973, Makarios was again elected the President by the Greek Cypriots. After his proclamation as President, Makarios promised to continue his nonaligned foreign policy.⁽²²⁾

In the early part of August 1973 a plan was headed by Grivas for the assassination of Makarios and a coup d'etat was to be accomplished in such a manner as to avoid antagonizing the Turkish Cypriots so that Turkey's military intervention might be avoided.⁽²³⁾

The coup within the junta in Athens in 1973 which brought military police chief Ioannides to power was a turning point. Ioannides had previously served in Cyprus and had a great antipathy towards Makarios.⁽²⁴⁾

A number of claims have been made that much of the funding came from the Americans via Ioannides. The Socialist leader on Cyprus, Dr Vassos Lyserides, said, "we have a lot of evidence that money was transferred to EOKA-B by the CIA. That's where the real money came from to continue their activities in Cyprus."⁽²⁵⁾

During the Junta's period in Greece, the American foreign policy was to put Makarios under control by the military government of Greece. The government of Greece was very open of the American influence. The government was isolated from the Western democratic countries and the only support came from the USA. In this period United States used the military bases without any restrictions. Getting such huge opportunities, the USA gave Greece military aid and supported her in the international institutions. Greek Junta tried to control the attitudes of Makarios but the good relations of Makarios with non-aligned countries gave him room to act freely.

⁽²²⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978) p.69

⁽²³⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978) p.70

⁽²⁴⁾ Bahçeli, T., (1990) p.84

⁽²⁵⁾ O'Malley, B. & Craig, I., (1999) p.152

The Greek Junta's Coup on the Island: An American Action?

During the period that Ioannides-Makarios relations worsened and, relations between Greece and Turkey rapidly broke down due to oil rights. Oil gained a bigger importance after the Yom Kippur War, due to worldwide price increasing. Greece began exploratory oil drilling in the northern Aegean in 1973. In November, of the same year, Ankara also declared oil exploration rights in areas of the Aegean Sea, which the Greeks regarded as their own. Tension increased at the end of March 1974 when Athens claimed Turkish jet fighters were violating the Greek air space. Turkish Foreign Minister Turan Güneş said that Turkey would not allow the Aegean to become a Greek lake and Turkey sent a survey ship supported by 32 warships into the disputed area to study the feasibility of oil drilling.⁽²⁶⁾

The issue was discussed at a NATO meeting in Ottawa on 20 June 1974 and in Brussels five days later. United States regarded the Aegean problem as an inter alliance problem, and tried to solve the problem inside the NATO body. In that period because of the continental shelf problem between Turkey and Greece the military operations in the Aegean Sea had to be postponed. This situation did not please USA, because Washington was worried of the unity of NATO.⁽²⁷⁾

The Americans backed a Turkish proposal for a joint ministerial committee to go over all the problems between the two countries and try to settle them. But Ioannides refused even to sit down with the Turks. Throughout the Aegean crisis, Turkish and Greek armed forces were put on alert, and their naval forces carried out provocative maneuvers. According to O'Malley and Craig in May and June 1974, Ioannides's irrational behaviour made a war with Turkey increasingly likely. The Americans had to find some way to prevent him starting a war with Turkey even if it put a risk at their relations with Greece in the short term.⁽²⁸⁾

⁽²⁶⁾ O'Malley, B. & Craig, I., (1999) p.152

⁽²⁷⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997) p.72

⁽²⁸⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978) p.71

On the 15th July, the Greek forces on Cyprus in alliance with the Greek controlled Cypriot National Guard staged a bloody coup against Makarios. The resistance which the Greek Cypriot police and socialists put up was sufficient to enable Makarios to escape from Cyprus but not sufficient to prevent the establishment of a dictatorship on the island. Greece brought to power an extremist pro-enosis puppet regime.

There are some claims on the support of the USA to the Greek coup. "On the day after the coup a State Department spokesman in Washington refused to comment on whether the State Department recognized the Makarios government and expressed the view that there had been no external intervention. The day before the invasion U.S Ambassador Scali in the U.N., said that it would be a serious error to rush judgement on whether there had been foreign intervention in Cyprus. ⁽²⁹⁾

After the coup on Cyprus, the State Department considered the Cypriot political situation an internal matter and favoured the continuation of the status quo. To the American policy makers, the factual situation dictated that the status quo should be accepted. The United States, however, did state its opposition to enosis and vowed that it supported Cypriot independence and territorial integrity and its constitutional arrangements.⁽³⁰⁾ Joseph claims that the strong antipathy for Makarios shared by Athens and Washington provided the impetus for a new round of violence and bloodshed.⁽³¹⁾ After the coup, the USA did not condemn the coup and was indeed the only country besides Greece that tilted towards recognition of the puppet dictatorial regime that came to power in Nicosia. Henry Kissinger, after two meetings of Washington Special Action Group stressed that the US would do nothing to jeopardize its air and sea bases in Greece.

Attalides believes that United States was aware of the Greeks intentions. According to him in early 1974 the Cypriot secret services observed a contact between the attempted dictator of Cyprus, Nikos Sampson and an ex-CIA station chief in Cyprus, Eric Neff. The meeting took place in Athens and later Mr. Clerides went to the

⁽²⁹⁾ Attalides, M., (1979) p.171

⁽³⁰⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978) p.90

⁽³¹⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997) p.72

U.S. Embassy in Nicosia to ask for information. Closer to the time of the coup, security forces in Cyprus had captured EOKA-B documents which indicated that money was coming from Athens at the rate of 6,000 dollars a day. The man who sent the money had influential connections in the CIA station in Athens.⁽³²⁾ These kind of evidences led people in Cyprus to think it unlikely that CIA had not been involved in the attempt to destabilize the Cypriot government.

Furthermore in April 1974, "working level" officers at the State Department tried to persuade Secretary of State Kissinger to act so and to prevent Greek moves against Makarios. Obviously these officers believed that it was both within the ability and rights of the State Department to bring influence to bear on the heavily U.S. dependent regime. Yet it was weeks before Kissinger was persuaded to instruct Ambassador Tasca to warn Ioannides not to create a *fait accompli* in Cyprus which would move the Turkish Government to invade".⁽³³⁾

In another study Salih writes that the USA had enjoyed good relations with Greece. She was very cautious not to exert excessive diplomatic pressure on Athens, because she wanted to protect the United States Sixth Fleet base at Piraeus, which the junta has allowed the fleet to make its home port. Washington considered the naval base at Piraeus strategically imperative to the NATO alliance in the eastern Mediterranean.⁽³⁴⁾

The American ambassador to Nicosia Roger Davies' attitude also gave pro-Greek signals. He was the only foreign ambassador received by the foreign minister of the coupist regime.

One of the other important assumption was the CIA links in Greece. "The groups involved in both in the dictatorial Greek Government and in the coup in Cyprus were no strangers to the American secret services. The first dictator Papadopoulos was liaison officer with the American CIA for the Greek Intelligence organization (KYP), the CIA had created in Greece. Ioannides was also known to cooperate closely with the CIA. Greek KYP officers were not only trained by the CIA, but in some cases directly paid

⁽³²⁾ Attalides, M., (1979) p.172

⁽³³⁾ Attalides, M., (1979) p.167

⁽³⁴⁾ Salih, H.I., (1978) p.71

by Washington. There is evidence that it was the Greek KYP which took over EOKA-B after the ousting of Grivas' nominated successor".⁽³⁵⁾

One point about the CIA connections with the allied secret services must be underlined here. As it is well known CIA had same relations with the Turkish secret service, MIT, like she had with KYP. CIA also was training the Turkish secret service and paid them from Washington.

An evaluation must be added here: The Turks were disappointed by the American reaction to the coup. There were no tears for Makarios in Washington. The Secretary of State Kissinger regarded him as a loser. Kissinger also felt that a conflict within NATO had to be avoided at all costs. Later, Kissinger was to claim that he opposed making any public proclamation against the Sampson regime for fear of encouraging the Turks to intervene in the crisis.⁽³⁶⁾

After the coup, Archbishop Makarios repeatedly said that he never expected a unilateral Greek coup. What he expected was an attempt to assassinate him or an intervention in an agreed way with Turkey to establish "double enosis".⁽³⁷⁾

Makarios fled from the island with British help. In a speech he made at the UN on 19 July 1974, he said: "The coup is clearly an invasion from outside, in flagrant violation of the independence and sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus. The so-called coup was the work of the officers staffing and commanding the national guard... The coup of the Greek military junta is an invasion and from its consequences the whole people of Cyprus suffers, both Greeks and Turks... The Security Council should call upon the military regime of Greece to withdraw from Cyprus, the Greek officers serving in the National Guard and put an end to its invasion of Cyprus".⁽³⁸⁾

⁽³⁵⁾ Attalides, M.,(1979) p.p.168-169

⁽³⁶⁾ Oberling, P.,(1982) p.p.161-162

⁽³⁷⁾ Attalides, M.,(1979) p.p. 169-170

⁽³⁸⁾ Denktash, R.R.,(1988) p.p. 180-185; Alemdar, S.,(1993) p.89

The coup seemed to put the U.S. in a lucky position of being able to kill quite a few birds with one stone. Firstly, she got rid of Makarios. Secondly, if Ecevit did not intervene he would have been in trouble at home. Thirdly, if he did, only the balance of power within Cyprus would be affected. Turkey would be a better safeguard in Cyprus preventing her to be in Soviet orbit. Finally, the Junta, would collapsed and replaced by a new Junta or by more moderate politicians. The Cyprus issue, for a medival period, would be solved by a single operation and it seemed that Kissinger's policy safeguarded his country's interests at every point.



TURKISH MILITARY INTERVENTION IN 1974

The junta in Athens chose Nikos Giorgiades Sampson, an ardent enosist as the new president of Cyprus. Because of his extremist background and his general lack of political qualifications, Sampson was not acceptable as president to most Greek Cypriots. Most Greeks on the island considered Sampson a political stooge of the junta, who sought to maintain control of Cyprus until enosis could be achieved.⁽¹⁾ The Turkish armed forces in particular pressured Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit to act to prevent the *de facto* enosis.

It can be said that the coup on Cyprus offered the Turkish military a golden opportunity to come back to Cyprus. Ecevit acted logically. Instead of acting unilaterally, firstly he asked Great Britain to fulfill its obligations under the 1960 accords and join Turkey in a military operation to insure the independence of Cyprus.

However the talks in London between Ecevit and British Prime Minister Harold Wilson and Foreign Secretary James Callaghan were fruitless for the Turkish military because London's national interest on Cyprus was in no jeopardy.⁽²⁾ It was mentioned many times that any action in Cyprus also risked triggering a military response from Turkey. In Denktash's words "Turkey as one of the guarantors of the Cyprus Republic could not accept the Greek fait accompli against the independence and sovereignty of the republic, nor could stand by and watch Turkish Cypriots being killed or put under the Greek colonial yoke."⁽³⁾ Before Turkey had repeatedly declared that it would resort to force to avert the Island's union with Greece. By sending its Air Forces in 1967, it demonstrated its leverage by forcing the military regime in Athens to withdraw the Greek troops that had been stationed on the island.

After his visit to London, Ecevit demanded that Athens should withdraw 650 Greek officers from Cyprus and that President Sampson should be replaced. Otherwise, he warned, the Turkish army would intervene in Cyprus. It is not clear if the United States, Great Britain and Greece were all under the impression that Turkey was bluffing. But at

⁽¹⁾ Salih, H.I.,(1978) p.89

⁽²⁾ Salih, H.I.,(1978) p.90

⁽³⁾ Denktash, R.R.,(1988) p.68

least the American intelligence service was fully aware of the intervention preparations. Nevertheless it was a reality that the Turkish parliament declared the proposition on going to war with Greece if the need arose, in 1967.

During this period United States was working to stop the crisis. Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Joseph S. Sisco was dispatched by Kissinger to Athens and Ankara to apply political leverage and to aid in finding a solution to the crisis. Athens was pressured by Sisco to replace Sampson with a more moderate Greek Cypriot and to withdraw its 650 officers from Cyprus. The junta in Greece refuse to comply with Sisco's suggestions because they represented a capitulation to demands of the Turks.⁽⁴⁾ Turkish Prime Minister Ecevit, rejected Sisco's request for a 48 hour postponement of the intervention.⁽⁵⁾ It seemed that Ecevit's government would pursue a policy more independently of the United States. Soon after he came to office in January 1974, he began to challenge the status quo in the Aegean by challenging Greece's claims on the continental shelf issue. This was not a great problem of United States if the issue would be solved inside the NATO, but it was a headache.

When the junta in Athens refused to reach a compromise with Turkey over the restoration of a constitutional leadership in Cyprus, Ankara decided to act on July 20th, 1974. Turkey considered its action legal under the Treaty of Guarantee, Article IV, which states that each of the three guaranteeing powers reserved the right to take action with the sole aim of reestablishing the state of affairs created by the present Treaty⁽⁶⁾

Sisco had failed to stop Turkey but he could at least try to prevent a Greco-Turkish war. The U.S. was prepared to use any and every threat to prevent it. Sisco had a meeting with Ioanides and some of the Commanders of Greece. Ioannides in this meeting shouted at Sisco; "You have betrayed us: I am going to attack Turkey". From an official who attended the meeting it was learned that Sisco brought heavy pressure on Greece while the Prime Minister kept demanding that Turkey should cease fire immediately and withdraw its troops; otherwise Greece would pull out of NATO and

⁽⁴⁾ Salih, H.I.,(1978) p.p. 90-91

⁽⁵⁾ Joseph, S.J.,(1997) p. 90

⁽⁶⁾ Salih, H.I.,(1978) p. 91

declare war. ⁽⁷⁾ In Joseph's words while the Turkish invasion was in process, the military junta seemed determined to go to war with Turkey and refused to negotiate with the American mediator. The Greek government saw the crisis as a new phase in Greek-Turkish rivalry with no room for bargaining. ⁽⁸⁾ As it is seen once more the United States was trying to restore peace to contain the conflict and to prevent a Turkish war.

On 20th July 1974 at NATO headquarters was holding one secret session after another and the excitement was intense. The NATO Council finally adopted a guarded resolution on the intervention, which disappointed the Greek delegate by not condemning Turkey. ⁽⁹⁾

Though Greece talked tough and moved to the brink of war the Greek junta in Athens was not well prepared going to war with Turkey. When the military shortfall was discovered and when it became obvious that the junta was powerless to block the Turkish military advances in Cyprus the junta resolved. Attalides accuses that in this period United States tried to prevent Greece going to the help of the Cypriots. The U.S. assured the Greek military chiefs that she would do all to stop the Turkish advances. "Ioannides feeling at last that the U.S. had been leading him up several garden paths, decided on the 21st of July, to go to war with Turkey but the three service chiefs of Greece, who had for over a year obeyed his orders, refused to go to war and demanded the return of a civilian government." Furthermore Attalides criticizes Kissinger that after the coup against Makarios, he promoted the overthrow of Ioannides, since he had decided that the dictator was a bad investment, "incapable of maintaining the kind of safeguards that the U.S. seeks for its bases in Greece and for the southern flank of NATO". From that moment of truth, the General's fate was virtually sealed. ⁽¹⁰⁾

Kissinger was in contact with the Turkish Prime Minister Ecevit throughout the intervention. He was following the operation very closely, trying to convince Ecevit to stop the operation ⁽¹¹⁾. A cease-fire was declared on 22th July.

⁽⁷⁾ Birand, M.A.,(1985) p. 25

⁽⁸⁾ Joseph, S.J.,(1997) p. 52

⁽⁹⁾ Birand, M.A.,(1985) p.27

⁽¹⁰⁾ Attalides, M.,(1979) p. 172

⁽¹¹⁾ Birand, M. A.,(1985) p.45

According to Birand, the idea of giving the power to Kostantin Karamanlis and other former politicians had emerged during discussions between the U.S. Ambassador Tesca, Naval Force Commander Arapakis, Air Force Commander Papanicolaou and a representative of Karamanlis. Karamanlis also agreed to the King's return to Greece. At the same time, an agreement was reached on three points. The points were: The Turkish-Cypriots were to be offered 28% of Cyprus, within the framework of a formula providing for federation on the basis of cantons or otherwise; Turkey was to be granted a portion of the continental shelf; and the elections were to be held in November so that the agreement should be signed by a civilian government or by two strong party leader. However, Greeks opposed the plan and it could not be put into effect.⁽¹²⁾

With the Turkish military intervention The Junta regime collapsed and democracy was returned in Greece. Similarly, the Sampson regime in Cyprus fell and Glafcos Clerides, the Speaker of the Greek House of Representatives, became the acting president.

Following Sisco's, failure to prevent the Turkish intervention, a second diplomatic initiative was taken by Britain to contain the crisis and its consequences. A peace conference was held in Geneva under the chairmanship of the British Foreign Minister James Callaghan. After two weeks of fruitless talks between Turkey and Greece the conference broke down.

In Cyprus, Turkish reinforcement was steadily arriving. In their restricted bridgehead there were 240 tanks, 400 armoured vehicles and some 30.000 troops. The Turkish Cypriot villages were still besieged and Clerides, having little control over events, could do even less about it.

NATO experts had begun to view the situation with deep concern. There must be some important motive for concentrating so strong force in such a small area. General

⁽¹²⁾ Birand, M.A.,(1985) p. 53. In this context it is clear that a probable agreement between Turkey and Greece today had its roots in those days.

Sancar had announced to the Turkish armed forces on 2 August , that the mission in Cyprus was not yet completed.⁽¹³⁾

At this time, a narrow corridor from the landing beach in Kyrenia to the Turkish section of Nicosia was under the control of the Turkish armed force. Prime Minister Ecevit was under pressure from the armed forces not to abandon in negotiations what the troops had won in the battlefield.⁽¹⁴⁾

On 14 August, the talks collapsed when Greece rejected Turkish proposals for establishing two separate autonomous entities within a federal or cantonal system in an independent Cyprus. The Turkish proposal would have created a federal Cyprus, with the Turkish Cypriot administration being concentrated in the northern part of the island and the Greek Cypriots on the southern part. As a result of the collapse of the Geneva Conference and the massacres of Turkish Cypriots in the Famagusta area, Turkey proceeded to a second attack on Cyprus that resulted in the occupation of 37 percent of the island. In 1975 it brought about an exchange of population. The Greek Cypriots living in the north were moved to the south and the Turkish Cypriots living in south were transferred to the north. The exchange at population brought into effect a physical separation of the two communities.

During the Turkish operation in Cyprus only the Greek contingent in Cyprus fought with Greek Cypriots against the Turkish army but no help came from Greece. In Athens, immediately after the Turkish advance, the Karamanlis government called for a meeting of the war council to decide on an appropriate response. But the Greek army chiefs did not concur, arguing that the state of readiness of armed forces was inadequate and engaging the Turks in distant was impractical. Later, Karamanlis understood the futility of fighting the Turks in Cyprus.

⁽¹³⁾ Birand, M.A.,(1985) p.78

⁽¹⁴⁾ Salih, H.I.,(1978) p. 95

The Impacts of the Turkish Intervention in Cyprus and the USA's Respond.

After the Turkish intervention in Cyprus, Greece made a formal appeal to NATO Secretary General Joseph Luns to convene a meeting of the NATO Ministerial Council and exercise pressure on Turkey. Luns refused to convene such a meeting or intervene actively in the conflict. Greece responded by withdrawing from the military wing of NATO on August 14th, 1974.⁽¹⁵⁾ For Greece, as for the Greek Cypriots Turkey's successful military intervention and radical alteration of the status quo in Cyprus was humiliating and the NATO and the USA did nothing to prevent it.

The first reaction of the USA towards the second military intervention of Turkey was to announce that if Turkey and Greece had a fight in Cyprus, the USA would put arms embargo to both of them.⁽¹⁶⁾ However, at the beginning United States did not have any negative respond towards the Turkish unilateral intervention. For example she did not announce her traditional policy of supporting the independence sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus, while Turkey was getting a large proportion of Cyprus.⁽¹⁷⁾ The Greek state administration and the Greek scholars accused the USA to be pro-Turkish. They assumed that the USA being unable to control the Turkish advance in Cyprus made contribution to the Turkish military success.

The Greeks' point of view towards the USA's silence on the Turkish second military operation was that, the American's did not help them at a critical time when they needed. The mediation efforts of Kissinger was a late and insufficient action towards the unlawful Turkish intervention.

The Greeks believed that Kissinger was privately reported to his diplomats that he would not try to stop the Turks until they had reached their territorial objectives.⁽¹⁸⁾ According to the Greeks, Kissinger's announcement of the USA's foreign policy on Cyprus on 19th August, 1974, that the parties could discuss the border line of the Turkish area, was a pro-Turkish action. Furthermore it was a major shift from the

⁽¹⁵⁾ Joseph S.J., (1997) p. 91

⁽¹⁶⁾ Birand, M.A., (1985) p.39

⁽¹⁷⁾ Uslu, N., (2000) p.301

⁽¹⁸⁾ Attalides, M., (1979) p.176

USA's traditional foreign policy that accepted a bizonal federal solution in Cyprus.⁽¹⁹⁾ Greece also accredited that her allies, Turkey and the USA, had to support the newly formed Greek government, nevertheless the acts of Turkey and US did not make everything easy for them.

A reality must be put here. The USA's administration was very busy with the President Nixon's resignation and formation of a new government while Turkey had the second military operation. The only thing that Kissinger could do, was to ask the parties, Greece and Turkey, to start the negotiations to find a solution to the issue.

The American vital strategic interest in the region was also an obstacle to act strongly towards Turkey. The USA's strategic interests in the eastern Mediterranean obliged her to run a policy not to accuse any party but made mediation in the Cyprus issue. The probability of opening the Suez Canal, the huge presence of the Soviets in the eastern Mediterranean, security of the region's energy sources and the oil lines needed stability in the region. So, in those circumstances the USA could only run an appeasement policy towards her allies.

After the Turkish intervention the Greek's main goal was to obtain diplomatic support at the international forms such as the United Nations and the conference of the non-aligned states.

The other major consequence of the Turkish intervention in Cyprus was the US arms embargo on Turkey that came into effect in February 1975 and the reaction of Turkey in suspending the American military bases in Turkey.

According to Joseph it cannot be claimed that the Greek lobby was solely responsible for the arms embargo but the Greek lobby representing nearly 3,000,000 Greek-Americans was a huge power to be effective in the Congress decision.⁽²⁰⁾

⁽¹⁹⁾ Uslu, N., (2000) p.302

⁽²⁰⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997) p.91

Greek Cypriots hold the American responsible for the Coup. For that reason US ambassador to Nicosia, Roger Davies was murdered by the demonstration on August 19, 1974.

The Turkish military intervention gaining a large area in Cyprus created a struggle among the Congress and American government whether an arms embargo would be put on Turkey. Some Congress members accused the Government of being unsuccessful in the policy of Cyprus and Greece. John Bredamas, a congressman, criticized Kissinger that all the responsibility of the coup and Turkish military action in Cyprus was Kissinger's fault and Turkey using American arms in Cyprus was an enforcing of the bilateral agreements. The USA had to put an arms embargo to Turkey until her soldier leave the island.⁽²¹⁾

The leading advocates of the embargo included not only Greek-American congressmen, but also such senators as Benjamin Rosenthal, Thomas Eagleton, Adlai Stevenson III, Charles Percy and Edward Kennedy. "These liberal Democrat congressmen were trying to assert Congressional rights in foreign policy making in the aftermath of the Watergate crisis. Congressional action on the embargo was largely the result of accumulated frustrations and resentment felt by many legislators at having been by-passed by the Executive, specially President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger in deciding major foreign policy issues."⁽²²⁾ The Congressmen based their claims that Turkey had enforced the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Foreign Military Sales Act of 1968.⁽²³⁾ The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as well as the bilateral agreements of 1947 and 1960 between the United States and Turkey all stipulated that the military assistance was to be used strictly for defensive purposes or for the maintenance of internal security.⁽²⁴⁾

In the Kissinger's point of view the Greek-American Congressmen were an instrument of the Greek foreign policy. In United States it was the executive who run the foreign policy not the Congress and the challenges of the Congress member towards

⁽²¹⁾ According to Uslu, N. Stern, L., *The Wrong Horse* pp.140-141

⁽²²⁾ Oberling, P., (1982) p. 75, p. 91

⁽²³⁾ Uslu, N., (2000) p. 310

⁽²⁴⁾ Oberling, P., (1982) p. 183

the State Department could not be acceptable. Also those Congressmen were Democrats that forced President for resignation.

One of the reasons of the arms embargo to Turkey was the clash between the US government and the congress. President Gerald Ford and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger tried hard to stop the arms embargo effort. Nevertheless the disagreement between the US government and the Congress failed their efforts. The opinion of the Congress was that the US government did not pay attention to them and acted unilaterally. So the Congress had to check the US government acts.

After the Turkish intervention, the Turkish Government's efforts to find a solution in Cyprus problem must be added. Turkish government, to make contribution to the US President efforts in preventing arms embargo, gave positive vote to a resolution in the 1 November 1974 session of the UN General Assembly. The resolution was on "the acceptance of the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus. The resolution also called for the withdrawal of the foreign military forces and returning home of the refugees."⁽²⁵⁾ Furthermore in the Turkish National Security Council's meeting on 5 November, 1974, a compromise was discussed and the withdrawal of 5.000 troops was accepted. In contrary, Deputy Prime Minister of the Turkish Government, Necmettin Erbakan, opposed any compromise on Cyprus.⁽²⁶⁾ Turkish Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit resigned on 7 November, 1974, to get the Cyprus intervention advantage in domestic politics at a probable new elections. Ecevit's goal was to gain absolute power in the elections for solving the Cyprus problem by himself without Erbakan's opposition. At last Kissinger's planed visit to Ankara in November 1974 was canceled because of the absence of a powerful government in Ankara to make compromise on Cyprus.⁽²⁷⁾ The aim of the Kissinger's visit to Turkey was to obtain concessions on territorial issues. It was believed that Turkey had gained an advantageous position in Cyprus and got more territory than expected. Under these circumstances, Turkey is concession in Cyprus was an expected action.

⁽²⁵⁾ Uslu, N.,(2000) p.p. 312-313

⁽²⁶⁾ Uslu, N.,(2000) p. 313

⁽²⁷⁾ Birand, M.A.,(1979) p. 79

The mediation efforts of the USA continued. Kissinger, in order to find a solution to the Cyprus problem, held meetings with the Turkish and Greek's foreign ministers between 12-14 December, 1974, in Brussels. According to Birand, in the meeting with Turkish Foreign Minister Melih Esenbel, Kissinger asked for a new round of intercommunal talks for Cyprus and he informed Esenbel that unless a development on Cyprus problem occurs "nobody can stop the congress getting an arms embargo decision."⁽²⁸⁾ After the meeting Kissinger declared that Turkey had been willing to make some concessions several months earlier but had not done so because of the embargo campaign. According to O'Malley and Craig this helped delay the arms cut-off until 5th February, 1975.⁽²⁹⁾

On 10 March, 1975 Kissinger paid a visit to Ankara. According to Birand, Kissinger asked Turkey to compromise on Cyprus. If Turkey did not have a progress in Cyprus, the arms embargo could not be put off. For Kissinger the best development would be the Turkish announcement of the willingness of territory concession and in respond the Greek's acceptance of a federal solution.⁽³⁰⁾ The opposition of the public in Turkey did not permit her to make concession in Cyprus so in 24th July 1975, the US House of Representatives rejected the proposal that would give a right to President Ford to suspend the arms embargo.⁽³¹⁾ In reaction to the ban the Turks immediately demanded negotiations on the future of the 26 US bases and installations in their country. The (US) administration battled to repeal the embargo. Ford met 140 legislators at a White House breakfast as a part of one of the most intensive lobbying efforts ever on any foreign policy issue. However, attempts to persuade the House of Representatives to suspend the ban were defeated in July, humiliating the President"⁽³²⁾

⁽²⁸⁾ Birand, M.A.,(1979) p.p. 90-94

⁽²⁹⁾ O'Malley B.; Craig I. (1999) p.226, Salih also wrote about the postponing of the arms embargo saying that, "since progress had been made in the Clerides-Denktash negotiations on Cyprus, the Senate voted to postpone until February 10th, 1975. Salih H.I. (1978) p. 100

⁽³⁰⁾ Birand M.A.,(1979) p.p. 118-120

⁽³¹⁾ Uslu N., (2000) p. 320

⁽³²⁾ O'Malley B.; Craig I.,(1999) p.226

For President Ford putting arms embargo to Turkey would create a reaction from Turkey, such as suspending the military bases activities in Turkey. But the House of Representatives was under the pressure of Greek pressure groups and it was more important than Turkey's reaction.

For Salih, President Gerald Ford in his important speech on the state of the world before a joint session of congress in April, 1975, reaffirmed his conviction that congress should lift the arms embargo against Turkey.⁽³³⁾ To quote President's speech; "I earnestly asked Congress to weigh the broader considerations and consequences of its past actions on the complex Greek and Turkish dispute over Cyprus. Our foreign policy cannot be simply a collection of special economic or ethnic or ideological interests. There must be a deep concern for the overall design of our international actions." He continued saying: "But the results of the congressional action have been to block progress toward reconciliation, thereby prolonging the suffering on Cyprus; to complicate our ability to promote successful negotiations, to increase the danger of a broader conflict. Our longstanding relationship with Turkey is not simply a favor to Turkey; it is clear essential mutual interest. Turkey lies on the rim of the Soviet Union and at the gates of the Middle East. It is vital to the security of the eastern Mediterranean, the southern flank of the Western Europe, and the collective security of the Western alliance. Our US military bases in Turkey are critical to our own security as they are to the defense of NATO."⁽³⁴⁾

As it is clearly seen President Ford was speaking in the Cold War context, declaring Turkey's importance in confronting the Soviet Union and in eastern Mediterranean politics. During the embargo period the US administration tried to preserve the Turkish friendship with the United States.

In the beginning of November 1975, Secretary of the State Henry Kissinger informed Turkish Foreign Minister Melih Esenbel that the Congress would put arms embargo to Turkey. He requested Esenbel not to act strong against the arms embargo

⁽³³⁾ Sa lih H.I.,(1978) p.186

⁽³⁴⁾ Salih H.I.,(1978) p.p. 186-187

because it would create difficult conditions for the US government to act.⁽³⁵⁾ Contrary to Kissinger's request Turkish action was strong. Foreign Minister Esenbel in his speech in the Turkish Senate announced that the American Aid was also for the benefit of the NATO. He continued saying: "USA's Congress action towards Turkey will not create a shift in Turkish Cyprus policy."⁽³⁶⁾ Turkish National Security Council also declared in a message that the US Congress did wrong in making such a decision and trying to put Turkish State under pressure.⁽³⁷⁾ Consequently, "the Turkish government retaliated by announcing that the activities of US bases including electronic monitoring stations that tracked the movement of Soviet troops and missile launched within the USSR were to be suspended" on 25th July, 1975.⁽³⁸⁾

According to the American Secretary of Defense Harold Brown, during the period of 1975 to 1979, Turkey got \$ 425 million credit from the USA Foreign Military Sales Program. Also Turkey bought some spare parts and service to her military from the USA with the contribution of the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency. Furthermore Turkey bought \$ 264 million worth military equipment from the Western countries. Contrary to the Congress' attitudes, Turkey and the USA signed a new defence agreement on 26th March, 1976 but the Congress did not ratify this agreement.⁽³⁹⁾ It can be clearly noted that the US government tried to do her best to assist Turkey during the embargo period. This was a need for the USA for containing the Soviet Union and to have better relations with Turkey.

On 26 July, 1978 the Senate and on 1 August, 1978, the House of Representatives voted to lift the arms embargo against Turkey. Immediately, Turkey gave the permit to reopen the American military bases in Turkey.

According to Joseph "although the gradual lifting of the embargo began in 1976 and was completed in 1978, its impact on USA-Turkish relations was devastating. For

⁽³⁵⁾ Birand M.A.,(1979) p.p. 99-100

⁽³⁶⁾ Uslu N.,(2000) p. 315

⁽³⁷⁾ Uslu N., (2000) p. 315

⁽³⁸⁾ O'Malley B., Craig I. (1999), p. 226

⁽³⁹⁾ Uslu N., (2000) p. 321

Joseph, besides the suspension of military bases, anti-American feelings were sweeping Turkey and irreparable damage had been done to US-Turkish relations. In 1979 when the USA sought to relocate its monitoring stations ousted from Iran after the fall of the Shah, the Turkish government rejected American overtures outright.”⁽⁴⁰⁾ The Turkish Prime Minister Ecevit’s arguments in 1978 were also challenging the US position. “Ecevit, commenting on the dramatic improvement in the Soviet-Turkish relations precipitated by the US embargo, noted that “even if the US embargo is lifted, we cannot rely on the US for our security beyond certain limits”.⁽⁴¹⁾ In short, the arms embargo had no effect on the Cyprus conflict and status quo created by the 1974 Turkish intervention. Turkey refused to withdraw its troops from the island and little progress was made towards a settlement of the problem.

Consequently, for a short period United States had some problems with Greece and Turkey. Greece’s withdrawal from NATO’s military flank and Turkey’s suspending of the military bases were all challenging American interests in the region. But neither Greece nor Turkey had never thought to alienate the West, but rather have only tried to define their own national interests. After the military coup in Turkey in 1980, Turkish military government voted for Greece’s return to NATO’s military flank. Until today United States has run her policy successfully in preventing Turkey and Greece to have a clash and the NATO’s unity has been preserved.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997) p.p. 75-76

⁽⁴¹⁾ Joseph, S.J., (1997) p. 76

CONCLUSION

The American foreign policy in the Middle East and in Cyprus is a reflection of the American global foreign policy. As it has been mentioned in the introduction part, USA did not have an independent Cyprus policy. During the Cold War American foreign policy was based on containing Soviet Union. Between 1945-47 Great Britain was containing the Soviet Union. After the Great Britain's declaration to end her responsibility for the defense of Greece and Turkey, the USA had to extend her sphere of influence. The increasing nationalist feelings of the Middle Eastern countries and the attempts of the Soviet Union to penetrate the eastern Mediterranean triggered the American Foreign policy. The USA declared in 1947 the Truman Doctrine and in the Eisenhower Doctrine to confront the Soviet Union in the Middle East. The Baghdad Pact was formed in 1955, as a part of the American global strategy of regional alliances .

The United States preferred to run her isolationist policy before the World Wars. Nevertheless after the Second World War, the USA had to cease her isolationist policy. By the end of the Second World War, State Department and Council on Foreign Relations laid down the general lines of the American Foreign policy. This needed the collapse of colonialism and political rationalization of the self determination policy. At first Great Britain was very reluctant to cease her imperial policy, especially in Cyprus. Cyprus, after Great Britain's had withdrawn from Egypt, became very important for Britain vital interest. i.e. for her oil policy in the Middle East. Britain thought only for her interests while the USA thought more globally. The changes in the power relation with Great Britain gave the USA an opportunity to pursue her policy.

The United States policy in 1950s was the unification of Cyprus with Greece. Greece being a NATO member would give a chance to USA to use the island for her purposes. However, when Turkey participated in the Cyprus issue, by the encouragement of Great Britain, the US had to change her policy. As it has been mentioned before the American foreign policy had to balance the interests of both Greece and Turkey. From this perspective the best solution, at least for the USA and NATO, was the formation of the Republic of Cyprus in 1960. Great Britain tried to

escape from the American pressure by offering autonomy to the Cypriots but it did not work because of the Greek Cypriot guerilla warfare.

The US pressure on Britain to consider the interests of the West more globally and the high cost to Britain itself of militarily occupying Cyprus against guerilla warfare created the preconditions for a kind of decolonization in Cyprus. The general deconstruction of the British Empire was called the decolonization process. The United States' aim in Cyprus was that the Republic of Cyprus would be a member of NATO. However, the decision of the Cypriot government was to run a non-alliance policy, and the USA saw Makarios as a challenge to her foreign policy. The regional policy of the USA was to prevent the clash between the NATO partners, Turkey and Greece.

In 1963 intercommunal problems began in Cyprus. The intercommunal problems and national ties of Greece and Turkey with Cyprus began to weaken the NATO's southern flank. This was a handicap of the American Foreign policy that had to balance the interests of both Greece and Turkey. In order to solve the problems, she effectively tried to influence the guarantor states, Great Britain, Turkey and Greece. When the guarantor countries were inefficient solving the problem she had to intervene more directly. At this point the role of the USA was to support the solution of the Cyprus issue among her NATO allies. She never preferred to internationalize the Cyprus dispute, because internationalization might have been sponsored by Moscow and international communism, which stood to benefit from the airing of inter-allied differences at the UN.

During the intercommunal fighting and threats of Turkish intervention the Cyprus Government rejected mediation or peacekeeping by NATO and appealed for assistance to Greece, the Soviet Union, Egypt and the United Nations. The reasons of the USA policy change were that the crisis increased to be more serious and the disability of the guarantors to find a solution. First attempt of the USA was to send NATO Commander in Europe, Lemnitzer to prevent a unilateral Turkish intervention and to support the promotion of a political settlement of the problem. The first proposal of the US was that the USA would contribute the formation of a NATO force in Cyprus, Nevertheless the USA had to change her views because the situation in Cyprus was turning worse. The main consequence of the new American attitude was that the British were replaced, as

the main outside arbitrator, by the United States. On January 29th 1964, the United States offered to provide troops for an international peace keeping force in Cyprus. This proposal was accepted by Turkey but turned down by the Makarios regime. The aim of the rejection was to prevent the American troops to come to Cyprus.

In the 1964 the Cold War was still in full gear and the aim of the foreign policy of the USA was to contain the Soviet Union. As a result the Soviets response came soon. She warned the West not to interfere in the internal affairs of the island. Otherwise the Soviet Union would help Cyprus to defend its freedom and independence.

Following Makarios rejection of NATO proposal for an international military force, the UN Security council voted on to create a multi-national UN force to keep the peace in Cyprus. For the USA that was "the second best option". Although the UN force was not a NATO force it would include contingents from NATO countries but not from the Soviet Block. The resolution was a compromise with the Soviets but it gave the USA almost all she wanted, i.e. the Turkish intervention would be prevented and there would be no war between Greece and Turkish.

When the clashes in Cyprus did not stop, Turkey declared her intention of a military intervention. The USA intervened to prevent a military clash that would blow up the southeastern flank of NATO. In response to İnönü's letter which specified the reason of a probable Turkish intervention President Johnson wrote a letter containing threats to the Turkish intervention. From Ankara's perspective, the most aggravating statement in Johnson's letter was that America would not help Turkey in case of a Soviet intervention caused by a Turkish action in Cyprus. But the letter stressed the seriousness of the American concern regarding the situation in the Eastern Mediterranean. It clearly shows how serious the situation was from the American perspective. From then on, Turkish foreign policy changed. Turkey opened up relations with the Soviets and third world countries in order to increase room for manoeuvre in the international relations.

After the Johnson's letter softer American diplomatic efforts continued. President Johnson held separate meeting in Washington with İnönü and Papandreou in 1964. Later the Acheson plan was declared. From the American point of view the Acheson

plan would be satisfactory to both of her allies. The portion of the Island would satisfy Turkey: She would have an area in Cyprus for the security of the southern Turkey and also Greece would be pleased having most of the island. In August 1964 Greek government refused to accept the Acheson plan and the mediation efforts of the USA failed.

From 1964 onwards the International Community's mediation efforts began. For American that was acceptable because during the negotiation process there would be no clash between Turkey and Greece. But when Turkey rejected the Plaza's report she kept silent. It was because America's first choice on the Cyprus problem was to solve it under the NATO umbrella not in the international fora. USA did not think that an UN mediation would solve the Cyprus problem.

The Turco-Soviet rapprochement after the Johnson's letter did not worry the Americans. She was aware of Turkish isolation in international fora and the limits of the Turco-Soviet rapprochement. Turkey would never slip from the American sphere of influence.

During this period, USA was not happy with the government in Greece as well. The Greek government had agreed with Makarios that the United Nations platform should be utilized in the settlement of the dispute. Greece, contrary to the NATO's permanent Council decision, was sending large numbers of troops and equipment to Cyprus, and Papandreou did not prevent Makarios to use the Soviet card whenever Turkey threatened with the intervention.

The Junta coup in Greece in 1967 provided an important opportunity for USA on the Cyprus problem. United States, comparing the Papandreou family and the military Junta, preferred the Junta. The main reason for the Junta's aim to cooperate with US was its domestic unpopularity and its international isolations.

The USA's mediation in solving the Cyprus problem made possible a summit meeting between the leader of the Junta, colonel Papadopoulos and the Turkish Prime

Minister Demirel in September 1967. However the Greek's offer a military base in Cyprus alone was not acceptable for Turkey and talks ended in failure.

After the collapse of the summit talks, an unexpected crisis in Cyprus almost resulted in Turkey's military intervention. The Greek Cypriot National Guard attacked at Turkish Cypriots and as a result Turkey responded by sending jets on warning flights over Cyprus and declared the intention to go to war with Greece, if necessary.

The US political reaction to Turkish intervention threat was not as strong as the respond of 1964. Now the US had more opportunity to influence Grece, because of her international isolation. During this period the USA returned back to more conventional diplomacy and jointed her efforts with that of England, one of the guarantor powers. Furthermore the USA appointed Cyprus Vance as a mediator. This was because at the same time the USA was getting busier in Vietnam. In 1967 crisis, Greece accepted all the Turkish proposals, which were at the same time supported by the USA. Greece was too weak in the international arena to confront the American pressure. In accordance with the agreement reached, Greece withdrew her forces from Cyprus. Consequently, Greece lost a very important deterrent against Turkey's possible future military intervention on the island.

After the withdrawal of the Greeke forces from Cyprus the intercommunal talks started in Cyprus. The U.S. official position was to support the intercommunal talks but a probable agreement should be accepted by Greece and Turkey. This reflected the American tendency to cooperate with Ankara and Athens ofter the governmental changes in Turkey and Greece in 1967.

By 1967 Presedent Johnson's administration had serious domestic problems. The American foreign policy was criticized by several prominent scholars and there were student riots all around of the United States. Even Congress questioned Johnson's strategy on world politics and threatened to develop a foreign policy of its own. Going through the Arab-İsraili war 1967 and the serious problem is the Far East, the USA did not wish to have a Turco-Greek war. As mentioned before, Cyprus question was in the

framework of the American global policy in general and the Middle Eastern Policy in particular. So the aim of the US was to prevent any conflict between NATO partners.

During the Junta's regime in Greece, the USA pursued a policy to control Makarios by the Greek military government. However, the good relations of Makarios with the non-aligned countries gave him room to act freely.

From 1967 onwards the USA used the military bases in Greece without any restrictions, and she gave Greece military aid and supported her in the international fora.

The coup within the Junta in 1973 was a turning point. Greece-Turkey relations began to strain after the new junta got the power. In that period Aegean dispute arose. Oil gained more importance after the Yom Kippur War, due to worldwide price increase. Greece began exploratory oil drilling in the northern Aegean in 1973. In the same year Ankara also declared oil exploration rights in areas of the Aegean, which Greece regarded as her own. When clashes increased the US mediation again came to the stage and all operations of the parties in the Aegean sea had to be postponed. In this period Americans faced provocative maneuvers by the Turkish and Greek naval forces. The Aegean issue was discussed at NATO meeting in Ottawa and Brussels in June 1974. But no solution came out.

The Greek coup on 15 July, 1974 against Makarios again boiled the Cyprus problem. After the coup, the American State Department considered the Cyprus political situation as an internal matter and favoured the continuation of the status quo. She also did not condemn the coup.

There was no doubt that the CIA had the information of the preparations of the coup but the US could do nothing. As mentioned before the allies of the USA had room to act and the relations with the allies but not military force.

The same situation can be seen during Turkish intervention on 20 July 1974. The U.S. used every threat to prevent it but she failed. After the Turkish intervention she tried to prevent a Greco-Turkish war and in this endeavour the USA was successful.

After the Turkish intervention the Greek military junta collapsed- and Karamanlis got the power. From that point on the American plan providing a federal solution was discussed and accepted by Karamanlis but because of the internal opposition in Greece the plan could not be put into effect. In this period Greece withdrew from the NATO's military flank accusing NATO of not being able to prevent the Turkish intervention.

It can be assumed that all the consequences of Cyprus were clashing with the American interests, but the realist is different. The main aim of the USA was to prevent Turco-Greek war and she was successful in that .

During the Greek coup and the Turkish intervention, the USA was accused to be both pro-Turkish and pro-Greek. In reality the United States was neither pro-Turkish nor pro-Greek. The aim of the USA was to pursue her Cold War policy. Her aim was to pressure the parties to solve their problem under the NATO umbrella. The USA pursued a policy that the parties had to decide the form of the government and the solution in Cyprus that they believed would best suit the conditions of Cyprus. At first United States offered the Acheson Plan which covered the interests of Greece and Turkey. When it was rejected she supported the intercommunal talks to settle the Cyprus problem. The United States was silent during the Greek Junta's coup because she (the CIA) supported the colonels and thought it was a good chance to get rid of Makarios. She was also silent during the Turkish intervention as she knew that it was not easy to stop Turkey in her action. The Turkish intervention would also create a geographic division of Cyprus so that there would be no contact between the Turkish and Greek communities to have a clash. Moreover, the USA was successful to stop a military action of Greece against Turkey in 1974.

The American foreign policy can be regarded on successful in preventing a war between the two NATO allies. After some time Turkey lifted her veto and Greece returned to NATO. The NATO's southeastern flank was back together. Consequently, the Soviet Union was successfully kept out of the region which was the main aim of the USA.

Appendix 1

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S LETTER TO PRIME MINISTER İNÖNÜ JUNE 5, 1964

Dear Mr. Prime Minister:

I am gravely concerned by the information which I have had through Ambassador Hare from you and your Foreign Minister that the Turkish Government is contemplating a decision to intervene by military force to occupy a portion of Cyprus. I wish to emphasize, in the fullest friendship and frankness, that I do not consider that such a course of action by Turkey, fraught with such far-reaching consequences, is consistent with the commitment of your Government to consult fully in advance with us. Ambassador Hare has indicated that you have postponed your decision for a few hours in order to obtain my views. I put to you personally whether you really believe that it is appropriate for your Government, in effect, to present a unilateral decision of such consequence to an ally who has demonstrated such staunch support over the years as has the United States for Turkey. I must, therefore, first urge you to accept the responsibility for complete consultation with the United States before any such action is taken.

It is my impression that you believe that such intervention by Turkey is permissible under the provisions of the Treaty of Guarantee of 1960. I must call your attention, however, to our understanding that the proposed intervention by Turkey would be for the purpose of effecting a from of partition of the Island, a solution which is specifically excluded by the Treaty of Guarantee. Further, that Treaty requires consultation among the Guarantor Powers. It is the view of the United States that the possibilities of such consultation have by no means been exhausted in this situation and that, therefore, the reservation of the right to take unilateral action is not yet applicable.

I must call to your attention, also, Mr. Prime Minister, the obligations of NATO. There can be no question in your mind that a Turkish intervention in Cyprus would lead to a military engagement between Turkish and Greek forces. Secretary of State Rusk declared at the recent meeting of the Ministerial Council of NATO in The Hague that war between Turkey and Greece must be considered as "literally unthinkable." Adhesion to NATO, in its

very essence, means that NATO countries will not wage war on each other. Germany and France have buried centuries of animosity and hostility in becoming NATO allies; nothing less can be expected from Greece and Turkey. Furthermore, a military intervention in Cyprus by Turkey could lead to a direct involvement by the Soviet Union. I hope you will understand that your NATO allies have not had a chance to consider whether they have an obligation to protect Turkey against the Soviet Union if Turkey takes a step which results in Soviet intervention without the full consent and understanding of its NATO Allies.

Further, Mr. Prime Minister, I am concerned about the obligations of Turkey as a member of the United Nations. The United Nations has provided forces on the Island to keep the peace. Their task has been difficult but, during the past several weeks, they have been progressively successful in reducing the incidents of violence on that Island. The United Nations Mediator has not yet completed his work. I have no doubt that the general membership of the United Nations would react in the strongest terms to unilateral action by Turkey which would defy the efforts of the United Nations and destroy any prospect that the United Nations could assist in obtaining a reasonable and peaceful settlement of this difficult problem.

I wish also, Mr. Prime Minister, to call your attention to the bilateral agreement between the United States and Turkey in the field of military assistance. Under Article IV of the Agreement with Turkey of July 1947, your Government is required to obtain United States consent for the use of military assistance for purposes other than those for which such assistance was furnished. Your Government has on several occasions acknowledged to the United States that you fully understand this condition. I must tell you in all candor that the United States cannot agree to the use of any United States supplied military equipment for a Turkish intervention in Cyprus under present circumstances.

Moving to the practical results of the contemplated Turkish move, I feel obligated to call to your attention in the most friendly fashion the fact that such a Turkish move could lead to the slaughter of tens of thousands of Turkish Cypriots on the Island of Cyprus. Such an action on your part would unleash the furies and there is no way by which military action on your part could be sufficiently effective to prevent wholesale destruction of many of those whom you are trying to protect. The presence of United Nations forces could not prevent such a catastrophe.

You may consider that what I have said is much too severe and that we are disregarding of Turkish interests in the Cyprus situation. I should like to assure you that this is not the case. We have exerted ourselves both publicly and privately to assure the safety of Turkish Cypriots and to insist that a final solution of the Cyprus problem should rest upon the consent of the parties most directly concerned. It is possible that you feel in Ankara that the United States has not been sufficiently active in your behalf. But surely you know that our policy has caused the liveliest resentments in Athens (where demonstrations have been aimed against us) and has led to a basic alienation between the United States and Archbishop Makarios. As I said to your Foreign Minister in our conversation just a few weeks ago, we value very highly our relations with Turkey. We have considered you as a great ally with fundamental common interests. Your security and prosperity have been a deep concern of the American people and we have expressed that concern in the most practical terms. You and we have fought together to resist the ambitions of the Communist world revolution. This solidarity has meant a great deal to us and I would hope that it means a great deal to your Government and to your people. We have no intention of lending any support to any solution of Cyprus which endangers the Turkish Cypriot community. We have not been able to find a final solution because this is, admittedly, one of the most complex problems on earth. But I wish to assure you that we have been deeply concerned about the interests of Turkey and of the Turkish Cypriots and will remain so.

Finally, Mr. Prime Minister, I must tell you that you have posed the gravest issues of war and peace. These are issues which go far beyond the bilateral relations between Turkey and the United States. They not only will certainly involve war between Turkey and Greece but could involve wider hostilities because of the unpredictable consequences which a unilateral intervention in Cyprus could produce. You have your responsibilities as Chief of the Government of Turkey; I also have mine as President of the United States. I must, therefore, inform you in the deepest friendship that unless I can have your assurance that you will not take such action without further and fullest consultation I cannot accept your injunction to Ambassador Hare or secrecy and must immediately ask for emergency meetings of the NATO Council and of the United Nations Security Council.

I wish it were possible for us to have personal discussion of this situation. Unfortunately, because of the special circumstances of our present Constitutional position, I

am not able to leave the United States. If you could come here for a full discussion I would welcome it. I do feel that you and I carry a very heavy responsibility for the general peace and for the possibilities of a sane and peaceful resolution of the Cyprus problem. I ask you, therefore, to delay any decisions which you and your colleagues might have in mind until you and I have had the fullest and frankest consultation.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson

REFERENCES

- 1) Adams, T.W and Cotrell, A.J., Cyprus: Between East and West. The John Hopkins Press. Baltimore 1968.
- 2) Alemdar, Ş., International Aspects of the Cyprus Problem, Ed. C.H. Dodd. The Political, Social and Economic Development of Northern Cyprus. The Eothen Press. Cambridgeshire 1993.
- 3) Altan, M., Süperler ve Türkiye. Afa Yayınları. İstanbul 1986.
- 4) Attalides, M., Cyprus, Nationalism and International Politics. Q Press. Edinburgh 1979.
- 5) Bahçeli, T., Greek-Turkish Relations Since 1955. Westpoint Press. Boulder, San Francisco & London 1990.
- 6) Birand, M.A., Diyet: Türkiye ve Kıbrıs Üzerine Uluslararası Pazarlıklar. Ağaoğlu Yayınevi. İstanbul 1979.
- 7) Birand, M.A., 30 Hot Days. Kemal Rüstem & Brother. Nicosia 1985.
- 8) Bostanoğlu, B., Türkiye-ABD İlişkilerinin Politikası: Kuram ve Siyasa. İmge Kitabevi. Ankara 1999.
- 9) Denktash, R., The Cyprus Triangle. The Office of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. New York 1988.
- 10) Ehrlich, T., Cyprus: 1958-1967. London Oxford University Press. London 1974.
- 11) Eisenhower, D.D., The White House Years: 1956-1961. Doubleday Company, Inc. Washington D.C. 1965.
- 12) Gaddis, S.L., Strategies of Containment. Oxford University Press. New York. Oxford 1982.
- 13) Hitchens, C., Cyprus. Quarted Books Ltd. London. 1984.
- 14) Joseph, S.J. Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Politics. Macmillan Press Ltd. London 1997.
- 15) Kızılyürek, N., Turkey and Greece in the Realism of Western Politics Towards the Near East 1945-1985, The Cyprus Review, Volume 6 Number 2 Fall 1994.
- 16) Kosut, H., Cyprus: 1946-68, Facts on File, Inc. New York 1970.
- 17) Krieger, J., Politics of the World. Oxford University Press. New York 1982.
- 18) Kyriakides, S., Cyprus: Constitutionalism and Crisis Government. University of Pennsylvania Press. Pennsylvania 1968.

- 19) Moran, M., Resolution 186. It's Genesis and Significance. Manoeuvres at the UN in 1964. CYREP. Nicosia 1999.
- 20) Nye, J.S.Jr., Understanding International Conflicts. An Introduction to Theory and History. Longman. New York 1999.
- 21) Oberling, P., The Road to Bellapais. The Turkish Cypriot Exodus to Northern Cyprus. Colombia University Press. East European Monographs, No. CXXV. Atlantic Studies. Brooklyn College Studies on Society in Change. No. 25. New York 1982.
- 22) O'Malley, B. & Craig, I., The Cyprus Conspiracy: America, Espionage and the Turkish Invasion. I.B. Tauris Publishers London. New York 1999.
- 23) Papandreou, A., Namlunun Ucundaki Demokrasi. Üçüncü Dünya Yayınları. İstanbul 1977.
- 24) Reddaway, S., Burdened With Cyprus: The British Connection. K. Rüstem & Brother and Weidenfeld & Nicolson Ltd. London 1986.
- 25) Salih, H.I., Cyprus: An Analysis of Cypriot Political Discord. Teo Gaus' Sons. Inc. New York 1968.
- 26) Salih, H.I., Cyprus: The Impact of Diverse Nationalism on a State. The University of Alabama Press. Alabama 1978.
- 27) Sander, O., Siyasi Tarih. Imge Kitabevi. Ankara 1993.
- 28) Schulzinger, R.D., US Diplomacy since 1900. Oxford University Press. New York 1998.
- 29) Sonyel, S.R., Cyprus: The Destruction of a Republic. British Documents 1960-65. The Eothen Press. Cambridgeshire 1997.
- 30) Sönmezoğlu, F., ABD'nin Türkiye Politikası (1964-1980). Der Yayınları. İstanbul 1995.
- 31) Spainer, J., American Foreign Policy Since World War II. Congressional Quarterly Inc. Washington D.C. 1997.
- 32) Stefanidis, I.D., Isle of Discord: Nationalism, Imperialism and the Making of the Cyprus Problem. Hurst Company. London 1999.
- 33) Suistola, J., Cyprus: A Conflict in Deadlock. Unpublished paper. 2001.
- 34) Tamkoç, M., The Turkish Cypriot State. K. Rüstem & Brother. London 1988.
- 35) Theophylactou, D.A., American foreign policy vis-à-vis Turkey, Greece and Cyprus: A historical perspective. The Cyprus Review. Volume 5 Number 1. Spring 1993.

- 36) Uslu, N., Türk-American İlişkilerinde Kıbrıs. 21. Yüzyıl Yayınları. Ankara 2000.
- 37) Vanezis, P.N., Makarios: Pragmatism V. Idealism. Abelard-Schuman. London 1974.
- 38) Williams, W.C. Mc & Piotrowski, H., The World Since 1945. Lynne Rienner Publishers. Colorado 1993.