

**In the Grip of Political Clientelism: The Post-1974 Turkish Cypriot Politics and the Politico-Economic Foundations of Pro-*Taksim* Consensus**

**Von der Fakultät für Gesellschaftswissenschaften der Universität Duisburg-Essen zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades**

**Dr. rer. pol.**

**genehmigte Dissertation**

**von**

**Sertac Sonan**

**aus**

**Nikosia, Zypern**

**1. Gutachter: Prof. em. Dr. Heinz-Jürgen Axt**

**2. Gutachter: Prof. Dr. Susanne Pickel**

**Tag der Disputation: 18/03/2014**

**Diese Arbeit wurde vom Fachbereich Gesellschaftswissenschaften der Universität Duisburg-Essen als Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades (Dr. rer. pol.) genehmigt.**

**Name der Gutachterinnen und Gutachter:**

- 1. Prof. em. Dr. Heinz-Jürgen Axt**
- 2. Prof. Dr. Susanne Pickel**

**Tag der Disputation: 18/03/2014**

## Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i> .....	v
<i>Abbreviations</i> .....	vi
<i>Tables</i> .....	viii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework: What is Political Clientelism? .....	14
1.1 Clientelism of Notables .....	15
1.2 Party-Based Patronage (Machine Politics).....	23
1.3 Accounting for the Emergence of Political Clientelism: Three Theoretical Approaches .....	29
1.4 Research Strategy.....	38
Chapter 2: The Turkish Cypriot Political Community in the Making: History of Electoral Politics and Roots of <i>Taksim</i> Policy .....	43
2.1 A Brief Overview of Politics among Turkish Cypriots in the British Period.....	43
2.2 <i>Taksim</i> : The Birth of a Vision for a Turkish Cypriot Political Community .....	49
2.3 The 1960 Republic and the First Elections .....	53
2.4 The Evolution of Separate Turkish Cypriot Administrations.....	60
2.5 Elections in the Post-1968 Period .....	67
2.6 The Role of Political Clientelism in the Pre-1974 Period.....	72
Chapter 3: Why Political Clientelism? Priorities of the Political Elite and their Choice of Mass Political Mobilization Strategy .....	78
3.1 Demand Side: Socio-Economic Structure of the Population.....	80
3.2 Supply Side: The Resource Base and the State of Bureaucracy.....	85
3.3 The <i>Taksim</i> Policy and Legitimacy Crisis of the Ruling Political Elite .....	96
3.3.1 External Dimension.....	97
3.3.2 Internal Dimension.....	104

3.4 Setting the Stage: The Wider Political and Institutional Context .....	108
Chapter 4: UBP: The Anatomy of a Machine .....	116
4.1 Dividing Lines Between Parties and Denктаş’s Catch 22 .....	116
4.2 A Brief Overview of the UBP’s Establishment Process, Program, and Social Composition.....	121
4.3 The Party Organization .....	126
4.4 The First Wave of Mass Political Mobilization and the Setting Up of the Machine....	132
Chapter 5: A Ruling Party at Odds with Itself.....	144
5.1 The Rise of the Junta .....	146
5.2 Split Within the Junta and Raif Denктаş’s Anti-Clientelistic Intra-Party Opposition	157
5.3 Denктаş’s Reclaiming of the Party .....	166
5.4 Fall of the Junta and the Unlikely Rise of Erođlu – Revenge is a dish best served cold! .....	176
5.5 The Emergence of the Rift between Denктаş and Erođlu .....	183
Chapter 6: The Left’s Perfect Storm: A Politico-Economic Analysis of the End of the Monopoly of Nationalism in Turkish Cypriot Politics.....	192
6.1 Delayed Catalysis: The Agonies of the Old Regime .....	194
6.2. The Public Sector: How bloated is it? .....	203
6.3 Bureaucratic Clientelism .....	208
6.4 The Collapse .....	216
Conclusions.....	228
<i>Annex</i> .....	235
<i>Bibliography</i> .....	236

## **Acknowledgments**

This dissertation is the culmination of years of research and along the way I have accumulated a great deal of practical and intellectual debts. My biggest debt is to my supervisor Heinz-Jürgen Axt. I would like to thank him for his guidance, kindness and patience in this long process.

Carlo Masala has always been generous with his time and comments. My debt to him goes far deeper than these words of thanks can convey. I am indebted to Hannes Lacher who encouraged me to pursue PhD and guided me in the early phases of the research. Yücel Vural's endless support throughout my post-graduate studies has been invaluable.

My sincere thanks go to Ahmet Cavit An, Altay Nevzat, Mehmet Birinci, Mehmet Öner Ekinci, Mete Hatay, Tuncay Yalçuk and Thomas Jütting for their contribution at different stages of the research. I am also grateful to all the people who consented to be interviewed.

My research was partly funded by Dr. Ahmet Cemal Adademir and his wife Asiye Adademir Education Foundation. Çağın Refik, a member of the board of trustees of the foundation, deserves special mention.

Finally, very special thanks go to my parents, Fatma and Hasan, my cousin Şerif Çağlı, and my wife Meral. Without their support this dissertation would not have existed.

## Abbreviations

AKEL	Progressive Party of the Working People (Greek Cypriot)
AP	Justice Party (Turkey)
AKP	Justice and Development Party (Turkey)
CHP	Republican People's Party (Turkey)
CTP	Republican Turkish Party
DC	Christian Democracy (Italy)
DP	Democratic Party
DHP	Democratic People's Party
DMP	Democratic Struggle Party
DPÖ	State Planning Organization
EOKA	National Organisation of Cypriot Fighters (Greek Cypriot)
EU	European Union
HLFS	Household Labor Force Survey
HP	Populist Party
İŞAD	TRNC Businessmen Association
İTEM	Settlement, Land Distribution and Equivalent Property Law
KATAK	Association of Turkish Minorities of the Island of Cyprus
KTÖS	Primary School Teachers Union
KTTO	Turkish Cypriot Chamber of Commerce
RoC	Republic of Cyprus
SEE	State Economic Enterprise
TBP	Turkish Unity Party
TFSC	Turkish Federated State of Cyprus
TRNC	Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

TMFA	Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs
TMT	Turkish Resistance Organization
UBP	National Unity Party
UN	United Nations
YDP	New Birth Party

## Tables

Table 1: Total employment figures.....	205
Table 2: HLFS basic indicators .....	205
Table 3: Public employment as a percentage of selected indicators.....	206
Table 4: Pensioners and public sector employees as a percentage of registered voters ....	207
Table 5: Average share of wages and salaries in total public expenditure in Southern, Western and Northern Europe (As percentage of the state budget) .....	208
Table 6: Public sector employees recruited through the Public Service Commission .....	210
Table 7: The Turkish financial assistance as percentage of the budget expenditures. ....	235

## Introduction

By voting in favor of the United Nations' (UN) reunification plan on 24 April 2004, Turkish Cypriots caught many casual observers of the Cyprus conflict by surprise because in doing so they have made a huge U-turn from their half a century old policy of *taksim* (partition). Until very recently, the proponents of *taksim* had always been in power and their electoral support was on the rise even until few years earlier. However, first, their votes declined sharply in the December 2003 parliamentary election, which brought about the first ever government led by a pro-reunification prime minister. A year after the referendum, Rauf Denktaş (henceforth, Denktaş), who had led the Turkish Cypriot quest for partition for almost five decades, was replaced as president of the self-proclaimed Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) by a supporter of reunification, Mehmet Ali Talat. Few months later, Derviş Eroğlu (henceforth, Eroğlu), the leader of the National Unity Party (*Ulusal Birlik Partisi*, UBP), who had served some fifteen years as prime minister, stepped down as the party leader. Within only a matter of months, the symbols of old regime fell one after another, marking the end of an era in Turkish Cypriot political life -though, ironically, not the end of the TRNC itself, as Greek Cypriots who had rejected the UN plan by a huge margin maintained an intransigent position in the negotiations held afterwards.

How can we explain the nationalists' sudden and dramatic fall from grace? Given their past, uninterrupted electoral success despite their dismal record in the provision of public goods such as sustained economic growth, monetary stability, a well-established public health-care and education system or at the very least, international recognition for the TRNC, it is highly unlikely that this was the price paid for failing to deliver on their promises. Has the Turkish Cypriot community become less nationalist all of a sudden, then? After all, as Vural and Peristianis (2008: 46) also highlight, one of the fundamental differences between the Turkish Cypriot political parties is their stance towards the Cyprus problem. The Turkish nationalists who favor the partition or status quo are considered right-wing, and parties favoring the reunification of the island on the basis of a federation are considered left-wing. Therefore, had we talked about an ideal case portrayed by "the responsible government model," where "above all, programmatic linkages matter for democratic accountability and responsiveness," (see Kitschelt 2000: 846) our answer could be "yes".

As the comparative politics literature shows, however, there are strategies linking the electorate and political parties together other than program. Political clientelism, which *“represents a transaction, the direct exchange of a citizen’s vote in return for direct payments or continuing access to employment, goods, and services,”* (Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007: 2, emphasis in original) is the most remarkable of these strategies. Where this strategy prevails, a government “party’s (or its program’s) popularity” cannot be inferred from its electoral successes (Stokes 2007: 607). In other words, the fact that Turkish Cypriot voters had kept the nationalists in power for almost 30 years does not necessarily prove that they had been bewitched by the nationalistic rhetoric of the pro-partition parties. Likewise, the fact that they have favored the Annan plan does not mean that the spell is gone, and they relinquished secessionism once and for all. We need to see both of these facts as consequences of certain historical and politico-economic dynamics. This study aims to explore these dynamics on the basis of the political clientelism literature. In doing so, as a subsidiary goal, it also aims to account for the underperformance of the Turkish Cypriot economy in the post-1974 period despite favorable initial conditions and billions of dollars of financial assistance funneled from Ankara. And thirdly, it can be seen as an attempt to outline the political history of Turkish Cypriots.

The research agenda followed in this study seeks to contribute not just to our understanding of the politico-economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community, but is also meant to contribute to the study of the Cyprus conflict in general. For a long time, the students of the Cyprus conflict have generally followed roughly three analytical perspectives: The clash of Turkish and Greek ethno-nationalisms (Attalides 1979; Mavratsas 2000; Kızılyürek 2002), the maintenance of the balance of power between Turkey and Greece in the Eastern Mediterranean (Theophanous 2001; Tayfur 2002) and the manipulation by external powers (Kitromilides and Couloumbis 1976; Pollis 1979a; Pollis 1998). The “Europeanization of the Cyprus problem” after the Republic of Cyprus’ (RoC) application for full membership, and the European Union’s (EU) decision to accept it as a candidate state, brought an additional dimension to these debates, and the possible effects of EU membership process attracted scholarly interest starting from the late 1990s (Axt and Brey 1998; Baier-Allen 1999; Diez 2002). Though all of these approaches possess valuable explanatory power, they provide only partial accounts of the changes outlined above. What is missing is, firstly, an account of the political competition within each

community in general, and within the Turkish Cypriot community in particular; the analysis of competing views over how to construct the Turkish Cypriot political community. Therefore, the research agenda pursued here seeks to complement, though not altogether displace, the existing focus on inter-ethnic conflict with a perspective that highlights the *intra-ethnic* sources of the ongoing state of affairs in Cyprus, and the mechanisms through which a particular vision of political community –which ruled out a unified Cyprus- was maintained. Secondly, I suggest that these mechanisms cannot be addressed in purely cultural terms, as much of the literature seeks to do, but need to be complemented by a politico-economic framework that addresses both the material aims of existing and contending elites, and the gains and costs incurred by different social groups.

In this context, the political sea change outlined above will be explained on the basis of - what turned out to be- a *temporary* crisis in the operation of the post-1974 politico-economic order, which had increasingly relied on political distribution of economic resources for its survival. This is to say the Turkish Cypriots' approval of the UN's reunification plan was essentially an attempt to escape from the social, political and economic ills, which this order have led to, by jumping on the EU train. In this effort to explain this historic turning point, the literature of political clientelism is used as the theoretical framework because as it will be illustrated in the chapters to come, it provides us with more explanatory power than any other competing approach in the analysis of the post-1974 politico-economic order in general, and the decline of the pro-*taksim* right in the early 2000s, in particular.

The dissertation is planned in accordance with this perspective. At the center of the research is a political party, the UBP. In the course of the study, it will be shown that (a) political clientelism was not a remnant of pre-democratic past or a cultural anomaly, but rather a strategy deliberately adopted by the UBP during its establishment phase to lock itself into power; (b) this was because the UBP has styled itself as the sole guardian of the state against the “enemy within”; (c) this attempt to exclude the opposition led to the emergence of a *guided democracy* or a *democrazia bloccata*<sup>1</sup>, and triggered widespread corruption; (d) this insistence to keep the UBP in power turned northern Cyprus into an

---

<sup>1</sup>The term is used in the sense developed by Mouzelis. He used it to describe the post-civil war order in Greece (cited in Mouzelis and Pagoulatos 2002). In a similar vein, *democrazia bloccata* is the term used to denote the post-World War II Italy (see, for instance, Sassoon 1995).

aid junkie or an *area assistita*<sup>2</sup>, and finally (e) the system came in the brink of almost complete breakdown in the eve of the 2004 referendum mainly due to two consecutive economic crises whose adverse effects spun out of control because of an infighting within the nationalist camp, and hence the referendum result.

Before focusing on the merits of political clientelism as a toolbox for research, I will briefly look at the relevant literature on Turkish Cypriot politics –which turned out to be surprisingly shallow (a) to see to what extent the approach adopted here was used before, and (b) to identify the gaps that can be plugged by this dissertation. I will start with three studies by Tayfur (2002), Kalodukas (2003) and Yaşın (1989), which aim to account for the emergence and perpetuation of the Cyprus conflict with a politico-economic approach.

According to Tayfur, the Cyprus conflict is nothing but a battlefield in the broader historical Turco-Greek rivalry over the domination of the Eastern Mediterranean i.e. a race to become the Western capitalism's agent in the region, which had started with the emergence of the Greek state in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and has escalated after the establishment of the modern Turkish state in 1923. Tayfur analyzes the rivalry between these two countries and its implications on the Cyprus problem in the framework of the world system theory. The downside of this work is that it completely overlooks the island level actors and interests.

Like Tayfur, Kalodukas suggests that the Cyprus problem, especially after 1974, should be considered as a part of the general Turco-Greek competition (2003: 71), and that every phase of it has been determined by the balance of power between the Greek and Turkish “capitalists” at the given period (*ibid.*: 103). In addition, he identifies the conflicts between the Greek Cypriot and the Turkish Cypriot capitalists on the one hand, and the conflicts between the Greek Cypriot and the Greek capitalists on the other, as the other reasons behind the perpetuation of the Cyprus problem. Yet, Kalodukas' approach is one-sided and therefore incomplete, as he does not elaborate on the Turkish Cypriot actors' interests. He tends to explain different historical developments in the Cyprus problem with the greed of the Greek Cypriot capitalists per se. For instance, incidents of the 1963-1974 period were consequences of “the apartheid regime” imposed by the Greek Cypriot “capitalists” on the Turkish Cypriots (*ibid.*: 75-9) and, the rigid rejectionist stance of the Greek Cypriot

---

<sup>2</sup> The term is used in the sense developed by Chubb (1982).

administrations between 1978 and 1988 was shaped by the Greek Cypriot capitalists' interests (*ibid.*: 95). In a similar vein, he argues that since Makarios-Denktaş High Level Agreement in 1977, the negotiation process has been in effect a struggle between the Greek Cypriot capitalists who has been trying to extend their influence over the north through a strong federal government and the Turkish Cypriot "side" who has been trying to prevent this by insisting on a weaker central government (*ibid.*: 91; 99).

At the single point, where he refers to the Turkish Cypriot capitalists in concrete terms, his analysis is flawed because apparently, he sees this class as a monolithic entity. He suggests that the mass movement in the early 2000s against the establishment in the north, was in conflict with the preferences of the Turkish Cypriot capitalists (*ibid.*: 126; 130). However, this is to overlook the active role of the Turkish Cypriot Chamber of Commerce (*Kıbrıs Türk Ticaret Odası*, KTTO) and other smaller business associations, which obviously represent a significant segment if not the entire Turkish Cypriot "capitalist" class, in this process.

Yaşın (1989) also sees the conflicting interests of the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot "bourgeoisies" as the source of the problem. However, with a diametrically opposite view to Kalodukas', who reduces everything to the greed of the Greek Cypriot capitalists, Yaşın goes as far as arguing that, the *taksim* policy stemmed from the dissatisfaction of the nascent Turkish Cypriot bourgeoisie in the late 1940s, which found its channels of development blocked by the more developed Greek Cypriot bourgeoisie. According to Yaşın, "From Turk to Turk" campaign reveals that the main motive of the *taksim* camp was in essence to create a separate Turkish Cypriot market (1989: 42-6; 69-70). The problem with this argument is that it is devoid of strong empirical evidence. In other words, overall, their other merits aside, the three studies concerned do not sufficiently and accurately study the politico-economic dynamics within the Turkish Cypriot community in creating or sustaining the Cyprus problem.

Unlike the three scholars mentioned before, Kızılyürek and Choisi do not put economic interests at the center of discussion in their efforts to account for the roots of the Cyprus conflict. Kızılyürek shows that the emergence of political/bureaucratic wing of the Turkish Cypriot upper class historically preceded the formation of an economic elite and therefore that the creation of a separate market/economy was only an ideological instrument and not a desire articulated by a class. According to Kızılyürek the Turkish nationalism in

Cyprus and its offspring *taksim* is devoid of any bourgeois class base, and is basically a counter-nationalist movement trying to cope with external factors including the Greek Cypriot chauvinism (1988: 17 and 104; 2003b: 17-18; see also Choisi 1993a: 19; 1997: 25). In other words, having a separate market/economy was a means and not the end for the Turkish Cypriot nationalist elite. In a somewhat similar vein, Choisi sees the Cyprus problem not as a conflict between the economic elites of the two sides but as an inter-elite conflict, in which nationalist ideologies were instrumentalized by the ruling elites in both sides “for mobilizing masses and for pursuing their interests” (1993b: 9-10; 13). It is important to note that both Choisi and Kızılyürek identify the unequal economic development process as an element, which served the deepening of the inter-elite conflict back in the 1950s (Choisi 1993b: 13; Kızılyürek 2003a: 253), but not as a reason for the conflict per se.

When it comes to explaining the perpetuation of the conflict in the post-1974 period, again, Kızılyürek and Choisi have similar approaches. They both emphasize the role of ideology i.e. Turkish nationalism, while acknowledging the role of political distribution of economic resources in the reproduction of the existing power relations. According to Kızılyürek, for instance, until 1974, the Turkish Cypriot political/bureaucratic elite had to rely only on ideology -which was anti-Greek, anti-Communist and aspired for a separate economy and a separate state- and rough repression to retain control. After attainment of the latter two elements of the ideology in 1974, political and economic organization of the Turkish Cypriot elite was strengthened in the second half of the 1970s, and repression and ideology began to be coupled by the distribution of material benefits (Kızılyürek 1988: 105). Choisi also identifies political clientelism as a means for maintaining power for the ruling elite (1993b: 14). But still, her main emphasis is on the ideology.<sup>3</sup>

This study complements the works of Kızılyürek and Choisi by focusing on the politico-economic dimension of the issue without of course ignoring the interaction of the material and ideological means in the reproduction of the existing power relations maintaining division on the island. In this effort, political clientelism literature provides us with an important analytical tool. Yet, the literature review reveals that this tool has been

---

<sup>3</sup> Based on the English summary of the study.

underutilized despite the abundance of anecdotal evidence showing that political clientelism has been a strong element of the Turkish Cypriot political life.

Since the first multi-party elections held in 1976, there has not been even a single election, which was not tainted by the opposition's claims about the selective and partisan use of the public resources by the ruling UBP, be it *inter alia* in the form of distribution of the Greek Cypriot movable/immovable properties, employment in the public sector, granting citizenship to Turkish citizens, granting taxi and rental car permits, and soft loans to fellow businessmen, or simply buying votes by offering cash. To take a random look at the local newspapers in any given election period suffices to have an idea about how extensively the UBP exploited its access to public resources to elicit electoral support. The media is full of anecdotes showing that from simple layman to the president, everyone has had something to complain about the irregularities in the election periods.

Furthermore, there are reports and even testimony of politicians admitting vote buying. In his report on December 2003 parliamentary election for the Norwegian Centre for Human Rights, for instance, Hylland states that "there is no reasonable doubt that vote buying and undue influence on voters occurred in connection with the 2003 parliamentary elections" (2004: 42). "It is not just a question of isolated cases. Such practices were widespread, at least in some segments of the population," the report concludes (*ibid.*).<sup>4</sup> More recently, in the aftermath of the 2009 election, Serdar Denktaş, the leader of the Democratic Party (*Demokrat Parti*, DP) and a former UBP deputy, apparently out of extreme exasperation, and with an expectation to pave the way for a system-wide catharsis admitted that his party bribed the voters. He was quoted as saying that all parties bought votes for cash: "We also bought votes ... If there is any party that says it did not also do so ... I'll put the proof in front of them".<sup>5</sup> The former head of the Turkish Cypriot Bar Association confirms that cash-for-vote is a "'well established' practice," and that "voters had 'grown used to being able to get cash for their votes'".<sup>6</sup> What is more, there are two different reports, one prepared by a parliamentary enquiry committee, and the other by the attorney general's office confirming the extensive use of public resources to gain votes in the eve of the 1990 and 1993 elections respectively.

---

<sup>4</sup> According to Hylland, reportedly "the price of a vote was, and had for a long time been, USD 100" (2004: 30).

<sup>5</sup> Cited in Simon Bahçeli: "Votes for cash claim in north." *Cyprus Mail*, 25.4.2009.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

Yet, the dearth of scholarly interest on politico-economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community equally applies to the study of political clientelism. To date, the role of political clientelism in the Turkish Cypriot politics have not been subject to a full-scale research though the abuse of the state's resources by politicians has been referred to many times in the literature (see for instance Warner 1993; Olgun 1993; Lacher and Kaymak 2005). Common point about all these studies is that neither of them is particularly interested in revealing the full extent and historical development of the clientelistic relations in a systematic way. All of them mention existence of such relations in passing, but do not elaborate on the issue. The only notable exception is the work of Egemen (2006), whose approach is fundamentally different from this dissertation. While Egemen sees the political clientelism in the post-1974 period only as the continuation of a process, whose roots can be traced back to the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, and therefore structural, this one seeks to show that its emergence was a result of a strategic choice made after 1974 to sustain the *taksim* project. The other differences between the two studies will be specified in the course of the dissertation.

When it comes to the relationship between political clientelism and its adverse effects on economic development, again, there is not much at hand. It is true that the Turkish Cypriot economy has attracted more scholarly interest than its political economy or its politics. However, most of the time these studies don't go further than enumerating the well-known pretexts for failure in economic development like "the unjust international isolation" and "structural disadvantages of being a small island economy". Mismanagement of the economy and the pervasiveness of political distribution are hardly taken up. For instance, a bloated public sector, one of the symptoms of political clientelism, is pointed out as a major problem almost in every study on the Turkish Cypriot economy (Olgun 1993: 275-9 and 289; Gumpel 1997: 71-2; TÜSiAD 1998; Türel 2002: 95; Balkır 2005; Seyidođlu 2004: 228; İneci 2004: 203; Kalaycı 2004: 189). However, most of the time, the authors tend not to establish a causal relationship between political expediency and over-employment in the public sector. When they do so, generally they tend to attribute this to more benign political motives such as boosting up the psychology of the people (İneci 2004: 203) or concerns to avoid emigration and unemployment (Türel 2002: 99). And only in some exceptional cases, they attribute this to use of public employment "as political bribery

during election years” by the governments, which aimed to “monopolize power” (Olgun 1993: 277; see also Balkır 2005).

There are two notable studies, which diverge from this mainstream approach: Altan (2003: 91-118) and Uğur (2003) explain economic problems of the TRNC with political distribution of the resources. Altan’s contribution is noteworthy as he establishes a causal relationship between economic crisis/decline of economic resources available for distribution, and political change/reorganization within community both in Turkey and Cyprus, though he does not relate this change directly with the Cyprus problem (2003: 93). His analysis is mainly on Turkey. But he likens the structure of the political distribution of economic resources, a structure devoid of economic rationality, in north Cyprus to the system in Turkey, and suggests that this structure is condemned to failure once economic resources dry up (*ibid.*: 103). The EU accession process or the negotiations with the IMF for stand-by agreements are seen as external dynamics to achieve, what is impossible with internal dynamics alone. That is why he sees the frequent crises of political distribution in general and the 2001 economic crisis in particular, as opportunities to transform and reorganize the entrenched system of political distribution (*ibid.*: 111). Altan highlights that the transformation starts when masses realize that the flow of money is in decline (*ibid.*: 103). He also stresses that the mechanism, which is based on political distribution of money coming from external sources cannot last long (*ibid.*: 104). Overall, Altan sees economic irrationality embodied by the political distribution of economic resources as the reason of economic crises not only in Turkey but in Cyprus as well. The problem is political and so is its solution, he argues.

Uğur (2003), who discusses the role of political clientelism in the Turkish Cypriot community within the context of accession to the EU, comes up with one of the most detailed analysis made so far on this issue. Basically, he argues that the widespread belief that the EU membership would facilitate economic growth in the north, alleviating the development gap between the two sides should not be taken for granted, given “the institutional/governance” inefficiencies in the north i.e. the clientelistic structure and dependence on the Turkish aid. Uğur suggests that these kinds of weaknesses may lead to widening of the gap between the two sides and subsequently threaten the sustainability of a prospective federal Cypriot state. Uğur’s contribution is important, as he clearly explains the sluggish economic performance of the north with political clientelism (2003: 61-2).

Going one step further, he establishes a causal relationship between this clientelistic structure and the Turkish Cypriot position in the inter-communal negotiations, and suggests that the legitimacy derived from this clientelist structure gave the ruling elite a free hand to pursue a hardliner policy vis-à-vis the Greek Cypriot administration.

That said, no matter how sound their conclusions are, it should be noted that both studies have a limited scope. After all, Uğur's study aims to examine the possible implications of EU membership for the north-south development gap in a federal Cyprus, and it is not an attempt to reveal the full-extent of political clientelism in the northern part of Cyprus. For instance, he concludes that a clientelistic structure was established in the north by analyzing only certain annual budget figures between 1977 and 1997. Altan's analysis, on the other hand, is to a large extent an extrapolation of his research on Turkey and hence needs to be tested scientifically; something this dissertation aims to do.

To sum up, the review of the literature on the politico-economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community shows that though the role of political clientelism in the Turkish Cypriot society have been taken up in passing in various contexts, a comprehensive study of political clientelism is still missing. This dissertation aims to plug this gap by offering a case study on the subject. In doing so, it also aims to contribute to the literature on Cyprus conflict, Turkish Cypriot economic development and political history of Turkish Cypriots.

## **Chapter Plan**

The dissertation is organized around an overarching question: How can we explain the Turkish Cypriots' approval of the UN's reunification plan in 2004, given the fact that they had kept pro-partition leaders and parties in power for almost half a century? I will argue that the answer should be sought in the politico-economic dynamics, and particularly in the declining ability of the regime to dispense material resources to buy legitimacy, or to put it another way, simply in the crisis of the clientelistic system.

If we are to account for this tectonic shift in Turkish Cypriot politics as an outcome of the crisis of the clientelistic system, then in the first place, we need to illustrate that there has been a clientelistic system sustaining this, what I call, pro-*taksim* consensus. With this in mind, the dissertation will start with a theoretical chapter on political clientelism. Here, I

will attempt to show the historical circumstances where clientelistic relations emerged and thrived elsewhere in the world, on the one hand, and the development of academic study of clientelism, on the other. After elaborating on the differences between “clientelism of notables” and “the party-based patronage,” and coming up with a working definition of political clientelism, I will review *culturalist*, *developmentalist* and *institutionalist* approaches, which try to account for the emergence of political clientelism in different contexts.

In the light of the theoretical chapter, in Chapter Two, I will look into possible historical roots for political clientelism in the Turkish Cypriot community. Can we explain the dominant role of political clientelism in the post-1974 period with the prevalence of patron-client ties in the preceding period? Can we trace clientelism back to the periods under the Ottoman or British rule? Or did it emerge after independence in 1960 as it did in the Greek Cypriot community?<sup>7</sup> My answer to all three questions will be “no”. By charting the evolution of electoral politics and intra-elite competition in the British and Republic periods, and illustrating that there was no ground for widespread clientelism then, I will show that neither the *culturalist* nor *developmentalist* approach, which seek the roots of clientelism in the pre-democratic past can explain the entrenchment of political clientelism in the contemporary Turkish Cypriot community. In this chapter, I will also briefly touch upon the roots of *taksim* policies; Ankara’s and Turkish nationalism’s influence on the Turkish Cypriot political elite and the evolution of separate Turkish Cypriot organizations in this period to prepare the ground for the subsequent analysis.

If political clientelism has not been inherited or structural, then, how can we explain its emergence in the post-1974 period out of the blue? I will answer this question, in Chapter Three, where I will focus on the immediate post-1974 period with a view to accounting for the emergence of political clientelism with an *institutionalist* approach. I will start from the premise that political clientelism should be taken as a deliberate choice or a strategy, which was adopted by those already in power at the time of first multi-party elections to outmobilize the newly emerging opposition parties. I will dwell on the circumstances within which this strategy was adopted, and particularly, highlight the central role of the

---

<sup>7</sup> For political clientelism in the Greek Cypriot community in general see Attalides 1977a; Loizos 1977; Faustmann 1998 and 2010. For this particular point see Faustmann 2010: 273-4.

*taksim* policy of the leadership and the ensuing legitimacy crisis it faced, in the making of this strategic choice. In the last section of Chapter Three, I will deal with the formation of the key institutions of the Turkish Federated State of Cyprus (TFSC) with a view to exploring other possible institutional factors promoting political clientelism. Of particular importance here will be the electoral system and form of government.

In Chapter Four, I will focus on the UBP's establishment process and analyze its program, social composition, constitution and organization. First, I will show that it was essentially held together not by program or ideology but rather by clientelistic ties by illustrating the lack of cohesion in its program and fundamental conflicts of interest in its cadres, who for the most part made strange bedfellows given their social backgrounds. Then, I will turn my attention to the party organization. I will show that curiously for an "internally mobilized party," whose founders were already in power, the UBP leadership opted for a bottom-up organization model, and attached great importance to the building up of an organization based on mass membership. Finally, I will illustrate how the UBP used public resources, first to recruit members, and then to mobilize voters in the run up to the first multi-party election.

What were the effects of this organizational model on the balance of power between the old guard and the emerging new guard within the party? How did it affect the functioning of the government once the UBP had won the election and become the government party? How did mighty Denktaş gradually lose the control of the party he had established? At a broader level, what were the consequences of the institutional choices i.e. the semi-presidential system and open list electoral system? Chapter Five will address these questions and chart the political developments at intra and inter-party level in the late 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. At the intra-party level, it will be shown that the underlying cause of the chaotic atmosphere and lack of discipline within the UBP was the power struggle within the party between the old and new guard. I will argue that the eventual purge of the old guard can be associated with the organizational choice. Although he was no longer the official leader of the UBP, Denktaş's role as one of the protagonists in this process will be at the center of the discussion. In this context, the rise of Eroğlu, a member of the new guard, who gradually took over the party organization and became Denktaş's archrival, will also be discussed. I will also point out how the clientelistic character of the party, which brought too many irreconcilable interests together, made it impossible to devise and

implement a program, to account for the dismal performance of the UBP as the governing party. At the inter-party level, I will touch upon the role of Ankara in forming a “guided democracy”.

What were the accumulated effects of political clientelism on social, economic and political life? What did give the clientelistic system its strength? Which factors did eventually undermine it? Why did not the EU’s expected catalyst effect in the solution of the Cyprus problem initially kick in? In the closing chapter of the dissertation, I will address these questions, and explore the causes of the crisis of the clientelistic system, which culminated with the approval of the Annan plan. After evaluating the accumulated effects of three decades of political clientelism on the socio-economic structure of the community, and the effects of bureaucratic clientelism, a distinct form of political clientelism, on the public finances, I will conclude by showing how two economic crises and infighting within the nationalist camp coincided to expose all the weaknesses of the establishment, and turned the EU membership and reunification in the public mind into a panacea to all the ills the community has been suffering from.

## Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework: What is Political Clientelism?

Clientelism is a very broad concept “at the crossroads of politics and administration, economy and society” (Roniger 2004: 354). Reflecting this multifaceted nature, the study of clientelism has been the common domain of anthropologists, historians, sociologists and political scientists (Scott 1977c: 483). Given this variety, no wonder that the concept means “different things to different people” (Medina and Stokes 2002: 2), and this difference grows bigger when these people come from different disciplinary backgrounds. In particular, definitions attributed to the very same concept by anthropologists on the one hand, and political scientists on the other, proved to be so divergent that it has become indispensable to specify from the outset, which type of clientelism or patronage is being analyzed (Weingrod 1968: 380). Having emerged as a tool of analysis used by anthropologists to study the interpersonal relationships in small rural communities, needless to say, the meaning attached to the concept has changed substantially as it has come to be used as a tool for studying complex political systems at national level.

Complicating things further, diverse terms such as patron-client relationships/ties, patronage, party-based patronage, *clientelismo*, mass clientelism, new clientelism, semiclientelism, bureaucratic clientelism, machine politics, clientelism of notables, pork-barrelling, and political jobbery are used in different contexts to express variants of clientelism. At times, some of these terms are used to describe more or less the same practices, and yet, sometimes they are used to denote completely different phenomena, making any attempt to make a clear-cut definition all the more complicated.

Bearing the contested nature of the concept in mind, this chapter aims to review the literature with a view to setting out a route map for the rest of the study, where the role of political clientelism in northern Cyprus in post-1974 period will be elaborated as a factor leading to the perpetuation of the Cyprus conflict on the one hand, and as a tool to explain its failure to keep up with its neighbor economically despite being considerably more advantageous at the outset, on the other. It will trace the historical evolution of the study of clientelism, and touch upon the major points of agreement and disagreement among scholars. Some of the questions that will be addressed in this chapter will be: How did the concept emerge in the first place? What are the main traits of patron-client ties as they are understood in anthropology? How was it introduced to the political science literature?

What are the main differences between clientelism in the anthropological and political science sense? In which contexts can it be used as a strong explanatory tool to elaborate complex political processes? How can we account for the emergence of political clientelism?

### **1.1 Clientelism of Notables**

The concept originates from the social organization once prevailing in Mediterranean peasant societies. It was subsequently generalized to describe the relationship between peasant cultivators and landowners or local notables in general, in traditional societies at large (Clapham 1982: 2; see also Allum and Allum 2008: 341). As the environment, a typical peasant destined to spend his life was characterized by extreme scarcities and threats, be it natural, like “disease, accident, death,” or man-made, like “violence, exploitation, and injustice at the hands of the powerful,” certain cooperative social arrangements emerged to cope with these difficulties of peasant life, patron-client relationship being one of the most important of them (Powell 1970: 411-2; see also Waterbury 1977: 337; cf. Lemarchand and Legg 1972). Under these adverse circumstances, “where subsistence needs are paramount and physical security uncertain,” the peasants saw that “a modicum of protection and insurance can often be gained only by depending on a superior who undertakes personally to provide for his own clients” (Scott 1977b: 133).

In essence, the relationship was based on economic or military services offered by the client, typically a sharecropper, in exchange for security and protection provided by the patron, typically the client’s landlord, against the uncertainties of peasant life. The whole exchange was encapsulated “within a set of moral obligations, often symbolized, for instance, by godparenthood” (Clapham 1982: 2).<sup>8</sup> Though in some occasional cases, the patron-client relationship was not based on “common participation in an agricultural enterprise,” it may be said that the bond still resembled, and “patterned after the landlord-peasant relationship” (Silverman 1977: 297). From an anthropological point of view, the patron-client relationship can be illustrated with the following example from Central Italy:

---

<sup>8</sup> It should be noted that, in Boissevain words, godparenthood “is a relationship that is not lightly entered into since it is a formal contract, solemnized in public and before God, and once concluded not to be broken” (1966: 21).

A peasant might approach the landlord to ask a favor, perhaps a loan of money or help in some trouble with the law, or the landlord might offer his aid knowing of the problem. If the favor were granted or accepted, further favors were likely to be asked or offered at some time later. The peasant would reciprocate –at a time and in a context different from that of the acceptance of the favor in order to de-emphasize the material self-interest of the reciprocative action- by bringing the landlord especially choice offerings from the farm produce, or by sending some member of the peasant family to perform services in the landlord’s home, by refraining from cheating the landlord, or merely by speaking well of him in public and professing devotion to him (Silverman cited in Powell 1970: 412).<sup>9</sup>

This summary epitomizes the basic features attributed to the patron-client ties: they “involve dyadic bonds between individuals of unequal power and socioeconomic status; they exhibit a diffuse, particularistic, face-to-face quality ... voluntarily entered into and derive their legitimacy from expectations of mutual benefits” (Lemarchand 1981: 15). Indeed, Pitt-Rivers’ “lopsided friendship” term summarizes the basic traits of the relationship in a rather succinct manner by emphasizing not only the personal and enduring character of the relationship, but also the asymmetry and reciprocity, it involves (cited in Weingrod 1968: 379).

These basic features merit further elaboration. The asymmetric character of the relationship, for instance, is particularly significant, because it creates “a debt of obligation,” on the client’s side, which makes him bound to the patron (Scott 1977b: 125). The asymmetry has two dimensions. First dimension stems from “*the disparity in their relative wealth, power, and status*” (*ibid.*, emphasis in original). Second dimension stems from the nature of the goods and services provided by the patron. The benefits provided by the patron were most of the time in material form (physical protection and economic assistance), while what the client provided for the patron required labor and effort, or simply demonstration of esteem (Lande 1977: xx; Powell 1970: 412; Wolf 1977: 174). Evidently, what the patron offered was what the client and his family needed for their survival and well being: “A locally dominant landlord ... is frequently the major source of protection, of security, of employment, of access to arable land or to education, and of food in bad times. ... [which] could hardly be more vital” (Scott 1977b: 125). The benefits of the patron on the other hand, were though of importance to the patron himself, tend to be less

---

<sup>9</sup> For a more coercive version of the clientelistic relationship, *clientele mafiosa*, see the case of 19<sup>th</sup> century Sicily (Graziano 1976: 361-4).

vital compared to what the client got in return: "Not only can a large landowner get along without the esteem or loyalty of an individual peasant and his family, but there are many more peasant families with needs than there are patrons with assets" (Powell 1970: 413). Therefore, ultimately, due to the asymmetric character of the relationship, the client was finding himself in an exchange in "which he is unable to reciprocate fully" (Scott 1977b: 125), making him more submissive to the demands of the patron. Informing the patron regarding the activities of his enemies can be an example for this (Boissevain 1966: 23). In more extreme cases, the services asked from the client could also involve illegal or unpleasant activities "such as threatening or committing violence on the person or property of a personal enemy, or the enemy of some friend, or some friend-of-a friend" (*ibid.*). Overall, this state of affairs used to help the patron to build up his social credit, which he could rely on later, should the need for it arise. "The larger a patron's clientele and the more dependent on him they are, the greater his latent capacity to organize group action" (Scott, 1977b: 125-6).

Beyond this social credit aspect, the patron acquired some further benefits. At the very least, to have a client was of great convenience for him too.

It provided a check against being taken advantage of, a check that was cheaper, more reliable, and in any case a useful supplement to supervision by *fattori*. It facilitated contacts with the peasant and contributed to the day-to-day efficiency of the enterprise. Finally, it was a means of controlling potentially disruptive influences from the outside. It is significant that the paternalism of the *mezzadria* landlords has often been pointed to as a factor in delaying the spread of labor agitation to the Central Italian hill region for several decades after its onset in many agricultural areas of the nation about 1870 (Silverman 1977: 296-7).

Reciprocal character of the relationship is also a significant element worthy of further elaboration. "A favor or service granted creates an obligation which entails a reciprocal service that must be repaid on more or less a *quid pro quo* basis. If it is not repaid when requested or expected, the relationship is terminated" (Boissevain 1966: 22, emphasis in original). Powell points out the expectations of mutual benefits, or in other words, reciprocity, as a factor distinguishing the patron-client tie "*from other ties which might bind parties unequal in status and proximate in time and space ... such as relationships based on coercion, authority, manipulation, and so forth*" (1970: 412, emphasis in original). He does not rule out the involvement of such elements in the patron-client pattern, but he suggests that if they come to play a dominant role, the tie is no longer a patron-client relationship

(*ibid.*). To rephrase Scott (1977a: 22), why should the patron cultivate a clientele in the first place, if he could simply issue commands? Obviously, although, the client is hardly on equal footing with his patron, he is not a pawn in a one-way relationship either (*ibid.*).

In the light of these basic features of the patron-client ties, the following definition formulated by Scott puts together the main traits of the patron-client relationship as it is understood in the literature of anthropology:

*The patron-client relationship –an exchange relationship between roles- may be defined as a special case of dyadic (two-person) ties involving a largely instrumental friendship in which an individual of higher socioeconomic status (patron) uses his own influence and resources to provide protection or benefits, or both, for a person of lower status (client) who, for his part, reciprocates by offering general support and assistance, including personal services, to the patron (1977b: 124, emphasis in original).*

It is important to emphasize that the services offered by the client, and security or protection provided by the patron were beyond the obligations necessitated by the landowner-peasant cultivator relationship pure and simple. The relationship as such is institutionalized and guaranteed under a “contractual” arrangement. Basically, it involves exchange of land for a share of the harvest. There are certain practices beyond this limited institutional arrangement that make the relationship fall under the genre of patron-client relationship, however. There is no institutional arrangement, for instance, that obligates the landlord to provide economic assistance and physical protection in case of emergency, or permanent tenure for a particular sharecropper. If he does so, this constitutes a special favor. In a similar vein, the sharecropper is not institutionally obligated to defer the landlord in a special way or speak well of the landlord or show special respect. If he does so this also constitutes a favor. If there is such a special relationship beyond the “institutionalized” landlord-tenant relationship, this, as Landé aptly puts it, constitutes an “addendum” to the former (1977: xxi), and this addendum part is what we exactly are interested in when we are dealing with the patron-client relationships. As such, patron-client addendum can be seen as a remedy for the “inadequacies of institutionalized relationships,” not only in agricultural tenancy but also in other sorts of institutionalized relationships (*ibid.*), which will be discussed in detail later in this chapter.

In this context, it should also be added that although there are many similarities, patron-client ties are different from feudal relationship between the landlord and the

peasant/sharecropper (Gellner 1977: 2-3). In fact, “[a]lthough patron-client relations can be traced far back in history, it was only with the growth of feudalism in Western Europe and Japan that relationships of personal protection and subordination between lord and peasant came to form a basis for social, economic, and political organization” (Hall 1977: 510). But this does not necessarily make them one and the same thing. Unlike in feudalism, in the patron-client bond, “[t]here was no oath of homage and no exchange of fiefs ... choice of master was free; and services were not defined” (Kettering 1988: 420). As Tarrow put it “[i]n feudal society, social relations are formalized, hierarchical, and legally sanctioned. A logical pyramid of mutual obligations was built up which was congruent with the requirements of the society for defense and solidarity. ... *Clientelismo*, however, is shifting and informal, and has no institutional recognition in concrete institutions” (cited in Kettering 1988: 420-1; cf. Boissevain 1966: 18).<sup>10</sup>

In addition to providing physical and economic security, another important role attributed to the patrons, which is widely cited in the literature, is their function as a link between the client and the rest of the world (Silverman 1977: 297; Weingrod 1968: 382). The emergence of this role is more recent. In her study on Central Italy, Silverman argues that until the unification of Italy, this role of the patrons was of minor importance as “the sphere of social interaction extended no farther than the nearby market towns and a radius of neighboring communities within which there were cycles of fairs and religious festivals” (1977: 298). The interaction with the larger political unit was also at a minimal level, and hence there was not much to be mediated (*ibid.*). Mediators, Silverman suggests, “can be best understood as elements of particular form of part-whole relationship, one which exists at a particular level of development of complex societies” i.e. during the early nation-building process, and thus, in a society at a pre-nation-state level of integration like pre-unification Italian one, she argues, “there would be little necessity for mediators” (*ibid.*: 294).

When the peasant village began to be gradually penetrated by the state and the market, thanks to the unification of Italy, however, this picture also began to change. There were

---

<sup>10</sup> It is also worth mentioning at this juncture that Kaufman criticizes Lemarchand and Legg (1972) of stretching the concept of patron-client relationship by treating “the highly legalistic, feudal contract as a sub-type of the general patron-client exchange, rather than as a completely different type of vertical transaction” (1974: 290).

particularly two changes of major significance, which in turn led to the transformation of the patron-client relationship defined by the land-tenure system, outlined above. Firstly, due to economic and social development, those “from the commercial class of the towns and cities of the region,” bureaucrats and professionals like lawyers, physicians, pharmacists, and schoolteachers etc. joined the ranks of traditional patrons (*ibid.*: 299). Secondly, in addition to their earlier functions, this extended patron group came to play a different role than their predecessors. Namely, they began to function as “mediators” between the village community and the rest of the newly emerging nation-state.<sup>11</sup>

Based on their empirical studies on Central Italy, and Sardinia, Sydel Silverman, and Alex Weingrod show that in the early phase of development of nation-state, for a particular period of time, this new group of patrons came to perform a major role in linking the local life of peasant communities with the rest of the nation (Weingrod 1968: 386-93; Silverman 1977: 297-300). In other words, the twin processes of state and market penetration of the peasant village transformed the patrons into brokers, mediating the impact of the larger society on peasant society (Powell 1970: 413).

When the state embarked on the task of bringing the isolated rural communities together, and the communication between the capital and the local increased steadily, the little world of the client began to expand. In the face of the challenge brought by this expanding world, the people of lower class turned to those who had always helped them: their patrons (Silverman 1977: 298). This does not necessarily mean that the patrons ceased to perform their traditional functions inherited from the past. However, in the post-unification period, according to Silverman, what made the patron crucial for the client began to be his function as the mediator: “the most valuable patron was neither the wealthiest nor the most generous, but the one with the best connections” (*ibid.*: 298-9). More than for their traditional functions, now they were needed to -help to fill out the paperwork, and to- write letter of recommendation, which became a *sine qua non* for the client in all sorts of his extra-local dealings:

If a client had to go out of the community for any purpose, the patron would recommend him to some acquaintance at the destination. In fact, all dealings with

---

<sup>11</sup> In the case of Italy, this was “particularly true of lawyers, who have a key role in litigating the land disputes that persist to present day” (Tarrow 1967: 82). For more on this see Graziano 1977: 362-3.

institutions or persons outside the local system required personal recommendations from a mediator. When M.'s grandfather tried to get the local tobacco concession, when R. applied to a military specialists' school, when F. took his deaf sister to a physician in Rome, when P. as a young man went periodically to the coastal plain to seek work, when T. took his bride to Perugia to choose a coral necklace –all would have considered it foolhardy to do so without a recommendation from a respected contact, and to get a recommendation a patron was needed. As jobs in the national institutions expanded, access to them was also a matter of recommendations, and this remained no less true even after adoption of the *concorso* system, an open competition for available jobs based on examinations (*ibid.*: 298).

Silverman argues that this transformation can be generalized to many other industrializing nations, and that the mediators play an important but temporary role when these countries go through the early phase of nation-building process (*ibid.*: 304). As the process progresses however, she argues that patrons or mediators become redundant, and hence tend to disappear because they are basically replaced by public or private institutions (*ibid.*: 300-4). Weingrod does not agree with this argument. He does not see this as the demise of patronage in general, but rather as the end of a specific type of patronage i.e. “patronage in the anthropological sense” or the patronage of notables, which is in turn, replaced by “*the new political party patronage system*” (1968: 380-1, emphasis in original; see also Zuckerman 1977: 65). He underscores “the impact of universal suffrage, mass political parties, and more generally, mass society” as the main factors paving the way for the transformation of the political conditions of rural societies (Weingrod 1968: 381).

Powell also points out this trend, and argues that this new form of patronage has political implications beyond the local level reaching to the national level, which merits further elaboration from the political scientists:

The concept, I believe, helps to illuminate the political behaviour of low-status actors, particularly peasants, as they are incorporated, recruited, mobilized, or inducted into the national political process. Inasmuch as the induction of the peasantry into this process has in fact not yet occurred in many of the developing countries, an understanding of clientelist politics may be useful in a predictive sense. And while clientelist behaviour may be most visible in the political cultures of Mediterranean extraction, there is much –although scattered- evidence that it can be encountered in political cultures in many parts of the world. This is not a prediction that clientele systems of the type found in Italy or Venezuela are to be anticipated elsewhere, but that clientelist patterns of interpersonal behaviour may be a significant factor in the process of peasant politicization everywhere (1970: 423).

Indeed, Weingrod and Powell can be seen as pioneers of a broader trend in the field of political science. From the 1960s on, the features of patron-client relationships began to draw the attention of political scientists working on political systems variously labeled as Third World, developing or modernizing countries. This was mainly due to the realization of these scholars of the fact that the tools that they were accustomed to use to explain politics in the West fell short of explaining politics in less developed parts of Europe, let alone in the newly independent countries (Lande 1977: xiii). As Legg writes of Greece, the style of politics was “unintelligible to many western observers” and “attempts to explain ... political events in the language of political discourse familiar to westerners are bound to cause distortion, as well as surprise and dismay” (1973: 234). While some political scientists simply dismissed the patterns of political behavior and political structures prevailing in these countries as “either pathological, deviant, or of minor import” (Powell 1970: 412), what they had observed prompted a group of scholars working on “the politics of developing countries to examine and learn from a body of anthropological literature dealing with interpersonal relationships” (Lande 1977: xiii).

Based on his empirical studies on South Asian countries, Scott, for instance, suggests that class analysis, and primordial sentiments i.e. *inter alia* ethnicity, fall short of explaining the political activity in these countries as the political process was mainly dominated by “*ad hoc* groupings” such as “informal power groups, leadership-centered cliques and factions, and a whole panoply of more or less instrumental ties” (1977b: 124). Likewise, Schmidt points out that the approaches, which are widely used to understand politics in the West such as “the study of interest groups, political parties, voting patterns and ideology fails to account for political behavior” in the developing world (1977: 305). Both scholars suggest that the use of clientelism as a tool of analysis can overcome the difficulty of analyzing and describing these polities.

Similarly, Lande observes that in these countries, during the process of organization of political activity, vertical inter-personal relationships play a more dominant role compared to horizontal relationships linking people of equal status along class or ideological lines (1977: xiii). As Tarrow observes, in Southern Italy, “[a]n individual is linked to the authority structure through personal ties of obligation and loyalty, rather than through merger of his interests with others of the same social group or ideological persuasion” (1967: 74). Even where horizontal organizations were observed to exist, it became evident

that they don't often operate like disciplined collectivities, but rather "as clusters of personal relationships" (Lande 1977: xiii).

Overall, "[w]hile class, ethnic, and religious cleavage may often explain a portion of the contest for power, clientelism often illuminates a vast range of political life which is not easily reducible to such categorical groupings" (Schmidt et. al. 1977: ix). Eventually, because of its usefulness in analyzing the empirical evidence from developing countries, the concept came to attract immense scholarly interest, and in the first decade of its introduction "in the lexicon of political scientists countless books and articles have been devoted to the exploration of clientelistic phenomena in settings as diverse as China and Columbia, Italy and Senegal, Venezuela and Lebanon" (Lemarchand 1981: 7). This interest did not last for long, however, and as Kitschelt and Wilkinson point out, "between 1978 and the late 1990s very little of theoretical consequence has been written about clientelism" (2007: 6).<sup>12</sup> Since then, however, a remarkable revival in interest to the subject can be observed.

## **1.2 Party-Based Patronage (Machine Politics)**

If traditional clientelism or clientelism of notables represents one end of the continuum, at the opposite end stands the modern clientelism of anonymous machine politics or party-based patronage.<sup>13</sup> As Weingrod (1968) was the first one to point out the distinction between patronage of the anthropologist and patronage of the political scientist, his study is a good starting point for the discussion on the party-based patronage, and its differences with the traditional one identified in the previous section.

Weingrod defines patronage in the anthropological sense as a type of social relationship, and describes the study of patronage from this perspective as the "analysis of how persons of unequal authority, yet linked through ties of interest and friendship, manipulate their relationships in order to attain their ends" (1968: 379-80). Patronage from the political scientist's perspective, on the other hand, takes the political party as the main unit of

---

<sup>12</sup> Only exception to this general trend, they say, without getting into the details, is "a rather isolated literature on the effect of electoral laws on personalism and intra-party factionalism in party systems" (Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007: 6).

<sup>13</sup> Machine and party-based patronage are mainly taken as more or less the same thing in the literature, and hence will be used interchangeably in this study.

analysis, and “refers to the ways in which party politicians distribute public jobs or special favors in exchange for electoral support” (*ibid.*: 379). It is “largely the study of how political party leaders seek to turn public institutions and public resources to their own ends, and how favors of various kinds are exchanged for votes” (*ibid.*).

Given this context, clientelism in the political science sense –and the working definition adopted in this study- is, in Piattoni’s words, “*the trade of votes and other types of partisan support in exchange for public decisions with divisible benefits*, which involves not only the distribution of jobs and goods but also the exploitation of the entire machinery of the state as ‘a token of exchange’” (2001a: 4, emphasis in original). “From a birth certificate to a building permit, from a disability pension to public housing, from a development project to a tax exemption” (*ibid.*: 6) almost everything under the control of the state can be subject to this exchange. As Kenny notes, “it is not a question here of considering that one may be entitled to these things by right, for between what is one’s right and what is possible lie a thousand different shrugs of the shoulder” (cited in Eisenstadt and Roniger 1984: 73). A patron seeking the vote of the client can make his client’s life much easier by ensuring “that the agents of the state either deal with the client honestly, or when required dishonestly ... by ignoring tax regulations, building codes, anti-squatter legislation, proper procedures for charging water and electricity, or by giving favorable legal judgments” (Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007: 11); in Chubb’s words these are “nonmonetary forms of patronage” (1982: 247; see also 211-6). Vice versa is also true. The life of an opposition supporter can be easily turned into nightmare by implementing laws selectively. In a former Peruvian president’s words, “for my friends anything. For my enemies the law”.<sup>14</sup>

In its extreme form, the machine party is devoid of any ideology; it is politically indifferent (Banfield and Wilson 1966: 115), or totally deideologized (Graziano 1976: 164; see also Scott 1969: 1143-4). Though, these attributes hardly applies to *all* contemporary patronage-based parties, because of its analytical utility<sup>15</sup>, it merits attention. Banfield and Wilson depict the machine like a business organization working in a “particular field of business –getting votes and winning elections. ... [I]t is ‘just like any sales organization trying to sell its products’” (1966: 115). “The source of power and the cohesive force is the

---

<sup>14</sup> Cited in “Politics in Argentina.” *The Economist*, 21.7.2012.

<sup>15</sup> As Banfield and Wilson aptly put it “[e]xtreme case of one kind ... illumines the logic of the other kinds” (1966: 116).

desire for office and office as a means of gain” (Lord Bryce cited in *ibid.*). The political entrepreneur engaged in machine politics lives “entirely ‘off’ politics ... is ‘pragmatic,’ without principles; he ‘buys’ votes by distributing office and other material rewards” (Graziano 1976: 164).

The machine, therefore, is apolitical: it is interested only in making and distributing income –mainly money- to those who run it and work for it. Political principle is foreign to it, and represents a danger and a threat to it. As D. W. Brogan has remarked, “The true character of machine is its political indifferentism. ... It exists for itself” (Banfield and Wilson 1966: 116).

As long as the organizational structure of the machine is concerned, Lemarchand mentions two “ideal types,” which can be of help in studying the development of clientelistic tendencies within a party. These are “neo-traditional” and “orthodox machine”. First one comes into being when clientelistic solidarities of a traditional type characterized by ties of deference “are incorporated into a broader institutional framework, usually a party,”<sup>16</sup> while the second one is a typical example of the patronage-based party, which is held together “by expectations of concrete, short term benefits” (Lemarchand 1981: 20-1).

Chubb comes up with a slightly different typology. Basically, she does not see the first type as a variant of machine but rather as a sort of transitional form between clientelism of notables and party-based patronage:

In its early stages political clientelism takes the form of competing cliques of traditional notables, each with his own personal following and personal ties to those in positions of political power. The machine as a political institution comes into being only when the organizational superstructure of a modern mass-based political party is substituted for the personal influence networks of notables. At this point the party organization itself assumes the role of patron and the resources of the state take the place of the personal economic and social power of the notable (1982: 4).

In this process, the notables who had been “occasional” or “dilettante” politicians due to the deference they inspire among their followers thanks to their social background as landowners or professionals leave their places to “professional ones,” who lack this natural legitimacy (Graziano 1976: 163; see also Caciagli and Belloni 1981: 36-7). As a result, to make up for this deficiency, this new breed of politicians increasingly resorts to the

---

<sup>16</sup> This is what Graziano calls “party of notables” (1976: 164).

distribution of material benefits. This is required not only to attract voters, but also to keep the party running:

patronage is best thought of as an incentive system – a political currency with which to purchase political activity and political responses. The chief functions of patronage are: maintaining an active party organization ... [p]romoting intra-party cohesion ... [a]ttracting voters and supporters ... [f]inancing the party and its candidates ... [p]rocur[ing] favorable government action ... [c]reating party discipline in policy making (Sorauf cited in Weingrod 1968: 379).

Remarkably, the account of a Sicilian practitioner of clientelism captures the differences between two variants of clientelism, as good, if not better than the subject's students:

'Clientelism,' the interviewed politician says, is by now an old word and needs to be replaced before long. It evokes, in fact, the letter of recommendation from the notable, a practice still in existence and still frequent in Sicily, though less and less so. For at least fifteen years clientelism has been changing in nature and instead of being a vertical tie as it was before, descending from the notable to postulant, it has become a horizontal one; it now concerns entire (social) categories, coalitions of interests, groups of (private) employees, employees of public office or regional enterprises. It is mass clientelism, organized and efficient, which consists of laws, *leggine* (laws made by parliament committees), extraordinary provisions, emergency measures, contributions and concessions granted no longer to the individual, but to favored groups.

In order to put this powerful machine to work, through time the Christian Democrats have had to place party men at every level of power, in each key position... (Today clientelism) is a relationship between large groups and public power (Saladino cited in Graziano 1976: 149-50; also cited in Lemarchand 1981:21-2; and in Caciagli and Belloni 1981: 35-6).

These fundamental differences between two variants of clientelism made Graziano, among others, to ask to what extent it is meaningful to use the same term to denote these two different political phenomena: "What is there in common between the 'vertical' clientelism which used to link landlord and peasant, and the 'horizontal' mass clientelism practiced by a party in power?" (1976: 150; see also especially Kaufman 1974; Lemarchand 1981; Mavrogordatos 1997). The common ground for both variants, answers Graziano, is *direct exchange*: "Clientelism as an interpersonal relationship and clientelism as party-directed patronage are both based on the direct exchange of favors" (1976: 157). Therefore, the relationship between the patron and the client can be defined, in both of its manifestations, as a clientelistic association, which is structured dyadically, based on direct, asymmetrical exchange (*ibid.*: 149). This definition was formulated because basically previous definitions,

and particularly Scott's definition quoted above, which he takes as a reference point, fall short of covering the impersonal character of mass clientelism today, where clients are no longer individuals but favored groups, and relationship is not face-to-face anymore. In this context, he also dismisses the typology adopted by Lande to distinguish between what is clientelistic and what is not; namely the "particularistic-categorical opposition," as this fails to capture the *collective particularism* of mass clientelism; "new clienteles," Graziano writes, are by their nature "categorical clienteles" (154-5; see also Kitschelt 2000: 852). Furthermore, though dyadic element was not abandoned by Graziano, it was later dropped from most of the definitions as proliferation of the studies on clientelism clearly showed that there were many other "organizational forms," making it inappropriate to single one out among others as the core form (Eisenstadt and Lemarchand 1981: 1-2).

Finally, one last point needs to be clarified for the sake of alleviating the conceptual cacophony prevailing in the literature; that is the distinction between patronage and clientelism. Some minor differences notwithstanding these are "largely the same phenomenon, with latter being more penetrating and all-encompassing than the former" (Piattoni 2001a: 7). Accordingly, they are used interchangeably in this study.

Having made the distinction between traditional and modern variants of clientelism, what needs to be done next is to set a benchmark, which can be used as a basis for comparison because without specifying what clientelism is not, it is impossible to define what it is (Graziano 1977: 368). In the literature, this is mainly done by setting clientelism against "an ideal-type of 'responsible party government'<sup>17</sup> in which parties offer packages of policies justified in terms of a principled defense of the 'public interest'" (Hopkin 2001: 117). These packages will, no doubt, be formulated in a way that they will benefit certain groups within the electorate that the party sees as its electoral base, while making the others worse off. The benefits are therefore directed to very large groups to attract as much support as possible. Then, these policy packages or programs are implemented without verifying whether the beneficiaries have actually voted for the party or not. Given that, according to the responsible party government model, the linkage between the voter and the party is programmatic, and unlike clientelistic politics (where exchange is

---

<sup>17</sup> For a brief account of responsible party government theory see Kitschelt and Wilkinson (2007: 1-2).

contingent and direct), “the politicians enter a *non-contingent, indirect political exchange*” (Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007: 10, emphasis in original). As Kitschelt puts it

[i]n the analysis of programmatic and clientelist politics, we ... have to separate definitional distinctions from empirical associations. In definitional terms, only the procedural nature of exchange relations counts to separate clientelist from programmatic linkage (direct versus indirect exchange). Empirically, party competition based on predominantly programmatic linkages may result in greater depersonalization of politics, more collective goods provision, and more institutionalization than clientelist politics. This is a contingent empirical association, however, diluted by democratic polities with predominantly clientelist linkages that are also highly institutionalized and routinized (2000: 853).

Obviously, in its current modern form, which is characterized by the involvement of categorical groups -political parties as patrons and entire social groups as clients- engaged in impersonal, bureaucratic and institutionalized political exchange, political clientelism has come to be perceived as *politics as usual*; as Piattoni puts it, “a variant of particularistic politics,” and not as a “cultural pathology” or “developmental distortion” (2001a: 7). In Eisenstadt and Lemarchand words, “[t]he burgeoning literature on patron-client relationships has ... recognized that such relationships can be found in many societies and civilizations, on different levels of economic development and social differentiation and in a great variety of cultural traditions” (1981: 1-2). In this respect, clientelism has come to be taken as a social exchange; a method of mobilizing political support (Chubb 1981 and 1982); a strategy to maintain power (Shefter 1994; Piattoni 2001); a method of electoral mobilization (Roniger 2004; Stokes 2007); or a linkage mechanism of democratic accountability (Kitschelt 2000; Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007); rather than an anomaly dictated by socio-cultural or socio-economic context per se.

Indeed, clientelism was depicted as a strategy as early as in 1977 by Waterbury: “Patron-clientele networks may be seen as strategies for the maintenance or aggrandizement of power on the part of the patrons, and of coping and survival on the part of the clients. They are probably never the sole strategies available” (1977: 332). This was later refined and developed by Piattoni:

clientelism and patronage are strategies for the acquisition, maintenance, and aggrandizement of political power, on the part of the patrons, and strategies for the protection and promotion of their interests, on the part of the clients ... Although they more or less likely depend on the sets of circumstances –generally conceivable

as costs and benefits – in which patrons and clients happen to make their choices, their adoption is ultimately always *a question of choice* (2001a: 2, emphasis added).

Choice is the key word here. But a clarification should be made. As I will explain in detail in the next section, this is not to say that the voters have a choice to make between political clientelism and responsible party government. Far from it; Banfield and Wilson describes the choice a typical voter faces most of the time in a rather vivid way as follows:

Even though in the abstract one may prefer a government that gets its influence from reasonable discussion about the common good rather than from giving jobs, favors, and ‘friendship,’ even though in the abstract he may prefer government by middle-class to government by lower-class standards, and even though in the abstract he may prefer the rule of professional administrators to that of politicians, he may nevertheless favor the machine in some particular concrete situation. The choice is never between the machine and some ideal alternative. If there is any choice at all –and in some instances there may not be- it is between it and some real –therefore imperfect- alternative. It is at least conceivable that in some of the large central cities the political indifferentism of the machine may be preferable to any likely alternative (1966: 127).

If it is a matter of choice, and it is not up to the voter to choose, then, the questions to be answered next are: whose choice, and in which context is this choice made? What does make political clientelism emerge as a more favorable strategy than other more legitimate choices? These are among the most fundamental questions the students of political clientelism have been seeking an answer for. The next section will present an overview of this endeavor.

### **1.3 Accounting for the Emergence of Political Clientelism: Three Theoretical Approaches**

As Kitschelt puts it, the literature on political clientelism is case study-oriented and “there is no systematic comparative literature on the rise or decline of” political clientelism (2000: 855). In other words, “[a]n approach ... which is capable of accounting for the wide variety of clientelist and patronage systems while explaining their resilience under changing contextual circumstances,” is obviously lacking (Piattoni 2001a: 2). Basically, the attempts to explain the causes of alternative linkage mechanisms/strategies have not yielded an all-encompassing theory which rules out any “empirical anomalies” (Kitschelt 2000: 866). To avoid these empirical anomalies as much as possible, more often than not, the students of clientelism come up with multiple, and often overlapping explanations, which are not

conducive for making broad categorizations. In what follows, an attempt is made to review these theories based mainly on categories used by Shefter (1994), Kitschelt (2000), and Piattoni (2001).

To distinguish between different approaches, which aim to account for the emergence of political clientelism, Shefter (1994) borrows concepts from economics. On the one hand, according to Shefter, there is demand-driven “neoclassical” approach where demand represents the political behavior of voters, and on the other, we have a supply-driven approach, where supply represents the strategic behavior/choices of politicians and political parties. In essence, in both approaches, eventually politicians call the shots. However, according to the demand-driven approach, the choice is dictated by the orientations (or preferences) and social composition of the voters the party is appealing for support (Shefter 1994: 26-7), while according to the supply-driven one political entrepreneurs have the upper hand.

According to the early students of clientelism, which can be called *culturalists* to use Piattoni’s (2001) term, the direction of the relationship is from demand to supply side. In other words, politicians offer particularistic benefits only to meet the demand from their voters, just like firms trying to respond to the demands of their customers. These scholars tried to understand and explain “the conditions under which citizens will demand individual favors or patronage in exchange for their votes” (Shefter 1994: xi-xii). Here, Shefter refers explicitly to Banfield and Wilson’s sociological approach. Banfield (1958) explains the clientelistic behavior of Southern Italian community of “Montegraneesi” with “amoral familism,” an “ethos” prevailing within the community, which can be summarized as: “Maximize the material, short-run advantage of the nuclear family; assume that all others will do likewise” (1958: 85). In such a socio-cultural context, it is argued, cooperation and any kind of continuing association beyond the nuclear family, involvement in any public problem or activity in the interest of the community, achieving and maintaining formal organizations are simply not possible, and thus political clientelism inevitable (Banfield cited in Silverman 1968: 1). Banfield’s argument is not limited to Southern Italy. In the introductory chapter of his work, he states that Japanese one being an exception, “[t]here is some reason to doubt that the non-Western cultures of the world will prove capable of creating and maintaining the high degree of organization without which a modern economy and a democratic political order are impossible” (1958: 8).

In a similar but somewhat more sophisticated vein -thanks to the addition of social background of the voters to the analysis- Banfield and Wilson (1966) portray the urban machines in the US as an institutional form representing the “private-regarding” immigrant ethos of the lower-classes of Catholic European origin, “which emphasized family needs and personal loyalties and took no account of the larger community” as opposed to “public-regarding” Anglo-Saxon ethos of middle and upper class voters (cited in Wilson and Banfield 1971: 1048-9).

Boissevain, another representative of this current of thought, argues that “[p]atronage is, to a very large extent a self-perpetuating system of belief and action grounded in the society’s value system” (1966: 30). It plays an important social role because ties of dependency continue to provide something that neither state nor the family is able to provide: protection. Furthermore, he points out a link between religion and patronage: “Catholicism in particular, with its range of benevolent patron saints intermediate between God and favour-seeking, dependent human, provides an ideological world view which closely parallels a conception of society articulated by political and economic patron-client relations” (1977: 81).

Another notable representative of this approach is Putnam, whose 1993 study can be seen as a return to *culturalist* lines. In his study on institutional performance of 20 different Italian regions, where he divides the Italian society into two groups as civic north and clientelistic south, Putnam concludes that more than anything else sociocultural context determines the level of success of regional governments (1993: 86 and 98-9). In other words, the government performance is not determined by the quality of its institutional set-up but rather by the level of “civic-ness of the citizens,” which has been shaped in the course of centuries, and thus unlikely to change in the short-run. According to this view, therefore, some polities are clientelistic and some are civic and there is no way to change this by political action. That is to say, demand is an exogenous given, at least in the short to medium-run. Therefore, trying to come up with an institutional design to break the vicious circle of clientelistic politics is nothing but a futile effort.

To use Piattoni (2001) and Kitschelt’s (2000) term, *developmentalists* are the second group of students of political clientelism. This group associates clientelist politics with socio-economic modernization, and suggest that the main cause behind political clientelism is

socio-economic backwardness. The group can be divided into two sub-groups within itself. First group tends to see political systems enmeshed in political clientelism, to be in a transitional stage of political development, which would eventually be replaced by a political system where programmatic politics will prevail (Scott 1969; Weingrod 1968; Powell 1970). Similar to the *culturalist* approach, this one is also demand-driven. According to Scott, “[s]uitable though it may be for the few groups in the modern sector organized along occupational lines, the modern legislative machinery of new nations cannot effectively cope with the host of special pleadings coming from outside the modern sector” (1969: 1142-3). Most of the political demands in these “transitional nations” are particularistic in character – for example a family’s request to have their son to be placed in a job in the public sector- and thus not suitable to be met by legislative action (*ibid.*). The only political form that can successfully meet these demands, and thrive on them, he argues, is urban machine (*ibid.*). What promote political clientelism in these countries, therefore, are their socioeconomic circumstances. Following the lines of modernization theory, the proponents of this approach predict “the prevalence of clientelist linkage mechanisms in poor countries and their transformation and eventual abolition with growing affluence, industrialization, and postindustrialization” (see Kitschelt 2000: 857). This transformation is only a matter of time. As Huntington argues, “parties and party systems are clientelist, patronage oriented, and localist in early stages of modernization but become more programmatic and institutionalized with progressing development” (cited in Kitschelt 2000: 856).

The second group of *developmentalists*, on the other hand, is not that optimistic and, does not see this as a transitional stage. It rejects the idea of modernization theory, which foresees a “unilinear or inevitable progression toward some pre-determined goal” i.e “characteristics found in a Western political system” (Legg 1969: 2), in this case. Its standpoint is parallel to that of Dore’s, who rejects the tenets of modernization theory, which amounts to foreseeing a common path of change for postwar Nigeria like that of seventeenth century England (cited in Schneider et. al. 1972: 330).

This group argues that once it is in place, political clientelism takes a self-reinforcing path. Based on her empirical study of the Christian Democratic (DC) rule in Palermo, Chubb argues that far from being an automatic process leading to dissolution of clientelism,

system is rather static, and hence, the “stimulation of change from within” is almost impossible (1981: 82):

While the possibility for a clientelistic model of politics to take root at the end of the war was clearly closely related to a pre-existing state of underdevelopment, the situation since then can be described as one of a mutually reinforcing bond between the structure of political power and the economic base upon which it rests – i.e., through its political control the DC has succeeded in disaggregation upon which the survival of the system of power which it has created depends. Thus, far from being a transitional form of political organization, a mass-based clientelistic party, once having established control over key economic resources, can block precisely that process of economic development which is seen as bringing about its eventual demise, thereby perpetuating the structural base of its own power (*ibid.*: 85-6).

Graziano has a similar approach. Firstly, he rejects the *culturalist* accounts of political clientelism by suggesting that culture cannot be the determining factor as culture itself is a dependent variable basically shaped by the economic and social structure of society (Graziano 1977: 361; see also Silverman 1968). He suggests that the process and the degree of capitalistic rationalization of an economy can account for the persistence of clientelistic relationships, and portrays clientelism in Southern Italy, as “the product of the incomplete capitalistic rationalization of the Southern economy” (*ibid.*: 361-2). Moreover, he rejects the idea that modernization will bring about the transformation and abolition of clientelism. Rather, he suggests that the modernizing forces of the state and the market, led to an “indigenous” model of political development characterized by clientelism’ (*ibid.*: 360), which inhibits “the emergence of conditions necessary for the development of less particularistic, more categorical groups” (*ibid.*).

In a similar vein, Legg suggests that in Greece, “those occupying high status modern roles were able to utilize clientage relationships to maintain their existing positions, and consequently to inhibit further modernization” (1973: 234). Given that although there are “countless specific, non-aggregative demands for personal intercession in all spheres, social, economic or political,” coming from below, which gives the impression that the process is demand-driven, Legg argues that the impetus for perpetuation of clientelistic relations stemmed usually from above (*ibid.*), emphasizing the supply side of the interaction.

Recently, with a volume edited by Kitschelt and Wilkinson (2007), a return to *developmentalist* perspective with a broader and more sophisticated research agenda, was

proposed. In this study, once again the level of economic development gains precedence in the quest to account for the choices of linkage strategies (clientelistic vs. programmatic) across time and space. Kitschelt and Wilkinson argue that “[e]conomic development is the most commonly confirmed predictor of differential modes of democratic accountability” (2007: 24). However, on its own it fails to account for all contexts<sup>18</sup>, and thus in this new version of *developmentalism*, or *neo-developmentalism* I am tempted to call it, in addition to the level of economic development, three more theoretical elements are introduced. These are the level of inter-party political competition<sup>19</sup>; economic resource endowments and politico-economic governance structures<sup>20</sup>; and ethnocultural diversity. There is a relationship of contingency between these elements. Different mixes produce different results on demand and supply side, and hence lead to different decisions. “[W]hat is critical ... is not to sort out the causal priority of any of these variables for economic development. It is important, however, to keep in mind that –as a bundle- they affect the politicians’ and voters’ preferences over democratic principal-agent relations” (*ibid.*: 40-1).

The articles in the book analyze the contingent interaction of these elements in roughly four different levels of economic development -extreme poverty, i.e. sub-Saharan Africa; weak level; intermediate level, i.e. “roughly, per capita gross domestic product in the range of USD 5,000 to USD 10,000 purchasing parity corrected in 2000” (*ibid.*: 47); and postindustrial capitalist societies.

Third group has a *historical/institutionalist* approach. According to Shefter, the pioneer of this approach, if we are to understand certain political phenomena, we need to focus *less on the views of the masses*, and *more on the political institutions* which shape and then in turn shaped by the strategic behaviour of leaders (1994: 3; emphasis added). Accordingly,

---

<sup>18</sup> Among others, Kitschelt notes in an earlier study that “[d]evelopmentalist accounts have much empirical evidence on their side but cannot explain the persistence of clientelism in some advanced democracies (e.g., Japan, Italy, and Austria). Moreover, the theory cannot explain why clientelist politics appears to be much more prominent in some post-Communist polities, such as Russia or the Ukraine, than in others with equal or lesser affluence, such as the Baltic countries” (2000: 857).

<sup>19</sup> The party system is defined as competitive when there is “some programmatic distance between alternative party blocs competing for executive office (‘polarization’) and when governments have considerable institutional leverage to shift resources (e.g., among clients)” (Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007: 28).

<sup>20</sup> Political-economic governance structures have something to do with the level of political influence over the economy via such mechanisms as the regulation agencies, public enterprises and public procurement contracts. To put it in a different way, we can say that the more “politicized” the economic governance structure, the more likely that we have a clientelistic linkage mechanism (Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007: 36).

Shefter rejects the idea that the behaviour of political parties is strictly determined by the composition of their electoral base, i.e. the demand side, which is largely determined by the social and cultural background of the voters:

parties have managed to win the support of migrants and peasants in transitional societies both by working through “vertical” patron-client networks and by organizing them into “horizontal” associations; parties have been able to mobilize the middle and working classes in more modern social settings both by distributing patronage to individual members of those classes and by appealing to broader class and occupational loyalties among them (*ibid.*: 25).<sup>21</sup>

Shefter’s approach reminds what is known in economic literature as Say’s law of market, which basically says, “supply creates its own demand”. He does not completely rule out the role of demand of voters in the process. He enumerates voter demands, along with the availability of resources for patronage, and the interests of party cadres and elites as the factors taken into consideration by the party leaders when they are trying to decide whether to adopt patronage as a party strategy or not (*ibid.*: 26). However, he points out that the political behaviour of the voters in modern as well as traditional settings, are not exogenous given, but “more variable and malleable,” in other words, susceptible to change by the deliberate action of political parties than, what he calls, neoclassical theorists assume, and thus, he puts more emphasis on the supply side of the process.

His approach requires a macro-historical context. Particularly, he focuses on the historical development of certain institutions and highlights their enduring effects on the political system. The relative timing of bureaucratization and extension of universal suffrage, in his view, conditions the character of political parties. “Whether a party will or will not be crucially dependent upon the distribution of patronage to maintain its hold upon its supporters is a function ... of how the leadership of that party *initially* established a linkage with a popular base” (*ibid.*: 29, emphasis added). In the establishment process, the party leaders considering resorting to patronage faces two constraints. First constraint is that its leaders need to occupy public office or be allied with elites who have access to the means required for patronage (*ibid.*: 27). If neither of these is the case, then they don’t have any other option than relying on “ideological and solidary incentives” (*ibid.*). This is the case for what he calls “externally mobilized parties;” for instance, “the major working class parties

---

<sup>21</sup> For specific cases see Table 2.1 in Shefter 1994: 23.

of Europe”. Even if party leaders hold public office, they face a second constraint: “if governmental agencies are protected by civil service statutes and other general laws that specify how public benefits and burdens are to be distributed and that thereby prevent politicians from intervening in the administrative process on a case-by-case basis,” then they need to rely, again, on ideology and solidarity (*ibid.*). Here, it is important to note that statutes and laws on their own are not enough as they are not “self-enforcing”.

Rather, if a civil service system (or any administrative arrangement providing for the allocation of public benefits and burdens according to general rules) is to resist the depredations of patronage-seeking politicians, the administrators or public officials who would defend it must be backed by a constituency that has a stake in the system and that is sufficiently powerful to prevail over competing forces. Only if it fears arousing the opposition of such a constituency will a governing party be constrained to forgo the immediate gains it would realize by directing bureaucrats to reward the party’s friends and to punish its enemies (*ibid.*: 28).

If the bureaucracy itself is not well established or lack the support of “a constituency for bureaucratic autonomy” identified above, and therefore not in a position to protect the public resources, they become open to the raid from political leaders, and thus mobilizing public with patronage becomes an option for the party leaders.

To summarize, today we are more likely to observe political clientelism in countries where an autonomous civil service capable of preventing the politicians from resorting to patronage, was absent at the time of extension of the universal suffrage because “the circumstances of a party’s origins ... can crucially influence the party’s subsequent behavior” (*ibid.*: 27).

Second representative of *historical/institutional* approach is Piattoni.<sup>22</sup> For Piattoni, whose conceptual context is strongly influenced by Shefter, clientelism is a strategy for both of the actors of the political game. It is a strategy to acquire, maintain, and aggrandize political power for the patrons, and a strategy to protect and promote their interests for the clients. As such, it is a matter of choice; a choice which is subject to dynamic “sets of circumstances” or “incentives and disincentives –generally conceivable as costs and benefits”. It is important to note that, these can be superseded and redefined by both

---

<sup>22</sup> For practical reasons, only Piattoni’s name is used here because she was the one, who wrote the introductory chapter summarizing their theoretical approach. However, all contributors to the volume, she edited, are representatives of the same approach.

actors: politicians or voters (2001a: 18). Therefore, what we have is a complex system where demand and supply interact, and in principle may produce completely different outcomes across space and time even when objective circumstances seem to be similar (*ibid.*: 24-5). To give an example, in the immediate post-World War II period,

the institutional room for clientelism was equally large (or small) in both France and Italy. The institutional setup of the French state left as much room to clientelist practices as that of the Italian state. The ideological commitment of the respective Christian Democratic parties was also (initially) equally strong. However, because the party leadership assessed the circumstances differently –with the French MRP leaders prioritizing the reformation of society according to Christian values and the Italian DC leaders the fight against communism– their strategies ended up differing (*ibid.*: 25).

Accordingly, as the strategy to be adopted is a matter of choice, Piattoni deliberately shies away from establishing a strict causal relationship between strategies (i.e. patronage vs. program) and sets of incentives or sets of institutional and historical circumstances to explain the presence or absence of clientelist relationships. She talks about constellations of institutional and historical circumstances that make these strategies politically more or less viable and socially more or less acceptable. However, she also states that although there is a connection between them, their emergence, transformation, and demise do not necessarily determine the outcome, emphasizing the decisive role of the “strategic choices of individual actors” involved. If we are to understand the character of representation, Piattoni argues, we need to focus on “the reciprocal interaction” of demand and supply sides of clientelism. So, what do supply and demand sides involve? On the supply side we have:

(1) The existence or lack of an independent bureaucracy resistant to partisan pressures, (2) the ideals or other objectives motivating politicians to run for office, and (3) the ideas and expectations about the source of legitimate power that historically developed along with the formation of state structures (*ibid.*: 17).

On the demand side, on the other hand, we have:

(1) The level of “empowerment” of the citizens, principally affected by their economic status; (2) their cognitive capabilities, especially influenced by the rate of literacy, access to information, availability of meeting places, and so on; and (3) their organizational capacity, that is, their capacity to form secondary associations or join independent organizations which may act as catalysts for collective action such as people’s churches and external political parties (*ibid.*)

The similarity especially, in demand side of Piattoni with the works of Banfield (1958), and Putnam (1993), whose works are largely influenced by Tocqueville, is obvious. Supply side on the other hand, is to a great extent influenced by Shefter (1994).

In fact, the second group of *developmentalists* could have been classified in this category too, as their approach is also historical, and to a certain extent *institutionalist*, and, as shown above, they see the strategic political choices of the politicians as a decisive factor in the perpetuation of the clientelistic political structures (Chubb 1981 and 1982; Legg 1973; Graziano 1976; see also Tarrow 1967). Besides, along with socio-economic change, they hold the circumstances in which specific democratic institutions have emerged responsible for the state of affairs prevailing today. Legg, for instance, points out:

In these systems, governmental structures borrowed from the outside have been superimposed upon clientelistic networks, and have in turn, nurtured them. ... The timing and sequence of political development, in the sense of the introduction of specific democratic institutional forms as well as the pace of social and economic change, have contributed to the development of a society in which patron-client ties have permeated modern institutions (1973: 233).

The reason they are categorized under the rubric of *developmentalists* is that it would be somewhat anachronistic to count them under the rubric of *historical/institutional* because this approach was not even formulated at the time of their writing. Secondly, and more importantly, they see the level of economic development at the time of initial political mobilization, as the primary factor to account for political clientelism.

#### **1.4 Research Strategy**

As the aim of the dissertation is to explain the politico-economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community in general and a historical turning point i.e. the result of the Annan plan referendum in the Turkish Cypriot side in particular, using political clientelism as an analytical tool, and not to come up with a new theory to account for the rise and fall of political clientelism, an eclectic approach is followed, which, I'm tempted to say, is the rule rather than exception in the literature.

The study is predicated mainly on Shefter and Piattoni's *historical/institutional* approach. This is to say, in the empirical part, contextual circumstances or interaction of demand and supply of political clientelism is studied to account for the emergence of political

clientelism. It should be noted that in some “clear-cut cases” like Greece and Sweden, Piattoni suggests that taking either demand or the supply side alone can suffice to explain the outcome. More complex cases on the other hand, like Spain and Italy where an “uneven geography of clientelism” exists, or “intermediate” cases like England, France and the Netherlands, require full account of both supply and demand side (2001: 21). In this typology, the case of northern Cyprus resembles more to Greece than, say the Italian case, as geographically there is uniformity in the distribution of clientelism, and hence the emphasis will be given to the supply side though the demand side is not completely overlooked.

In line with the *institutionalist* approach, in the empirical part a special attention will be given to the immediate post-1974 period, as this was the time when the institutions of the new political entity, not least its political parties, have been shaped, and multi-party elections have been introduced where for the first time universal suffrage was implemented without the shadow of guns. Having said that, to set the political stage and better understand the wider background, putting the Turkish Cypriot quest to become a political community in a historical context is required. Therefore, the empirical part will start with a review of the major political developments in the pre-1974 period. This is also necessary to account for the origin of political clientelism in the Turkish Cypriot community. Particularly, the question whether political clientelism was in the cultural genes of Turkish Cypriots or not, has to be addressed to justify the adoption of the *institutionalist* approach. By showing that the answer to this question is negative, I will highlight that when modern institutions were introduced there was no pre-existing clientelism that could inhibit their entrenchment, and in doing so, demonstrate that political clientelism was a more recent artifact, whose roots should be sought in the strategic choices of the ruling nationalist political elite in the post-1974 period.

Yet, showing that political clientelism was a strategy adopted by the UBP in its establishment process is not sufficient. It should also be shown that this *initial* choice conditioned the party’s subsequent development up until the early 2000s, and that the party remained to be clientelistic. As the period under consideration spreads over a long period of time, in this effort, the focus will be mainly on the election campaigns. This is not a big weakness though, because as Weingrod suggests manifestations of political clientelism become most obvious during the election periods (1968: 380). Having said that,

identifying where exactly to focus on in the empirical analysis of political clientelism beyond the election periods is a real challenge. How can we measure the level of clientelism in a given political system? Or how can we show that a party remains in power by patronage? To answer these questions, as Kitschelt points out, “we cannot simply ask politicians to explain their favorite linkage mechanisms. Educated, sophisticated citizens such as politicians, find clientelism morally objectionable, even if they practice it” (2000: 869). It would be naïve, at best, to expect them to answer this question in honest manner. Mass surveys are also unlikely to bring up “true confessions” as the issue is quite sensitive (Mavrogordatos 1997: 3).

In the face of these challenges, Kitschelt proposes three indirect methods to determine whether political clientelism is a widespread strategy in a polity or not. With some reservations, he suggests “the existence of programmatic incohesiveness and the lack of discipline in roll call voting may serve at least as an indirect indication that a party, as a coalition of politicians, is held together by nonprogrammatic or charismatic linkages” (2000: 870). Measuring the “levels of corruption in a polity” is the second indirect method brought up by Kitschelt (*ibid.*: 870-1). As Müller also points out, in the countries where political clientelism is highest in the Western democracies, i.e. Italy and Greece, corruption is also measured as highest (2007). As there is no direct way to measure the level of corruption, Kitschelt notes, it can be useful to use the reports and surveys conducted by financial risk assessment companies, businessmen, journalists and economists (2000: 871). Last indirect indicator of clientelism, Kitschelt comes up with, is reviewing the government budget to find out the proportion of funds “allocated to pork and special interest projects” (*ibid.*). Kitschelt concludes that “[t]he presence of clientelist linkages is particularly plausible when different indirect measures point in the same direction” (*ibid.*).

The research strategy employed by Mavrogordatos for the empirical study of clientelism also presents a practical model. In his empirical analysis of political clientelism in Greece, he limits his focus to “employment and career opportunities” (1997: 3). The range of goods and services provided by clientelism is quite diverse and it is practically not possible to cover all of them. In that respect, picking one of them for the purpose of testing makes practical sense. Furthermore, providing employment is “not only specific, but also the single most vital item (of patronage), as reflected in public opinion” (1997: 3; for more on the role of public employment in maintaining clientelism see especially Chubb 1981 and

1982; and Lyrintzis 1984). He identifies “meritocracy, implying a system whereby appointments and career patterns are determined on the basis of merit alone, according to universalistic and objective criteria,” as the opposite of clientelism (*ibid.*: 4), and compares the number of employments made through party channels, and general competition.

This study has been guided by an approach, which combined methods suggested by Kitschelt and Mavrogordatos. Particularly, in the Chapters Four and Five, the aim will be to expose the UBP’s “programmatically incohesiveness and lack of discipline,” as an indicator of its clientelistic character. However, to do this, rather than focusing on the “roll call voting,” I mainly relied on the statements of the UBP politicians published in the media; most of the time those who had resigned, but at times also of those who were still party members. This was made possible by the very nature of the party: Throughout the party history, intra-party rivalries and frequent resignations have prepared the ground for high-level party functionaries to air their criticisms against their fellow party members, which found wide coverage in the local media.

As for the corruption, in the absence of reports like the Transparency International’s corruption perception index, I will touch upon the issue only in an unsystematic way, as a full-scale analysis of corruption would make a dissertation on its own. I will rely on anecdotal evidence to show that, as in the case of Italy, political clientelism and lack of alternation in power have led to widespread corruption.

Investigation of the government budget figures pointed the direction towards the biggest constituency of patronage: the beneficiaries of tens of thousands of paychecks issued monthly by the ministry of finance to pay the public sector employees, pensioners and those on welfare benefits. This issue will be elaborated in detail in Chapter Six, where, after showing that the public sector has been even more over-bloated than it is usually assumed, I will show that the reason behind this was what Lyrintzis calls bureaucratic clientelism. To do this I will basically use the method employed by Mavrogordatos outlined above.

Throughout the research process, I extensively used newspaper and magazine archives as well as unstructured interviews with former politicians and bureaucrats. The minutes of the parliamentary debates on certain relevant issues were also occasionally used. Another

major source of information used in the study were the statistics provided by the government organizations.

Finally, although, this is not a comparative study in its strict sense, in the rest of the dissertation, occasional references will be made to political parties from different parts of the world cited in the literature. Among these parties, one stands out. This is *Democrazia Cristiana* (Christian Democracy, DC), which had dominated the political life of Italy for almost five decades after the World War II. The review of the literature and the empirical field research on the Turkish Cypriot politics revealed that there is a striking resemblance between the UBP and DC whose organization in *Mezzogiorno* is probably the most extensively studied case in the literature of political clientelism. In this respect, various similarities between the two parties will be given special attention in the rest of the study.

## **Chapter 2: The Turkish Cypriot Political Community in the Making: History of Electoral Politics and Roots of *Taksim* Policy**

The hegemonic role of Turkish nationalism in Turkish Cypriot politics cannot be understood in the absence of a historical analysis going back to the British rule. Nor is it possible to account for the emergence and development of political clientelism without looking into the nature of political competition in this period. With this in mind, in Chapter Two, the aim will be compressing the major developments of the pre-1974 period into a chapter, with a view to giving essential background for the subsequent analysis of the post-1974 Turkish Cypriot politics.

In this framework, the chapter will present a brief history of electoral politics in the Turkish Cypriot community. In parallel, the emergence of the idea of *taksim*, the blueprint upon which the Turkish Cypriot political community construction took place; its effect on the emergence of the political right; the political right's ideological underpinnings and its leader Denktaş's relations with different actors in Ankara; the way the alternative vision of political community i.e. coexistence with the Greek Cypriot community, was annihilated; and other intra-communal rivalries will be briefly touched upon in this chapter. Furthermore, the gradual progress of the separate Turkish Cypriot administrative structure after the inter-communal clashes in 1963, in other words, the building blocks on the way to partition, will also be taken up.

In the light of the contours of electoral politics during the British and post-independence period, in the concluding section of this chapter, I will turn my attention to tracing back the roots of patron-client relations in the Turkish Cypriot community. The major question to be answered here is: Can we explain the existence of political clientelism in the post-1974 period with the prevalence of pre-existing patron-client ties? My answer will be "no".

### **2.1 A Brief Overview of Politics among Turkish Cypriots in the British Period**

Contrary to the general assumption, electoral politics in Cyprus was introduced by the Ottomans after the *Tanzimat* reforms although the powers of the representative institutions were limited, and elections were rudimentary and "even corrupted" (Nevzat 2005: 112; see also Purcell 1969: 221). In the Central Administrative Council, there were

elected representatives of the two communities (Nevzat 2005: 113).<sup>23</sup> At the village level too, *mukhtars* (village headmen) were elected annually “in free assembly” (Dixon Hepworth cited in Katsiaounis 1996: 62; see also Dixon cited in Loizos 1977: 121).<sup>24</sup> Not surprisingly, as elsewhere in the Mediterranean, popular participation in this period was very limited because (a) the minimum tax payment excluded a considerable number of the population from the franchise, and (b) those who were franchised would be expected to vote “within a deferential and familial concept of politics” (Katsiaounis 1996: 62).

When the British took over the administration of the island, they were initially reluctant to give a say to the Cypriots in the island’s affairs (Nevzat 2005: 112). When they instituted the Legislative Council in December 1878, all of its members were nominated rather than elected.<sup>25</sup> Only after the adoption of the 1882 constitution, the representatives of the two communities started to be elected (Leventis 2002: 30-1), on a proportional basis (Attalides 1979: 41).<sup>26</sup> The new Legislative Council was “composed on the principle that the official members plus the Turkish exactly equalled the number of the Greek members” (Storrs 1945: 472). Accordingly, the Legislative Council contained 12 elected members, of whom nine were Greek Cypriots and three were Turkish Cypriots, along with six nominated officials including the High Commissioner (Lyssiotis 1990: 56).<sup>27</sup> There were “three electoral Districts, each returning four Members, one Moslem and three non-Moslem” (Hill 1972: 421). The representatives were elected for a five-year term, in a separate communal vote, where suffrage was limited to the tax-paying male population over the age of 21, who resided in the island not less than five years (Hill 1972: 421; Kitromilides in Nevzat 2005: 112; Lyssiotis 1990: 56; Leventis 2002: 31).

---

<sup>23</sup> “[I]n ostensible imitation of the constitutional practices prevailing in Europe, membership of the electorate was conditional upon the property qualification. The franchise was extended to Ottoman subjects who were older than 18 and paid a minimum of 50 piastres in *vergi* (property tax). Candidates for office had to be at least 30 years old and pay a minimum of 100 piastres” (Katsiaounis 1996: 62).

<sup>24</sup> The British abolished elections for this post in 1891 (Nevzat 2005: 113).

<sup>25</sup> “Mustafa Fuad Efendi, of an old Cyprus family,” who was nominated as a member by the High Commissioner Wolseley, represented the Turkish Cypriot community in this council (Cavendish 1991: 155). The other two native members were, “a merchant named George Glykis, and the Italian farmer Richard Mattei. It was remarked at the time that none of the unofficial members spoke or understood English” (Cavendish 1991: 155; see also Hill 1972: 416-7).

<sup>26</sup> Until then, representation was equal. “The Muslim leaders protested against this and asked for equal representation,” to no avail (Attalides 1979: 41).

<sup>27</sup> “The Council was enlarged on the same basis in 1925, so that with nine officials and three Turks the Governor’s casting vote could carry any measure against the united opposition of the twelve Greeks” (Storrs 1945: 472).

Writing in 1891, Williams likens the Legislative Council to a “toy parliament”:

The Cyprus constitution was a sham gift. The giver gave nothing. The recipient received that which he did not want, and was unable to put any good use. And the gift has had the fate of all shams. It has made the giver contemptible and the receiver ungrateful (cited in Hill 1972: 419).

Especially, in the early years of the British rule, participation in elections was low. According to a British official, in the 1886 election, from 63 villages, which had 1556 registered voters combined, “not a single voter went to the poll and ... 40 villages with an electorate number of 1025 sent one voter apiece, and he, in the majority of cases, was the village representative whose presence is compulsory!” (cited in Katsiaounis 1996: 89). In another election in the early 1920s, the turnout was as low as 4 percent largely reflecting the frustration in the face of the British government’s rejection to introduce full self-government (cited in Hill 1972: 426).

This “liberal-constitutional phase” of the British rule, to use Georghallides’ terms, came to an abrupt end with the October uprising in 1931 (cited in Leventis 2002: 71).<sup>28</sup> In the more authoritarian phase of the British rule following the uprising, the Legislative Council was abolished, “[p]ower to legislate was given to the Governor,” and the constitution and all other elective institutions were suspended (Hill 1972: 432).<sup>29</sup> There was little room left for political activities (McHenry 1997: 139). “Meetings of more than five -later fifteen persons- without permission of the local District Commissioner were banned” (Purcell 1969: 225). In 1933, in a letter to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Edward Stubbs, the governor, wrote “I would not propose anything which would give an opening for political meetings or discussions by including any form of election” (cited in Leventis 2002: 72-3).

This heavy-handed rule continued until the early 1940s. Though the island “was ruled by decree,” and no election was held for representative bodies other than municipalities up until independence (Richter 2006: 138), a relative liberalization could be observed during

---

<sup>28</sup> Regarding the end of the liberal phase, Choisi wrote: “The threat of a common ‘national cooperation’ of Greek and Turkish Cypriots had to be avoided at all costs, if the ‘colonial peace’ in Cyprus was to be retained. It was this fear, and not the October 1931 tumults – as it is usually held in the literature on Cyprus – that led the British put aside the constitution and rule the island via emergency laws until the end of their domination. The October tumults were solely the suitable occasion which the British waited for long, in order to abolish the controversial constitution” (1993: 20).

<sup>29</sup> The elections for the post of *mukhtar* were also abolished, and the authority to nominate them was given to the governor (Richter 2006: 136).

the governorship of Battershill (1939-1941). In 1941, political parties, and political meetings were legalized (Richter 2006: 143; Purcell 1969: 226), and in 1943<sup>30</sup>, the municipal elections were reintroduced (Leventis 2002: 93; Protopapas 2006: 276-9; Christophorou 2006: 298).<sup>31</sup> In the absence of any other representative bodies, “municipal elections provided the only platform for the expression of rivalries and competitive political representation” (Protopapas 2006: 269).<sup>32</sup>

This relatively liberal political environment paved the way for the emergence of modern politics in the Greek Cypriot community (Christophoru 2006: 296). The first political party to be established was Progressive Party of the Working People (AKEL), a strong left-wing organization. It was established in 1941, and began to gain ground by largely capitalizing on the success of the trade union movement as well as its precursor, the Cyprus Communist Party (KKK), which had been outlawed in 1933 (Protopapas 2006: 271-2; Peristianis 2006: 249-50). The emergence of a strong, organized opponent or “*ungodly internal enemies*,” as they perceived it, triggered the formal organization of the right (Protopapas 2006: 275; emphasis in original). Consequently, it can be observed that in this period, right and left in the Greek Cypriot community came into being with their “full array of mass organizations (political parties, trade unions, peasant unions, cultural and athletic clubs – and so on)”<sup>33</sup>, and competed in the municipal elections along ideological lines (Peristianis 2006: 251; Loizos 1977: 129).

As in many other respects, the Turkish Cypriots lagged behind the Greek Cypriots in the setting up of modern political institutions. In the 1943 election, for instance, although Dr Fazıl<sup>34</sup> Küçük (henceforth, Dr Küçük), the rising star of the Kemalist movement, and his friends ran for the Municipal Council in Nicosia as the candidates of the People’s Party<sup>35</sup>, there was no sign that the party was organized in other electoral districts of the island. Moreover, it was only a party in name, which was formed just to contest the election; its

---

<sup>30</sup> The election was held on 21 March 1943 (An 1996: 2-3).

<sup>31</sup> Indeed, the municipal elections were scheduled for June 1941. However, because of the German occupation of Greece in April 1941 the elections were postponed (Christophorou 2006: 298; Leventis 2002: 93).

<sup>32</sup> Universal male suffrage was implemented; men over the age of twenty-one “who had resided in the municipal boundaries for the past twelve months” were entitled to vote (Protopapas 2006: 277; Christophorou 2006: 296).

<sup>33</sup> “Use of the terms Right/Left by the social actors, referring to political formations with a respective ideological content, actually began in the 1940s” (Peristianis 2006: 251).

<sup>34</sup> Sometimes also written as Fadıl.

<sup>35</sup> A clear reference to the Republican People’s Party in Turkey (An 1997: 268).

name was never heard afterwards. The same applies to the grouping, which competed against the People's Party in Nicosia. It did not have a name beyond the leader's, let alone an organizational structure. It was called "Avukat Fadıl Partisi" (the party of Fadıl the lawyer) (Gürkan cited in An 1997: 268) or "Necati Partisi" (the party of Necati).<sup>36</sup> Indeed, in the last election for the Legislative Assembly in 1930, at least there was a tint of an ideological element in the power struggle between the *Kemalist* candidate, Necati Özkan and the representative of the traditional elite, Mehmet Münir. Choisi depicts this political competition in a broader context as follows:

The Kemalist movement in Cyprus embodied above all the idea of opposing the influence of the ruling notabilities and their British protectors. It was therefore, not an emancipatory movement in the conventional sense. Its objective was not to overcome colonial domination in order to set up an independent national state. Rather, it was simply a movement by part of the Turkish Cypriot elite, to thrust aside the moslem oriented notabilities, and obtain influential posts. Because the Kemalist opposition faced difficulties in its social and political development, due to the close network of cliental dependencies created among the traditional Turkish Cypriot elite, it tried through an ideological binding to the new Turkish national state, to limit the influence and power of the ruling traditionalists (1993: 19; cf Nevzat 2005: 377).

From what governor Storrs wrote, we understand that beyond the "ideological" binding, Kemalists secured the active support of the Turkish government in their quest to replace the traditional elite. Assaf Bey, the Turkish Consul, played an active role in the success of Özkan who managed to defeat the incumbent Münir, the representative of the old guard (1945: 501).<sup>37</sup> I will come back to this in the last section of this chapter. Suffice it here to say that the defeat of the old guard showed that after all, "the close network of cliental dependencies," mentioned by Choisi was not so strong.

The political situation in the 1940s was more or less the same. Only difference was, when we look at the political debates in the 1940s, we see that it was no longer between the traditionalists and Kemalists but rather among the proponents of Kemalist ideology, and hence devoid of any ideological distinction even on surface.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Ak. Pınar (obviously a pseudonym): "Cemaat İşlerinde Doğruluk Lazımdır [Righteousness is required in communal affairs]." *Halkın Sesi*, 13.1.1944.

<sup>37</sup> Necati defeated Münir by 1993 to 1553 votes (Nevzat 2005: 376).

<sup>38</sup> See for instance, Dr. Fadıl Küçük: "Çarpışan İki Fikir [Two clashing ideas]." *Halkın Sesi*, 16.12.1943; Dr. Fadıl Küçük: "Yeni Edebiyat Numuneleri [New literature samples]." *Halkın Sesi*, 18.12.1943.

The political debates going on in *Halkın Sesi* in the 1943-44 period corroborate the diagnosis of various British officials on the Turkish Cypriot community who wrote that “the lack of initiative and organizing power ... is generally a characteristic of this community” (cited in Choisi 1993: 13) or talked about “the spirit of hopeless resignation” in the face of an “economic decline over a long period” prevailing among the Turkish Cypriots (cited in Choisi 1993: 17). The political elite of the time seems to be caught in a stalemate, failing to surmount personal rivalries and effectively tackling on socio-economic backwardness of the community.

One of the first attempts to break this vicious cycle and to work together as a united front to protect the interests of the Turkish Cypriot community proved to be rather short-lived, although a promising start had been made. In the formation process of Kıbrıs Adası Türk Azınlıklar Kurumu (Association of Turkish Minorities of the Island of Cyprus, KATAK), old personal political rivalries seemed to be pushed aside. Among others, Münir, a representative of the traditional elite, Özkan, his Kemalist successor in the Legislative Council, and Dr Küçük whose party competed against Özkan’s few weeks earlier in the municipal election, managed to come together, along with many other members representing different segments of the society.<sup>39</sup> However, the KATAK experiment did not last long, and even before the first anniversary of its establishment, Dr Küçük resigned.<sup>40</sup>

The association apparently failed to mobilize a mass support, and in the face of popular indifference, the prospect of success for KATAK would have been quite low even if Dr Küçük had not withdrawn his support. Two months before Dr Küçük’s resignation, a frustrated Denктаş, who was then just 18 years old, wrote an article entitled “I accuse people!” where he criticized the Turkish Cypriot community’s indifference towards this

---

<sup>39</sup> “Türk Azınlığının Haklarını Koruyacak Yeni Bir Cemiyet Kuruldu [A new association has been founded to protect the Turkish minority’s rights].” *Halkın Sesi*, 21.4.1943.

<sup>40</sup> Apparently, once again, personal rivalries overshadowed communal motives. His resignation came a month after an election where the representatives of Nicosia federation in the broader confederation of KATAK were elected (“Bir İstifa [A resignation].” *Halkın Sesi*, 13.1.1944). The election was held on 9 December 1943 (“KATAK Sekreterliği’nden: Lefkoşa Federasyonu [From the KATAK secretariat: the Nicosia federation].” *Halkın Sesi*, 14.12.1943). From what Dr Küçük wrote in his newspaper, it is understood that Necati Özkan had attempted to prevent Dr Küçük’s election with a political manoeuvre (Dr Fadıl Küçük: “Seçim Böyle mi Olur [Is this how one holds an election]?” *Halkın Sesi*, 16.12.1943).

“unique, precious association,” when less than 10 people turned up in the first 6-monthly general meeting of KATAK.<sup>41</sup>

## **2.2 *Taksim*: The Birth of a Vision for a Turkish Cypriot Political Community**

The Turkish Cypriot community had to wait until the latter part of the 1950s for a full-fledged political mobilization (Patrick cited in Attalides 1977: 80 and 1979: 46-7). Until then the political activism of the Turkish Cypriot community was to a great extent limited to expressing their loyalty to the British government and voicing their concerns regarding the prospect of enosis (Markides 1977: 22-3). 1955 marks the beginning of the armed struggle of EOKA, which aimed to achieve enosis by force. Even in the face of such an existential threat, the Turkish Cypriot’s political mobilization was not entirely home-grown: “Within the next 3 years, a community political structure was developed as a result not only of efforts of Turkish Cypriot leaders to oppose enosis, but also of encouragement from British and Turkish officials who were seeking to safeguard their countries’ strategic interests” (Patrick cited in Attalides 1977: 80 and 1979: 46-7).<sup>42</sup> As Choisi puts it, the Turkish Cypriot “national ‘awakening’ occurred not as a reaction to British colonialism, but as an anti-Greek opposition encouraged by the British” (1993: 25). In the center stage of this national awakening has stood the ideal of *taksim*. Yet, even this ideal, according to some accounts, was strategically introduced by the British to dissuade Greek Cypriots from their demands for enosis, and it took the Turkish government a while to fully embrace it (Markides 1977: 24-5).<sup>43</sup>

Once it became involved in the Cyprus problem, the Turkish government threw its weight behind Dr Küçük in his campaign to become the communal leader<sup>44</sup> (Karagil cited in An 2006: 659), so that the Turkish Cypriots could speak with one voice. A Turkish citizen,

---

<sup>41</sup> *Halkın Sesi*, 2.11.1943.

<sup>42</sup> Patrick wrote this based on his interview with Dr Küçük (1976: 42).

<sup>43</sup> Charles Foley, a British journalist based in Cyprus in 1955, quotes Hikmet Bil, saying “[i]f, and only if, Britain decides to abdicate in Cyprus, then we shall put forward our claim to regain the island for Turkey ... If necessary, we shall fight” (1964: 29).

<sup>44</sup> His newspaper, *Halkın Sesi* should also be considered as a factor further boosting his political power. In a letter to a friend in Istanbul dated 11 September 1954, Özker Yaşın, a contemporary journalist, wrote “Dr Küçük’s *Halkın Sesi* has been a force, a scourge haunting everyone in this island for years. ... I have to admit that no other newspaper has the same effect on the community as *Halkın Sesi*. *Halkın Sesi* has been the strongest, and the most influential weapon providing Dr Küçük with credit and leadership (Cited in An 2006: 509-10).

Hikmet Bil was sent to Cyprus to help Dr Küçük to reorganize his party (Foley 1964: 29).<sup>45</sup> The party secured its dominance when it managed to take over the control of Evkaf, “the most important Turkish communal institution<sup>46</sup>,” when the British finally decided that the time was ripe to surrender the administration of this influential institution to the Turkish Cypriots.<sup>47</sup>

The new party fully endorsed the idea of *taksim* and managed to mobilize the community on this basis. The following excerpt from an interview given by Dr Küçük summarizes very well the justification for *taksim* policy of the Turkish Cypriot leadership then, and in the decades to come:

Cyprus is not a ‘country’ in any ethnic sense; it is just a small island which does not have a ‘nation’ of its own, being populated as it is by two separate communities which are mere extensions of Greek and Turkish nations proper. The Turks comprise one fifth of the population and own no less than 30 percent of all arable land on the island, as well as being shareholders in the sovereignty of Cyprus.<sup>48</sup> Therefore, actual ownership of land by virtue of title deeds alone can be a criterion of ownership for Cyprus, let alone the fact that Cyprus before it was leased to Britain in 1878 was a Turkish province for about 300 years. Consequently if the Greeks acquire the right to unite with Greece, the Turks should have the same right and unite with Turkey.<sup>49</sup>

Dr Küçük was considered as the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community because the political unity among Turkish Cypriots was achieved around his Cyprus is Turkish Party

---

<sup>45</sup> *Kıbrıs Milli Türk Birliği Partisi* decided to re-name itself as the “Cyprus is Turkish Party” after the visit of Hikmet Bil, the chairman of the Cyprus is Turkish Association, which had 83 branches in Turkey. The decision was made unanimously in an extraordinary congress of the party held on 24 July 1955 (An 2006: 522).

<sup>46</sup> Georghallides explains the importance of Evkaf as follows: “after the withdrawal of the Ottoman state, the Evcaf became the most important Turkish communal institution. It had a leading voice in Turkish education and it oversaw and contributed to the expenses of schools and mosques throughout the island. Since to a large extent the Evcaf drew its strength from the Government, it became a means for the exercise of British influence over the Moslem community. This was most clearly exemplified by the career of Mussa Irfan bey, Turkish Delegate from 1904 to 1925. Irfan posed as the staunch defender of the rights and privileges of the Turkish community and simultaneously (since he was the director of a semi-Government department) as an apologist of British policies” (1979: 79).

<sup>47</sup> This was recommended earlier by the Committee on Turkish Affairs in its report. The report, which was expected to be “instrumental in securing a higher standard of living for the Turkish community and pave the way for greater responsibility” (Lord Winster cited in Crawshaw 1978: 44), among other things recommended “that the Muftiship would be restored; that Evkaf should be managed by an elected all-Turkish Committee”. The Committee was convened in April 1948 (Crawshaw 1978: 44). For the full report in Turkish, see Fedai 2002.

<sup>48</sup> In fact, the interview was conducted in 1964. However, the last part of the sentence regarding sovereignty, which became relevant after the establishment of the Republic aside, the position was not different in the mid-1950s.

<sup>49</sup> “Constitutional Position Today.” *Special News Bulletin*, 11.10.1964. From the interview given to the Encounter magazine on 5.10.1964.

(*Kıbrıs Türktür Partisi*). However, the spearhead of the *taksim* movement was Denktaş thanks to his active role in the initiation and conduct of the armed resistance. After his resignation from the government of Cyprus, where he had worked for nine years in different capacities<sup>50</sup>, he became the president of the Federation of Turkish Cypriot Associations (Nesim 1999: 9) -“a voluntary organization activating social and economic life of Turkish people in Cyprus and organizing their resistance to” *enosis*.<sup>51</sup> The federation was the second most influential organization at the time after the Cyprus is Turkish Party.

Few weeks after he had become the president of the Federation, Denktaş took part in the establishment of the Turkish Resistance Organization (*Türk Mukavemet Teşkilatı*, TMT). The other two founders were, Burhan Nalbantoğlu, a medical doctor and the secretary general of the Federation, and Kemal Tanrısevdi of the Turkish Embassy. The TMT was not the first counter-*enosis* armed organization. What made it distinct from the others was: Firstly, it was organized island-wide, and secondly and more importantly, upon Denktaş’s insistence it was directly attached to the Special Warfare Department in Turkey (Kızılyürek 2003: 247).<sup>52</sup> Although the other two co-founders’ approach was to keep the TMT as “a Cypriot organization,” and not to ask for anything from Ankara, Denktaş recounts, he insisted on Turkey’s involvement, and said “[u]nless this is going to be Turkey’s organization, we are not going to manage anything; we’ll end up killing each other like EOKA” (2006: 47-8).

After meeting both leaders, the Department’s head decided to have Denktaş rather than Dr Küçük as its liaison in the island (Tansu cited in Kızılyürek 2003: 247-8).<sup>53</sup> As Kızılyürek suggests, this decision turned out to be “a turning point in Denktaş’s political life ... as soon as he entered into organized politics, he had become the ‘strongest man’ of the Turkish Cypriot community” (Kızılyürek 2003: 247-8).

The TMT quickly made its name known by issuing leaflets ordering the people to get prepared for the day “when you will be called upon to sacrifice your life and blood in the

---

<sup>50</sup> From 1949 until 1957, Denktaş had worked for the Cyprus government as “Junior Crown Counsel, Crown Counsel, and Ag. Solicitor General” respectively (Public Information Office (n.d.): 3). He also took part in the Consultative Assembly (1948), and the Committee for Turkish Affairs (1948-9) (*ibid.*).

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>52</sup> The organization’s name has been changed several times (see Söyler 2012: 7).

<sup>53</sup> Denktaş, Mayes observes, “is a shrewder, tougher man than Kucuk” (1960: 103).

'PARTITION' struggle" (Crawshaw 1978: 287-8, emphasis in original). The means, it had used to mobilize the Turkish Cypriot community around the ideal of *taksim* was not always peaceful: "Where ethnic consensus failed to be reached through nationalistic formations, the militant cadres of the TMT came into play to secure a forced-ethnic consensus through pressure and violence" (Kızılyürek 2003: 264; see also Attalides 1977a: 81; Crawshaw 1978: 287). The methods used by the nationalists were sometimes found "extremely oppressive" by the Turkish government. *Kıbrıs Türk Gençlik Teşkilatı* (Cyprus Turkish Youth Organization), which had close ties with the Turkish Cypriot leadership, for instance, was identified as a "fascist" formation by the Turkish premier Menderes and its president, Celal Hordan, a Turkish citizen was called back to Ankara (Kızılyürek 2003: 251).

It is important to note at this point that the formative years of Turkish nationalism as an ideology of mass mobilization in Cyprus, coincides with the rise of a more conservative and less tolerant version of Turkish nationalism with Pan-Turkist and Islamist elements in Turkey, in the late 1940s and 1950s (Kitromilides 1979: 25-7). The Turkish Cypriot version of Turkish nationalism was heavily influenced by these currents, which basically amounted to "an exclusive political and cultural dogma, which blocked a tolerant outlook from developing" (*ibid.*). Furthermore, as Kitromilides suggests the secret organization in Ankara, which had taken the responsibility of the TMT operation in Cyprus had been "directly linked ... to the most reactionary and militant elements in the conservative revival in Turkey" (*ibid.*: 27). The organization Kitromilides referred to was the Special Warfare Department, which was the official title given to the Turkish *Gladio*. As Söyler puts it, the organization, which had been established as a counter-communist organization under NATO, in time "deviated from its official purpose and was authorized not only to destroy political dissidence, but also to subvert governments if necessary" (2012: 7). This organization was nothing other than what would come to be known as the "deep state" or "state within a state" in the 1990s (see Gunter 1998). As it will be briefly touched upon in Chapter Five, the organization would use this extended authority i.e. destroying dissidence and subverting governments, in northern Cyprus too. This connection also goes a long way to explain the level of respect Denktaş would command with the Turkish establishment, and how he would be able to resist the pressure from various political leaders including charismatic Özal and Erdoğan in the more recent past. Obviously the ties he had cultivated

with the deep state over decades shielded him against political actors, who were themselves held under tutelage by this mighty organization.

Furthermore, unlike EOKA, and the Greek Cypriot right in general which had to take on AKEL, the TMT did not have to compete with a well-entrenched political ideology/rival. The newly fledgling trade union movement was far from constituting a formidable challenge for TMT, and therefore it did not take it long to suppress the movement. Similar to the Greek Cypriot case, neither existed a liberal challenger (for the Greek Cypriot case see Peristianis 2006). Therefore, the TMT, and Turkish Cypriot right single-handedly shaped the political landscape during the period of political modernization, and emerged as a political monopoly, effectively and sometimes violently crowding out any contender in the decades to come.

### **2.3 The 1960 Republic and the First Elections**

By February 1959, the vicious feud between the proponents of *enosis* and *taksim* appeared to come to an abrupt end, when it was declared that Turkey and Greece came to an agreement in Zurich about the future of the island: independence. “It is something like a miracle,” Sir Hugh Foot, the British governor, was quoted saying in *Time*, and “too good to be true” said the *London Daily Mail*.<sup>54</sup> Yet, the news caused less enthusiasm in the island.

Both communities regarded the new Republic very much as a ‘second best’ arrangement. ... Greek-Cypriot leaders viewed the treaties and constitution as an ‘imposed’ solution which had to be *temporarily* accepted to prevent *taksim*. Turk-Cypriot leaders would have preferred partition and union with Turkey. Since that was not forthcoming, they demanded the strictest adherence to the provisions of the treaties and constitution which granted their community very generous entrenched rights (Patrick 1976: 35; emphasis added).

Ironically, independence brought its most determined opponents, the proponents of extreme nationalism in both communities, to power. The former EOKA and TMT members were recruited at all levels of the new government and the civil service (Attalides 1979: 55), in a way sowing the seeds of its own destruction.

Given these circumstances, the establishment of the RoC did not bring about normalization in the inter-communal affairs. Indiscriminate murders were still rampant despite joint

---

<sup>54</sup> “Cyprus: Something Like a Miracle.” *Time*, 23.2.1959.

appeals by Makarios and Dr Küçük to their respective communities to avoid clashes (Pantelis 1984: 331-2), and the media in both sides were full of statements declaring that the struggle was not over yet. Using this tension as a pretext, the Turkish Cypriot leadership refused to loosen its grip in its internal affairs. The elections for various offices in the new republic came against this backdrop.

Dr Küçük was elected by acclamation and proclaimed vice-president on 3 December 1959 (An 2006: 641-2; Pantelis 1984: 331) without much controversy, at least on the surface.<sup>55</sup> Indeed, Nalbantoğlu who had an immense influence on the TMT fighters was at loggerheads with Dr Küçük, and wanted to replace him with Denктаş as early as in 1959 (Denктаş cited in Gazioğlu: 64). Denктаş did not agree. As he had a different strategy, he did not seek a ministerial post in the central government or a seat in the House of Representatives either.<sup>56</sup> Rather, he opted for the chairmanship of the Communal Chamber as he thought the chamber “is more important because it deals directly with the people”.<sup>57</sup> He was right; the Communal Chamber was the most important institution of the Turkish Cypriot community as it had far-reaching executive powers unlike alternative posts. It had authority “in all religious, educational, cultural and teaching questions and questions of personal status” (Mayes 1960: 223).<sup>58</sup> In this capacity, it controlled the Turkish and international aid received for the Turkish Cypriot community, as well as the influential institutions like the Cooperative Central Bank and Evkaf.<sup>59</sup> “To me the biggest challenge is to set up this new Communal Government and win the confidence of our people,” Denктаş

---

<sup>55</sup> This was not the case in the Greek Cypriot community. The people of Cyprus were not consulted about the agreements founding the Republic. However, the presidential election can be seen as a quasi-referendum in the Greek Cypriot community because of the positions of the two contenders: Makarios and John Clerides. Eventually, Makarios who was in favor of the Zurich-London Agreements won the 65% of the votes against John Clerides who represented joint opposition camp of the extreme Right and Communists, who were against the agreements (Kitromolides 1980: 189; Markides 1977: 80-1).

<sup>56</sup> The 1960 Constitution envisaged the sharing of the legislative power between the House of Representatives, and the two Communal Chambers.

<sup>57</sup> “Our candidates are above party politics says Denktash.” *Cyprus Mail*, 21.7.1960. According to Mayes “he was deliberately keeping himself uninvolved, ready to see Küçük founder with the agreements” (1960: 103). “Certainly Rauf Denктаş is the man to watch, if there is a breakdown in Cyprus,” Mayes adds with remarkable foresight.

<sup>58</sup> The Communal Chambers would also “supervise the working of the separate Greek and Turkish Cypriot municipalities that were to be created in the five largest towns for a trial period of up to four years” (Mayes 1960: 223).

<sup>59</sup> Aydın Samioğlu interviewed by author; The British Government, for instance, agreed to pay one million pounds to the Turkish Cypriot Community for its own use, independent from financial aid being given to the RoC. The first instalment, 500 thousand pounds, were paid into the Turkish Bank in Nicosia on 29<sup>th</sup> July 1960 (“Ankara Pledge of Economic Aid to Turks in Cyprus.” *Cyprus Mail*, 30.7.1960).

said.<sup>60</sup> This was what he did rather successfully in the next few years to come. He built up the foundations of the formidable electoral base that he would rely on in his long political life, in this period. When asked what made Denктаş such a political heavyweight, Fuat Vezirođlu, one of his aides in the late 1950s and early 1960s, gave the following answer:

Denктаş was a great organizer; by establishing organizations, he was securing mass participation. ... Sometimes, all of a sudden he was jumping out of his office, driving to the remote villages of Karpasia or Tylliria, stopping by at coffee shops, chatting with the villagers, listening to them, and if possible satisfying their needs. ... He was always in touch with people; always trying to solve their problems. Whenever, he was in the eve of making an important decision, he started with convincing the notables at the village level: *mukhtars*, *imams*, and the company secretaries (elected representative of the village cooperatives). This way, he had made a popular base.

Along with his charisma and skill as an orator, his modest personality made him likeable to the masses. He was making ordinary folk feel important by greeting the crowd gathered in the coffee shops one by one, eating and drinking with them, and telling them what was going on in Nicosia. ... It is worth adding that Denктаş had also made a name for himself as a staunch advocate of Turkish rights in his capacity as a counsel during the British rule.<sup>61</sup>

As for the parliamentary elections, it can be said that what was supposed to be the first democratic experiment of the Turkish Cypriots in the post-colonial Cyprus<sup>62</sup> turned out to be not so democratic because of the authoritarian tendencies of the leadership (see for instance Gürkan 2001). The elections for the House of Representatives and the Communal Chambers were set for 31 July and 7 August 1960 respectively. Three organizations, which had come to dominate all aspects of life in the Turkish Cypriot community, the Party<sup>63</sup>, the Federation<sup>64</sup> and the Youth Organization<sup>65</sup> joined their forces in a common ticket and called themselves the National Front.<sup>66</sup> The candidate list, “a national organ above party

---

<sup>60</sup> Public Information Office (n.d.): 5.

<sup>61</sup> Interviewed by author.

<sup>62</sup> Universal suffrage was introduced in this election (Pantelis 1984: 331-2). According to the Article 63 of the Constitution: “every citizen of the Republic who has attained the age of twenty-one years and has such residential qualifications as may be prescribed by the Electoral Law shall have the right to be registered as an elector in either the Greek or the Turkish electoral list”.

<sup>63</sup> Cyprus National Turkish Union (*Kıbrıs Milli Türk Birliđi*); sometimes also referred to as National Unity (*Milli Birlik*) led by Dr Küçük.

<sup>64</sup> The Federation of the Cyprus Turkish Associations led by Denктаş.

<sup>65</sup> The Cyprus Turkish Youth Organization led by Necdet Güvener.

<sup>66</sup> “Parti, Federasyon ve Gençlik Teşkilatının Mebus Adayları Açıklandı [The parliamentary candidates of the party, the federation and the youth organization have been revealed].” *Halkın Sesi*, 20.7.1960.

politics,” as Denktaş put it<sup>67</sup> was to a great extent determined by Denktaş, and was made up of “yes men” (Gürkan 2001: 72).

As nobody else contested, all thirty National Front candidates for the Turkish Communal Chamber were elected by acclamation. Eight candidates for the House of Representatives, who were not opposed in their constituencies, were also declared elected.<sup>68</sup> However, to the dismay of the leadership, there were other candidates for the remaining seven House of Representatives seats for the districts of Famagusta, Limassol and Paphos, and therefore elections had to be held.<sup>69</sup>

Few weeks before the election, Dr İhsan Ali, a notable from Paphos district, had announced in a press conference that he was going to establish an opposition party.<sup>70</sup> However, the party could not be set up as the Turkish government was against this: The Turkish president, Cemal Gürsel was quoted in the Turkish Cypriot daily *Bozkurt* as saying “we never support the splitting of the Turks, who constitute a numerical minority into few parties and strata” (An 2006: 659).<sup>71</sup> Under the circumstances, rather than forming a party, the opposition candidates opted for running as independents. Though he did not stand for election himself, Dr İhsan Ali was considered as the leader of the opposition movement.<sup>72</sup> Opposition in any form was seen as a source of weakness by the leadership however, and whoever attempted to run as an independent was stigmatized as “subversive” (*ibid.*: 667-8).<sup>73</sup> “The ones who foment and abuse the opposition only serve the Greek Cypriots,” Denktaş thundered in an election rally in Famagusta (*ibid.*: 669).<sup>74</sup>

Consequently, all seven contested seats went to the National Front.<sup>75</sup> Yet, it is worth adding that the independent candidates in Limassol, Paphos and Famagusta managed to garner

---

<sup>67</sup> “Our candidates are above party politics says Denktash.” *Cyprus Mail*, 21.7.1960.

<sup>68</sup> “12 Representatives Returned Unopposed.” *Cyprus Mail*, 23.7.1960.

<sup>69</sup> The situation in the Greek Cypriot community was not much different: For the 35 seats in the House of Representatives, there were 45 candidates (“No Nomination Day Shocks: 67 Candidates for 50 Seats.” *Cyprus Mail*, 22.7.1960). According to *Cyprus Mail* dated 23 July 1960, “all the Greek local papers agreed yesterday that it would be preferable for an election to be avoided”. Of the 10 independents 2 withdrew by 27 July (“Yet Another Candidate Leaves the Elections.” *Cyprus Mail*, 28.7.1960).

<sup>70</sup> “Kıbrıs’ta Türkler Yeni Parti Kuracak [Turks in Cyprus will set up a new party].” *Milliyet*, 6.6.1960.

<sup>71</sup> Originally published in *Bozkurt* (24.6.1960).

<sup>72</sup> “Patriotic Front Names its Communal Candidates.” *Cyprus Mail*, 28.7.1960.

<sup>73</sup> Originally published in *Bozkurt* and *Halkın Sesi* on 22.7.1960.

<sup>74</sup> Originally published in *Halkın Sesi* on 26.7.1960.

<sup>75</sup> “Patriotic Front Sweep the Board.” *Cyprus Mail*, 2.8.1960.

more votes than the National Front candidates in the town centers but lost due to the votes coming from the villages.<sup>76</sup> The result in Limassol was particularly contested. Supporters of independent candidates in Limassol held demonstrations for two consecutive nights to protest the election result, which they believed was rigged.<sup>77</sup> The demonstrators demanded a new poll to no avail.<sup>78</sup> The fact that ballot boxes were transferred to the district centers for vote counting making it possible to change the ballot papers en route lends credibility to the allegations.<sup>79</sup> Furthermore, there were also reports in the local press that the independent candidates were harassed by the TMT members during the election campaign. Osman Örek, the interim minister of defence of the Republic, for instance, admitted that Faiz Kaymak, an independent candidate from Famagusta, was followed by the TMT on his way to canvassing, however denied any wrongdoing: "This is something normal. This is not pressure. No harm was done to him or to his property," (*ibid.*: 671) he was quoted as saying.<sup>80</sup>

Within less than two months, a necessity arose to hold a by-election to fill the three seats vacated by the members of the House who had been appointed as cabinet ministers.<sup>81</sup> Kemal Deniz<sup>82</sup>, who ran as an independent, managed to defeat the candidate of the National Front in Nicosia, though other two seats went to the National Front again.<sup>83</sup> Faiz Kaymak was dissuaded from running in the by-election, apparently under duress.<sup>84</sup> In the

---

<sup>76</sup> "Kıbrıs [Cyprus]." *Kim* (Turkey), 31.8.1960 (Reprinted in the pro-Republic Turkish Cypriot daily *Cumhuriyet* on 19.9.1960).

<sup>77</sup> "Kıbrıs'ta Seçimleri Kaybeden Adayların Taraftarları Dün Nümayiş Yaptılar [The supporters of the defeated candidates in Cyprus held a demonstration yesterday]." *Milliyet*, 4.8.1960; see also "Leymosun'da Bozgunculuk Tezahürleri: Seçimlerde Yolsuzluk Yapılmış [Manifestations of Subversion in Limassol: Electoral fraud allegations!]" *Halkın Sesi*, 3.8.1960.

<sup>78</sup> "Election Protest by Limassol Turks." *Cyprus Mail*, 3.8.1960.

<sup>79</sup> See "Rey Sayımı [Counting of votes]." *Halkın Sesi*, 30.7.1960.

<sup>80</sup> Originally published in *Bozkurt* (30.7.1960).

<sup>81</sup> "Ara Seçimleri İçin Hazırlıklara Başlandı [By-election preparations have started]." *Halkın Sesi*, 3.9.1960.

<sup>82</sup> Kemal Deniz was probably not considered as a major threat by the leadership as he was a loyal nationalist himself. Few weeks after his election, in a press conference in Turkey, he asked the Turkish government among other things to consider Cyprus always as a part of the motherland ("Kıbrıslıların İsteği [The Cypriots' request]." *Milliyet*, 7.10.1960).

<sup>83</sup> "Ara Seçimlerinin Neticeleri Bu Sabah İki'de Belli Oldu: Seçimleri Banka Müdürü Orhan Bey ile Tüccar Kemal Deniz Bey Kazandılar [The result of by-election disclosed at 2 am: The bank manager Mr Orhan and tradesman Kemal Deniz won]." *Halkın Sesi*, 26.9.1960.

<sup>84</sup> "Kıbrıs [Cyprus]." *Cumhuriyet*, 19.9.1960.

meantime, though the establishment of a new party had been announced in early August<sup>85</sup>, it did not take part in the by-election.

Indeed, the necessity to hold a by-election on its own merits more attention than its outcome. It was obvious that these three interim ministers would be appointed as the ministers in the first cabinet. Then, given the fact that the constitution did not allow them to hold these two positions at the same time, why did they stand for election in the first place? This was, in Denktaş's words, basically to "prove to certain elements in Turkey that they were in office by the will of the people"<sup>86</sup> because some "malicious rumours in Turkey" held that they lacked the approval of the Turkish Cypriot community.<sup>87</sup> Indeed, this was nothing but a manifestation of a wider rift between the Turkish Cypriot leadership and the Committee of National Unity (*Milli Birlik Komitesi*) in Turkey, which came to power after the military coup d'état of 27 May 1960.

The junta was suspicious about the Turkish Cypriot leadership's loyalty. Some notable Turkish Cypriots apparently fomented these suspicions.<sup>88</sup> The initial intention of the government was to replace Dr Küçük, as he was considered too close to Menderes, the toppled Turkish premier. One of Dr Küçük's articles in his daily, where he basically had said, it was wrong to criticize the deposed leaders mercilessly before they were tried and found guilty, was considered pro-Menderes and counter-revolutionary.<sup>89</sup> This triggered anti-Dr Küçük demonstrations in major cities of Turkey, which were organized by the Turkish Cypriot university students.<sup>90</sup> Given that a military rule was prevailing at the time in Turkey, these demonstrations were obviously endorsed if not directly organized by the junta. Ironically, other international actors involved, Britain and Greece, were reluctant to accept a change of leadership in the Turkish Cypriot side fretting that this might stir a backlash within the community, and in turn, jeopardize the implementation of the

---

<sup>85</sup> "Turk Under Death Threat Announces New Party." *Cyprus Mail*, 5.8.1960.

<sup>86</sup> "Kranidiotis Rejects Foreign Affairs Ministry." *Cyprus Mail*, 16.8.1960.

<sup>87</sup> "Our Candidates are Above Party Politics says Denktash." *Cyprus Mail*, 21.7.1960.

<sup>88</sup> See for instance the telegrams sent to the junta by Nevzat Karagil (cited in An 2006: 659-60).

<sup>89</sup> "Doktorun Hatası [The Doctor's fault]." *Milliyet*, 24.6.1960; "Kıbrıslı Gençler Doktor Küçük'ü Protesto Ediyor [Cypriot youths to protest Dr Küçük]." *Milliyet*, 23.6.1960.

<sup>90</sup> "Kıbrıslı Öğrenciler Nümayiş Yaptı [Cypriot students held a demonstration]." *Milliyet*, 24.6.1960. Some of the banners read: "Küçük, you are not the leader any more"; "Küçük, you have a place in Yassıada too"; "Enough! Freedom to the Turkish Cypriots too"; "Küçük, resign!" See also "Kıbrıs İçin Ankara'da Sessiz Yürüyüş Yapıldı [A silent march held in Ankara for Cyprus]." *Milliyet*, 26.6.1960.

agreements.<sup>91</sup> It turned out that eventually the new military-backed government, which had earlier expressed its commitment to the agreements signed by the Menderes government<sup>92</sup>, took this concern into consideration, and did not push for a leadership change in the island.

To cut the ties with the previous regime however, the Turkish government withdrew the appointment of İsmail Soysal, chief spokesperson of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (TMFA) during Menderes administration<sup>93</sup>, and appointed a retired lieutenant colonel, Emin Dirvana as its first ambassador to the RoC<sup>94</sup> - who would prove to be a staunch proponent of the Republic to the dismay of the Turkish Cypriot leadership. Apparently, the junta had some second thoughts about the TMT as well. They recalled its commander, colonel Rıza Vuruşkan, and the responsible officer in Ankara, İsmail Tansu was forced to retire.<sup>95</sup> As the dominant tendency within the government was to attach the TMT directly to the Turkish contingent in the island<sup>96</sup>, they did not appoint a commander to replace Vuruşkan.<sup>97</sup>

The junta's commitment to the London and Zurich Agreements was so firm that despite the TMT's insistence "after the coup not a single gun had been run to the island until the clashes broke out in 1963".<sup>98</sup> The TMT was re-organized, and in a way pacified, as part of this operation. As a result, former commanders became in effect inferior to sergeants sent from Ankara, which caused a deep disappointment among the ranks of the TMT (Halluma 2007: 344).<sup>99</sup> A replacement to the commander was appointed only after a civilian government took over in 1962 in Ankara.<sup>100</sup> This appointment coincided with a change of heart on the Turkish position regarding the future of the Republic. The turning point seems

---

<sup>91</sup> Aydın Samioğlu interviewed by author.

<sup>92</sup> "Selim Sarper Anlaşmalara Sadık Kalınacağını Bildirdi [Selim Sarper declared that the agreements would be honored]." *Milliyet*, 2.6.1960.

<sup>93</sup> "Diplomatic 'No' for Mr Soysal." *Cyprus Mail*, 10.7.1960.

<sup>94</sup> "Retired Colonel will be Turkish Envoy." *Cyprus Mail*, 6.8.1960.

<sup>95</sup> Aydın Samioğlu interviewed by author.

<sup>96</sup> A contingent of 650 Turkish soldiers (along with a contingent of 950 Greek soldiers) was deployed in the island in accordance with the Treaty of Alliance between Cyprus, Turkey and Greece.

<sup>97</sup> Aydın Samioğlu interviewed by author.

<sup>98</sup> Fuat Veziroğlu interviewed by author.

<sup>99</sup> In his memoirs, Mehmet Ali Tremeşeli, one of the local commanders writes how he decided to resign after this "dishonouring" act. The section is entitled "When Mice Become the Commander of Elephants!" (Halluma 2007: 343-56).

<sup>100</sup> Aydın Samioğlu interviewed by author.

to be Makarios' visit to Ankara in November 1962.<sup>101</sup> In this visit, İnönü, the Turkish premier, reiterated the Turkish position regarding the agreements establishing the Republic, and asked Makarios not to push for any changes in the constitution but did not receive a positive answer. "Makarios' attitude in the official meetings cannot be seen as an indication of a solution to the problems in Cyprus any time soon," wrote Mehmet Ali Kışlalı of *Milliyet*, referring to the sources close to the TMFA.<sup>102</sup>

Having studied the period running up to the inter-communal clashes, Patrick concludes, "there is no doubt that both Cypriot communities expected the 1960 constitution to prove unworkable, and that they anticipated and planned for an armed clash" (1976: 37). Before long, the anticipated armed conflict broke out when Makarios, despite the clear opposition from Turkey, proposed to amend the constitution in December 1963.

## **2.4 The Evolution of Separate Turkish Cypriot Administrations**

The inter-communal clashes of 1963 paved the way for the first administrative division in the island. The Turkish Cypriots evacuated more than hundred villages and retreated into the areas where Turkish Cypriots constituted majority. One fourth of the Turkish Cypriot population was displaced.<sup>103</sup> These areas were basically disconnected enclaves, dispersed all around the island. Overall, there were, some large and some very small, no less than 73 different administrative units.<sup>104</sup> Eventually, more than half of the Turkish Cypriot population of 116 thousand started living in the areas under Turkish Cypriot control (Borowiec 2000: 65). As Denктаş put it, "the Turkish community was forced into an economic and administrative vacuum" (1982: 34; for an alternative account see Nicolet 2002: 61-8; for an account from the Greek Cypriot perspective, see Spyridakis 1974: 183-192). To fill that vacuum, and to administer the Turkish Cypriot affairs, a General Committee was established. This first step in the direction of a separate administrative structure was justified, in a rather vivid way, in the *Special News Bulletin*, the mouthpiece of the Turkish Communal Chamber as follows:

---

<sup>101</sup> Fuat Veziroğlu interviewed by author.

<sup>102</sup> "Makarios 'Güçlükler Yenilecektir' dedi ['Difficulties will be overcome' Makarios said]." *Milliyet*, 26.11.1962.

<sup>103</sup> State Planning Organization (1979: 4).

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*

The structure and mechanisms of bodies be they of a group of people or of a state are organic. Just as a living matter which is rejected by an organic body looks for a place to strike its roots as a separate organism, the Turkish Cypriots, whose existence in the Republic of Cyprus is ignored, are inclined to look for their own sources in order to secure their separate existence. Naturally this leads to actual separation and paves the way for TAKSIM. In the administrative field we possess the status of a separate community.<sup>105</sup>

The General Committee, which consisted of 13 members<sup>106</sup>, was only one of the foci of political power within the community<sup>107</sup>. Even before the inter-communal clashes began, there had been a power struggle between these forces. “The commander of the TMT, the Turkish ambassador, and the commander of the Turkish contingent had wanted to use certain authorities, which belonged to the politicians, and this caused some quarrels,” Nejat Konuk, the then secretary general of the Communal Chamber, recounts (cited in Besim 2011: 132).

The inter-communal conflict not only brought the ongoing internal power struggle waged behind closed doors into limelight but also tilted the balance in favour of the TMT, the most organized group within the community. Accordingly, its commander, so-called *Bayraktar*<sup>108</sup>, a colonel from Turkey, therefore accountable to the Turkish Joint Chief of Staff, became the holder of “absolute power,” not only in military but also in political matters (*ibid.*: 133; Cf. Salih 1978: 181). Dr Küçük, on the other hand, though on top of the political hierarchy as the vice-president of the Republic had in effect no executive power. The Communal Chamber had retained its political and economic influence thanks to its control over the Turkish financial assistance as well as the *Evkaf* and Cooperative Central Bank. However, Şemsi Kazım, who was in charge of the Communal Chamber in the absence of Denktaş<sup>109</sup>,

---

<sup>105</sup> “Taksim a Quid Pro Quo for Enosis.” *Special New Bulletin*, 16.12.1964 (Emphasis in original).

<sup>106</sup> The Vice-President of the Republic (Dr Küçük); Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives (Orhan Müderrisoğlu); Speaker of the Communal Chamber (Rauf Denktaş); three Turkish Cypriot ministers of the Republic (Osman Örek; Fazıl Plümer; Niyazi Manyera); four members of the House of Representatives (Ümit Süleyman; Burhan Nalbantoğlu; Halit Ali Rıza, A. Mithat Berberoğlu); Acting Speaker of the Communal Chamber (Şemsi Kazım); the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (Zeka Bey); and the Turkish Cypriot member of the Constitutional Court (Necati Münir). The General Committee consisted of 7 lawyers, 5 medical doctors.

<sup>107</sup> In fact, the committee itself was formed as an attempt to ensure power sharing among contending Turkish Cypriot leaders. However, the attempt utterly failed, and a vicious power struggle ensued. For more on the General Committee see Adalı 1999: 81-2.

<sup>108</sup> Kemal Coşkun who was also known as Kenan Coygun or Bozkurt (Grey Wolf). His cover was a diplomatic position in the Turkish Embassy.

<sup>109</sup> He was banished by the Makarios administration after he had left for Ankara in early 1964.

sided with the *Bayraktar* rather than Dr Küçük.<sup>110</sup> This was, in fact, what Dr Küçük had been concerned about from the outset. Although, he was its leader, at least on paper, he was concerned that the existence of an armed organization would eventually “weaken his political influence” (Gazioğlu 2000: 21). His concerns were obviously proven well founded. Although the balance of power between the actors changed from time to time, this three-headed structure prevailed until 1974 (cf. Salih 1978: 181), and came to be known as the Rule of BEY: *Bayraktar*, *Elçi* (the Turkish ambassador), *Yönetim* (the Turkish Cypriot administration), and hence the acronym BEY, which can be roughly translated as master.

Against this backdrop, Dr Küçük continued to play his role as the community leader, and did his utmost to avoid any public show of disunity. In answering a foreign journalist’s question regarding the opposition within the Turkish Cypriot community, he wrote, “[t]here are no clashing trends of opinion among the Turks of Cyprus. We are all engaged in a struggle for survival and we are solidly united in this cause. In fact our solidarity constitutes our strength in this life-or-death struggle”.<sup>111</sup> This was indeed hardly the case not only due to the internal power struggle within the formal leadership but also because of the existence of different voices in the public at large. Few months before the interview concerned, in a cable dated 16 March 1964, addressed to İnönü, “on behalf of the citizens who cannot raise their voice owing to the prevailing threats and terrorism,” wrote Dr İhsan Ali, “I am sure your foresight will bring about the failure of those who are trying to mislead you and your Government into a difficult position by leading Turkey to a war, and to turn this island into hell by putting forward to world opinion the nonsensical allegation that the two communities cannot live together in Cyprus”.<sup>112</sup>

How representative of the Turkish Cypriot public opinion Dr İhsan Ali’s views were, remains a moot point, as the popularity of his ideas had never been put to test in a real election. What is known for a fact is that he was a strong critic of the leadership, and that he supported at least initially, the short-lived opposition party established by Ahmet Gürkan and Ayhan Hikmet, who also published the pro-republic *Cumhuriyet* newspaper, which

---

<sup>110</sup> Şemsi Kazım refused to comment on this issue in our interview.

<sup>111</sup> “Federal System in the Swiss Model.” *Special News Bulletin*, 14.10.1964. From Dr Küçük’s written reply to the editor of *Zurcher Woche*.

<sup>112</sup> *In Memory of Dr. İhsan Ali* (1995: 65).

came to an abrupt end in April 1962, when its founders were assassinated, allegedly, by the TMT.

The Turkish establishment was firmly against the idea of military intervention. Much to the disappointment of the Turkish Cypriot leaders, Cemal Tural, the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, publicly ridiculed the calls for intervention repeatedly: "The Turkish army cannot be sent whenever someone gets thrust a needle on his foot in Cyprus," he was reported as saying.<sup>113</sup> About the same time, he made the following statement:

There is no such thing as the Cyprus problem today. The Cyprus problem is made up of balloons flown by some who are after their selfish interests. There is a fight between Ali and Aleco [the characters of a popular story about two fishermen] in Cyprus but there is no need for sending the army for the fight between two persons. ... Should an event occur, we will defend our just cause, but at the moment, there is no incident in Cyprus. The ones who are after their selfish interests have exaggerated what had happened.<sup>114</sup>

This stance of the Turkish military notwithstanding, Turkey and Greece came to the brink of war when clashes broke out in the villages of Kophinou (Köfünye) and Ayios Theodoros (Geçitkale) in November 1967.<sup>115</sup> Ankara threatened to invade unless twenty thousand Greek troops in the island were withdrawn, and their commander Grivas recalled.<sup>116</sup> A deal was eventually brokered thanks to the US president Lyndon Johnson's special envoy Cyrus Vance's intensive shuttle diplomacy between Ankara, Athens, and Nicosia, and shortly the Greek troops began to withdraw from the island.<sup>117</sup> The Greek Cypriot press denounced the agreement as "a sell-out".<sup>118</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> "Tural 'Kıbrıs Zaten Bizim Elimizde' dedi ['Cyprus is already in our hands,' Tural said]." *Halkın Sesi*, 11.10.1966.

<sup>114</sup> "Tural: 'Kıbrıs Davası Ali ile Aleko Kavgasıdır' [Tural: 'The Cyprus cause is like a quarrel between Ali and Aleco']." *Halkın Sesi*, 13.10.1966 (originally published in *Akşam*, İstanbul).

<sup>115</sup> The crisis was so serious that the families of American diplomats and other personnel were evacuated to Beirut (see *Cyprus Mail*, 25.11.1967 and 10.12.1967).

<sup>116</sup> "Turkish Jets Violate Island's Airspace." *Cyprus Mail*, 19.11.1967; "Turkish Troops Poised for Attack." *Cyprus Mail*, 24.11.1967; "Turkey Seeks Once-For-All Solution in Cyprus." *Cyprus Mail*, 25.11.1967.

<sup>117</sup> "Greco-Turkish Agreement Finally Reached." *Cyprus Mail*, 3.12.1967; "First Greek Troops Sail." *Cyprus Mail*, 9.12.1967.

<sup>118</sup> Cited in *Cyprus Mail*, 5.12.1967.

Emboldened by this success, and further encouraged by the turmoil in Athens (the military government was internationally unpopular and internally unstable)<sup>119</sup> Ankara took one more step, and on 28 December 1967, the Turkish Cypriot leaders declared the establishment of the Turkish Cypriot Provisional Administration.<sup>120</sup> The decision was made the previous night in a meeting at the vice-president's office where two Turkish officials, Zeki Kuneralp, the secretary general of the TMFA, and Suat Bilge, the TMFA's chief legal adviser, also participated.<sup>121</sup> According to the Turkish Cypriot leadership this was merely "an attempt to put their house in order by re-organizing their existing administrative system".<sup>122</sup>

Not surprisingly, the declaration stirred an international controversy. It was perceived as an act of secessionism by the Greek Cypriot leadership. The Makarios government declared the administration "unlawful," and lodged a protest at the UN.<sup>123</sup> The involvement of Kuneralp in the process was considered as interference in the internal affairs of the RoC, and the Greek Cypriot administration declared him *persona non grata*.<sup>124</sup> Furthermore, Makarios issued an "ultimatum to all heads of foreign missions in Cyprus, warning them that any contact by them with the members of the Turkish Cypriot provisional administration would be regarded ... as an act of 'recognition' of the Turkish administration, and as such, a violation of the terms of their accreditation".<sup>125</sup> U Thant, the UN Secretary General did not welcome the declaration either, and in his Report to the Security Council, he wrote, *inter alia* "I cannot conceal my misgivings as to the decision itself, its timing, the way in which it was announced and the publicity given to it by the Turkish Cypriot leadership".<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup> The military government had been in power since the coup in April 1967. However, it should be noted that the king tried to stage a counter-coup, and when failed, was sent into exile in mid-December ("Restoration Bid Fails: King Constantine flees into exile." *Cyprus Mail*, 15.12.1967).

<sup>120</sup> "Kıbrıs'ta Geçici Türk Yönetimi Kuruldu [Provisional Turkish administration established in Cyprus]." *Milliyet*, 30.12.1967.

<sup>121</sup> "Re-Organization of the Turkish Cypriot Administrative System." *Special News Bulletin*, 30.12.1967.

<sup>122</sup> "Setting the Record Right About Turkish Cypriot Re-Organization." *Special News Bulletin*, 4.1.1968.

<sup>123</sup> "Makarios: 'Hareket Kanunsuzdur' [Makarios: 'The Act is Unlawful']." *Milliyet*, 30.12.1967.

<sup>124</sup> "Makarios Türk Hükümetini Protesto Etti: Kuneralp İstenmeyen Adam İlan Edildi [Makarios protested the Turkish government: Kuneralp declared *persona non grata*]." *Milliyet*, 31.12.1967.

<sup>125</sup> "Makarios Still Adamant in his Attempt to Restrict the Freedom of Movement of Diplomats." *Special News Bulletin*, 10.1.1968.

<sup>126</sup> Secretary Generals Report to the Security Council cited in "U Thant Concerned Over Turkish Move." *Cyprus Mail*, 5.1.1968.

Kuneralp assured that the intention was “to facilitate administration and not to promote partition or the creation of a separate state” (Crawshaw 1978: 78). This was reaffirmed by Dr Küçük, in a telegram addressed to the UN Secretary General, dated 30 December 1967: “the reorganization is entirely within the framework of the Constitution and has no scope of a political nature. Nor has it any connection with the final solution of the problem of Cyprus”.<sup>127</sup> The leadership repeatedly reiterated the constitutionality of the move, and denied the allegations that it was meant to set up a separate government in the island:

The Turkish Cypriot Administration is not a new institution. It is basically, an integral part of the constitutional government of the Republic, which, having been pushed out its original legal setting, by armed force and violence, came to exist and function separately to cater for the needs of Turkish Cypriots. ... The measures announced on 28 December 1967 by the Turkish Cypriot Community were, therefore, no more than a reformulation of a system which has been in existence before the eyes of the world since 1963. There is nothing sinister or subversive in Turkish Cypriots’ attempt to run their affairs more efficiently. ... Nor does it tend to violate the Constitution of the Republic; if anything, it is, a reaffirmation of the Turkish community’s determination to uphold the Constitution and secure respect for its provisions.<sup>128</sup>

The Basic Provisions of the Provisional Cyprus Turkish Administration dated 29 December 1967, which was envisaged to remain in force “until all provisions of the 16 August 1960 Constitution of the RoC are applied,” gave the executive power to the executive council (cited in Salih 1978: 153; see also Denktaş 1982: 35). The president of the executive council was the vice-president of the RoC, Dr Küçük, and the vice-president was the president of the Turkish Communal Chamber, Denktaş (cited in Salih 1978: 153). Judicial power was given to “independent Turkish Courts”. The authority to appoint the Turkish judges as well as the members of the executive council were given to the president on the recommendation of the vice-president (Basic Provisions cited in Salih 1978: 154). In the new structure, the members of the Communal Chamber and the House of Representatives, who had been elected in 1960, continued performing their legislative roles in a single body called the Turkish Cypriot Legislative Assembly (Salih 1978: 76).

---

<sup>127</sup> “Vice-President Refutes Greek Allegations Concerning Turkish Cypriot Re-Organization and Assures UN Secretary General of Turkish Cypriot Cooperation in the Exercise of his Good Offices.” *Special News Bulletin*, 5.1.1969.

<sup>128</sup> “Setting the Record Right About Turkish Cypriot Re-Organization.” *Special News Bulletin*, 4.1.1968.

Of course, this was just on paper. The real power was still concentrated at the *Bayraktar's* office. When in an effort to reassert themselves, few Nicosian members of the Communal Chamber called a general meeting to discuss a road map, they were bluntly told by the *Bayraktar* that basically there was not much to discuss and that the "Chamber was put into the freezer".<sup>129</sup>

Denktaş was appointed in absentia as he was forced to stay in Ankara after the Makarios administration banned his entry to Cyprus. He was seen as a "rebel leader,"<sup>130</sup> who committed "offences against the state".<sup>131</sup> His time in exile in Ankara was probably one of the worst periods of Denktaş's life.<sup>132</sup> The Turkish government was seeing him as an extremist. Denktaş, for his part, was openly critical of the Turkish government: "The culprits of the current deadlock in Cyprus are the Turkish governments, which had ignored warnings and insisted on their (mistaken) policies. ... The problem can be solved only by the intervention of Turkey, which had been authorized by the Treaty of Guarantee," he was quoted as saying in a public meeting in Ankara.<sup>133</sup>

Particularly, it is known that he fell out with İhsan Sabri Çağlayangil, the Turkish foreign minister.<sup>134</sup> Their relationship turned from bad to worse, when Denktaş had provided the opposition leader Bölükbaşı with documents, which led to the grilling of Çağlayangil in a parliamentary debate on Cyprus.<sup>135</sup> This led to his isolation at the TMFA, where he had an office (Adalı 1999: 54). There was a growing criticism against him in Cyprus as well. Dr Küçük who came to perceive him as a political rival, published articles criticizing him, and allegedly wrote letters asking Ankara to keep him away from Cyprus to avoid disunity in

---

<sup>129</sup> Ahmet Mutallip, a member of the Communal Chamber (cited in Adalı 1999: 88-92). The meeting was supposed to take place at a hotel. However, upon the request of the Charge D'affaires and the *Bayraktar*, it took place at the Turkish Embassy.

<sup>130</sup> "What brought Denktas to Cyprus?" *Cyprus Mail*, 3.11.1967.

<sup>131</sup> *Patris* cited in *Cyprus Mail*, 10.11.1967.

<sup>132</sup> Indeed, looking from a broader perspective, being in exile between 1964 and 1968 can be seen as a blessing for him as well. During this period, the Turkish Cypriot society was totally isolated because of the roadblocks erected by the Greek Cypriot authorities. Turkey's inability to intervene in the face of Greek Cypriot aggression was also a huge psychological blow. In these circumstances, being away from Cyprus helped him to come through all the internal power struggles within the Turkish Cypriot community unscathed.

<sup>133</sup> "Kıbrıs Konusunda Açık Oturum - Denktaş: 'Kıbrıs meselesi bu şartlar altında halledilemez' dedi [Public discussion on the Cyprus issue: Denktaş: "The Cyprus problem cannot be taken care of under these conditions]." *Halkın Sesi*, 17.12.1966.

<sup>134</sup> Veziroğlu interviewed by author.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*

the community his return may cause. At some point, the General Committee even reduced his salary (*ibid.*). Not only the Makarios administration, but also Ankara, and even his closest friends were trying to eliminate Denktaş (*ibid.*: 55). He was so frustrated and depressed that he decided to come back to the island secretly. When he was caught after landing on the coast of Larnaca, and put into custody, he said to his interrogators, he came to show his critics that he was not a “deserter”.<sup>136</sup>

The Greek Cypriot public opinion was split about what to do with Denktaş. According to one view, he should be tried and punished. One of the proponents of this view was *Patris*, a Greek Cypriot daily, which likened Denktaş’s botched attempt to land in Cyprus to Rudolf Hess’ attempt to land in Britain in 1941, and argued “[l]ike Rudolf Hess, who was detained, and later tried at Nuremberg and sentenced to life imprisonment the Denktaş mission should similarly fail”.<sup>137</sup> According to the second view, “for reasons of expedience he should be deported to Turkey”.<sup>138</sup> Eventually, the second view prevailed, and after some ten days in custody, he was sent back to Turkey on the condition that he would not seek to enter the island illegally again.<sup>139</sup> His return to the island was finally allowed in April 1968<sup>140</sup>, and as soon as he came back, he assumed his post as the negotiator of the Turkish Cypriot community in the inter-communal talks - a post he was to retain for more than 35 years.

## 2.5 Elections in the Post-1968 Period

The rift between the TMT fighters and Dr Küçük took a different turn when the administration called the long overdue vice-presidential election for 25 February 1968. This was because the Greek Cypriot administration decided to do so. This election marked one of the rare instances, when the view of the different actors from Ankara in Cyprus so obviously diverged. When the election was called, determined to get rid of Dr Küçük once and for all, his critics approached to probably the most respected member of the Turkish Cypriot community of the time, Chief Justice Zeka Mehmet (henceforth, Zeka Bey).<sup>141</sup> Zeka Bey was the former president of the Cyprus Supreme Court and a serving judge at the

---

<sup>136</sup> “Court Remands Denktash.” *Cyprus Mail*, 3.11.1967.

<sup>137</sup> Cited in *Cyprus Mail*, 4.11.1967 and 15.11.1967.

<sup>138</sup> “Much ado about the case of Mr Denktash.” *Cyprus Mail*, 7.11.1967.

<sup>139</sup> “Denktash Sent to Turkey.” *Cyprus Mail*, 13.11.1967.

<sup>140</sup> “Happy Reunion.” *Special News Bulletin*. 16.4.1968.

<sup>141</sup> “Mr Justice Zekia as Turkish Candidate.” *Cyprus Mail*, 23.1.1968. See also *Special News Bulletin*, 24.1.1968.

European Court of Human Rights, where he represented the RoC. He had also served as a member of the Legislative Council and chaired the Committee for Turkish Affairs during the British rule.

Initially, Zeka Bey was not willing to accept the offer, as “he had not intended to mix in politics”.<sup>142</sup> However, upon strong request and pledges of support by a number of Turkish Cypriot organizations and notables including some members of the Communal Chamber and the House of Representatives, and the Commander of the Turkish contingent (Adalı 199: 95-6)<sup>143</sup>, he decided to stand for election against Dr Küçük “for the sake of the national interest”.<sup>144</sup> “If it is a national duty, I will carry it out,” he said in an interview.<sup>145</sup>

Zeka Bey’s candidacy was welcomed by “the men on the street,” according to the Turkish Cypriot weekly *Zafer*.<sup>146</sup> His distance from politics was highlighted as an advantage. “What the Turkish Cypriot Community needs today is an administrator who is expert in legal matters and who has no political ambition,” wrote one O. Toprak in *Zafer*, urging the voters to vote for Zeka Bey.<sup>147</sup> Given the fact that he was not associated with any organization, he was seen as someone who could promote “unity in the Turkish community”.<sup>148</sup> Zeka Bey’s candidacy was welcomed also in the Greek Cypriot community. *Cyprus Mail* reported that Zeka Bey “has a long record of good cooperation with the Greek Cypriots ... [and if] he wins, the road may be open for constructive negotiations between the two sides”.<sup>149</sup>

After just few days of election fever, and at a time when he was expected to fly to Ankara to confer with the Turkish officials about his candidacy, Zeka Bey surprisingly withdrew from the race with the short statement cited below:

With the object of preserving unity in our Community, which is needed more than ever before at this critical stage in which our national cause stands and in view of

---

<sup>142</sup> “Mr Justice Zekia as Turkish Candidate.” *Cyprus Mail*, 23.1.1968.

<sup>143</sup> Although, he was a member of the General Committee, Zeka Bey was not a political figure. His son in law, Dr Şemsi Kazım was the acting president of the Turkish Communal Chamber. His other son in law, Oktay Feridun was the deputy solicitor general.

<sup>144</sup> “Mr Justice Zekia as Turkish Candidate.” *Cyprus Mail*, 23.1.1968.

<sup>145</sup> Interview with *Zafer* cited in “Turkish Nominee Calls for Communal Effort.” *Cyprus Mail*, 25.1.1968.

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>147</sup> Cited in “Yesterday’s Turkish Press.” *Special News Bulletin*, 27.1.1968.

<sup>148</sup> Interview with *Zafer*.

<sup>149</sup> “Turkish Cypriots to go to the polls.” *Cyprus Mail*, 21.1.1968.

the comforting assurance given by H.E. the Vice-President Dr. Fazil Kuchuk, I shall not put my nomination for the election of a Vice-President in the 25<sup>th</sup> February.<sup>150</sup>

Indeed, Zeka Bey changed his mind under duress, and even his withdrawal statement was formulated by Ankara (Yavuzalp 1993: 142). Oktay Feridun, who was present at the meeting between Zeka Bey, and the two top Turkish officials in the island, Yavuzalp, charge d'affaires, and the *Bayraktar*, where Zeka Bey was forced to withdraw his candidacy, recounts that their attitude towards Zeka Bey was not diplomatic to say the least.<sup>151</sup> He also recounts how the third representative of Ankara, the commander of the Turkish contingent, Fazil Polat who was in favour of Zeka Bey's candidacy, said "he should not have gone to that meeting" in protest (cited in Fedai 2002: 70-1).

Zeka Bey was preparing to run on a platform that would outline what to do to make progress in the field of economic development. He had the chance to talk about his plans at length in an interview published in *Zafer*, which is very illustrative of the socio-economic ills in the enclaves:

Our grievances are not only political. ... This thing cannot be carried out by one or two persons. Everybody has to do his best. Our existence on this island depends on the development of all 120,000 persons. The development of one or two groups does not mean the development of the community as a whole. ... We need a programme, a plan. We must provide a future for the youth. To say "you must stay here" cannot prevent emigration. Our youth must have a future here. ... The first condition is to become productive, not consuming. There should be no more salaries for idlers. Everyone should deserve pay for the work he offers. He must earn it. We cannot live on aid forever. ... We must give a place to our experts. Every job must be entrusted to the right man. Everybody must work. Everybody must take part in the community's cause for existence and development.<sup>152</sup>

As far as the policy to be pursued regarding the Cyprus conflict was concerned, Zeka Bey's stand was indeed not different from the incumbent Dr Küçük. When he was asked a question on that, his response was revealing: "as you know this is worked out by Ankara ... all our efforts must be exerted jointly with Turkey".<sup>153</sup> It is also worth noting in this juncture that among other things, the TMT fighter's role in the candidacy of Zeka Bey reveals that the rift between the TMT fighters and Dr Küçük was largely a power struggle

---

<sup>150</sup> "Statement by Mr. Mehmet Zekia." *Special News Bulletin*, 30.1.1968.

<sup>151</sup> Oktay Feridun interviewed by author.

<sup>152</sup> Cited in "Turkish Nominee Calls for Communal Effort." *Cyprus Mail*, 25.1.1968.

<sup>153</sup> Interview with *Zafer*.

devoid of any disagreements in policy. Otherwise, Zeka Bey, a well-known moderate, would probably be the last person in the community the TMT would turn to as a candidate to replace Dr Küçük. At any rate, the rift came to a temporary if not a definitive end when Denktaş came back from exile and reassumed his position as the vice-president of the executive council and the speaker of the Communal Chamber.

Two years later, when the Greek Cypriots decided to hold parliamentary election after ten years<sup>154</sup>, the Turkish Cypriot administration felt the pressure to follow suit<sup>155</sup>, and announced that an election for the Turkish Cypriot members would be held parallel to the Greek Cypriot election on 5 July 1970 (Yavuzalp 1993: 144-7). This prompted Ahmet M. Berberoğlu, a member of the House of Representatives, who had also served as a member of the General Committee (see Fevzioglu 1998: 39 and 47), and his friends to start an initiative to establish a political party (Yavuzalp 1993: 147-8). They prepared the statute and program of the party, which they named the Republican Turkish Party (*Cumhuriyetçi Türk Partisi*, CTP)<sup>156</sup>, and submitted it to the Turkish Embassy to get “the green light” from Ankara (*ibid.*). However, the attempt was vetoed on the grounds that the establishment of a party would trigger the establishment of others, which would in turn give an image of disunity within the community in this critical period of the national cause (*ibid.*: 149; see also Adalı 1999: 75-8).<sup>157</sup>

“After various consultations with Ankara, and the community,” writes Ercüment Yavuzalp, the then charge d’affaires at the Turkish Embassy in Nicosia, in his memoirs, “the framework in which the elections would be conducted was decided” (1993: 148-9). Accordingly, “[t]he Turkish community has worked out a ‘National Solidarity Programme,’ which has been accepted by all the candidates as a common denominator”. “The programme” according to the administration “caters for all the views and convictions which obtain within the Turkish community with regard to domestic and political

---

<sup>154</sup> The representatives were elected for five years in 1960. However, due to the internal situation after 1963, in the mean time no election was held, and their term was extended yearly.

<sup>155</sup> According to Şemsi Kazım, majority of the members of the Legislative Assembly were indeed, against holding an election (interviewed by author).

<sup>156</sup> According to Adalı the name of the party would be the Republican Party (1999: 75).

<sup>157</sup> In the Greek Cypriot community, on the other hand, 1970 election was contested on an organized party basis – first time ever (“No Fuss Election Goes Off Quietly.” *Cyprus Mail*, 6.7.1970).

issues”.<sup>158</sup> “On the Turkish side, unlike the Greek side, there is no party strife and, therefore, no conflicting policy platforms,” claimed the *Special News Bulletin* boastfully.<sup>159</sup> All candidates, 59 for the 15 seats in the Chamber and 43 for the 15 seats in the House<sup>160</sup>, ran on the National Solidarity Programme, which had been prepared by Denктаş, and campaigned only to show that they were the most capable ones to implement the national program.

The *Bulletin’s* claim was only partly justified. Although there was no formal party, the candidates close to Denктаş came together under the National Solidarity Team (*Ulusal Dayanışma Ekibi*), and ran as a group in all six districts. There was no group contending them island-wide. However, judging from the local press coverage, it can be said that there were candidates acting together at local level against the National Solidarity. In Famagusta, for instance, there were candidates who called themselves the Green Island Team (*Yeşilada Ekibi*).<sup>161</sup>

For the most part, the candidates of the National Solidarity won the seats, although in Nicosia three out of ten seats went to the independent candidates.<sup>162</sup> Denктаş, who ran as a candidate above groups<sup>163</sup> won the biggest victory of his political life by obtaining according to one account, over 95 percent of the votes.<sup>164</sup> This overwhelming support strengthened his hand and gave him an aura of invincibility in the years to come. Furthermore, it confirmed that the days of Dr Küçük as the vice-president were numbered.

---

<sup>158</sup> “Election Revelations.” *Special News Bulletin*, 4.7.1970.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>160</sup> “Nominations.” *Special News Bulletin*, 26.6.1970.

<sup>161</sup> Osman Arif, Ayhan Çiftçioğlu, Taner Erginel in Famagusta ran under “Yeşilada” team (see for instance “Adayları Tanıtıyoruz [We are presenting the candidates].” *Bozkurt*, 1.7.1970). According to *Cyprus Mail*, A. M. Berberoğlu formed a group in Limassol to compete with the National Solidarity Team led by Ziya Rızıkı (“Cyprus voters still in the dark.” 19.6.1970).

<sup>162</sup> Kemal Deniz who had won as an independent in the by-election, managed to retain his seat in the House. Özker Yaşın and Nevzat Uzunoğlu managed to defeat the candidates of the National Solidarity Team, Ayer Kaşif and Ümit Asım Öznil, to win seats in the Chamber (*Bozkurt*, 5.7.1970 and 7.7.1970; see also Akay Cemal: “Kıbrıs’da AKEL karlı çıktı [AKEL made gains in Cyprus].” *Milliyet*, 8.7.1970).

<sup>163</sup> Denктаş’s name did not feature on the ballot paper along with the candidates of the National Solidarity Team to emphasize his status above all groups. However, the Team decided to leave his place blank, and only four names featured on the left hand side of the ballot paper for Nicosia, where the National Solidarity Team’s candidates were. Denктаş’s name was on the right along with the independents (*Bozkurt*, 5.7.1970).

<sup>164</sup> “A Warm ‘Thank You’ by Denktash.” *Special News Bulletin*, 8.7.1970.

Before his return from exile Denктаş was asked by the Turkish government to maintain a good relationship with Dr Küçük for the sake of unity.<sup>165</sup> Denктаş heeded this request and silently waited for his day. In the meantime, the two leaders continued to work together. Upon the request of Ankara, even Denктаş's office was moved next to the vice-president's office (Adalı 1999). However, the bitterness between the two leaders was obvious. The gradual transition of power from Dr Küçük to Denктаş, which had started in 1958, was finally completed in 1973 when Dr Küçük's term as the vice-president expired. After he returned empty-handed from his last-ditch visit to seek support in Ankara, Dr Küçük declared that he would not seek a re-election as "he felt an election campaign now might have negative repercussions within the community".<sup>166</sup>

Berberoğlu, who had earlier declared his candidacy as the representative of the CTP<sup>167</sup>, was also forced to withdraw few days before the election. In what has become a "tradition," Berberoğlu was invited to the Embassy, and asked to withdraw from the election. When he refused, he was reminded by the *Bayraktar*, "who abruptly stepped in from the next room," that he had to take into consideration that "a stray bullet" or a "car accident" might find him on his way back home, if he insists on running (Berberoğlu cited in Özuslu 2011: 37). When he defied and wanted to fly to Ankara, he was put to house arrest (*ibid.*: 38). The next day, on 16 February 1973, Denктаş was declared the vice-president of the Republic<sup>168</sup> and became the formal leader of the Turkish community.

## 2.6 The Role of Political Clientelism in the Pre-1974 Period

Having briefly reviewed the pre-1974 political developments, now, the role of patron-client ties in this period can be addressed. As discussed in the previous chapter, to account for political clientelism in a given society, *culturalist*, and to a certain extent *developmentalist* approaches tend to focus on the earlier existence of deep-rooted patron-client ties within the society concerned. To oversimplify somewhat, in certain societies, the argument goes, voters demand particularistic benefits in exchange for their votes because the traditional patron-client ties, which had emerged in the pre-modern/pre-democratic period and had prevailed for centuries, are still resilient and continue to haunt them. The form of

---

<sup>165</sup> Veziroğlu interviewed by author.

<sup>166</sup> "Dr Küçük not to seek re-election." *Special News Bulletin*, 3.1.1973.

<sup>167</sup> The Republican Turkish Party was established on 27 December 1970.

<sup>168</sup> "Denktash the new Vice-President." *Special News Bulletin*, 17.2.1973.

incorporation into electoral politics explains this continuity: In the time of initial political mobilization, political parties did/could not reach these rural communities with ideological or programmatic appeals but rather penetrated via existing channels of patronage. In other words, electoral mobilization took place via the “politicisation of clientelistic networks between leaders and followers” (Sayari 1977: 108). This clientelism of notables, then evolved into a party-directed patronage. In other words, for reasons, which can be simply identified as path dependence, where strong patron-client ties prevailed in the past, we have political clientelism today.

The Turkish Cypriot case, however, does not fit into this pattern and therefore these approaches fall short of explaining the pervasiveness of political clientelism in contemporary Turkish Cypriot politics. To start with, as discussed earlier in this chapter, after the emergence of the idea of *taksim* in the mid-1950s, the newly established Turkish Cypriot leadership penetrated the rest of the community, rural and urban alike, with this strong idea in a rather authoritarian fashion. The electoral incorporation in the post-1960 period took place in the same manner. This is to say there was neither a competitive election nor a coherent political opposition to be outmobilized, which could have necessitated resorting to clientelism, as their development had been effectively arrested by the TMT earlier. Secondly and probably more importantly, even if such a need had arisen, it would be difficult to find “existing channels of patronage” because it is not possible to talk about a long history of patron-client ties in the island. For one thing, Cyprus did not have a feudal past (Lanitis 1992: 3), which is often associated with the diffusion of political clientelism. Unlike the rest of the Ottoman Empire<sup>169</sup> or the wider Mediterranean basin, a big majority of farmers of Cyprus have been peasant proprietors. By 1944, of the sixty six thousand adult male peasants, 48,600 (73,7 percent) were peasant proprietors (Lanitis 1992: 6; see also Nevzat 2005: 373). As Meyer notes,

A bright spot in the Cyprus land picture is the virtual absence of really exploitative – on Egyptian or Iranian standards- feudal and absentee ownership of holdings. Only some 7 per cent of the island’s farmland is estimated to be in the hands of town-dwellers, and sharecropping is rare. The Cypriote farmer at least is still his own master (1962: 31).

---

<sup>169</sup> Katsiaounis suggests “inequality of landownership was not as pronounced as in other regions of the Empire,” and most villagers still tilled their own land (cited in Nevzat 2005: 373).

Furthermore, to give a specific example, Loizos notes that in the Kalo village where he conducted his research in the 1970s, “in 1931 only 21 out of 169 families – roughly 12 percent- were landless while a handful of families were moneylenders and regular employers of labour” (1977: 129). He goes on:

At the extremes then, a class structure existed. But between these extremes something akin to a ranking system operated, since virtually everyone owned land and worked with his hands. There was no landlord or latifundist class, no leisured aristocrats, no literate elite. The land-rich peasant was prepared to take a man with little land as son-in-law.

It is important to note that there is not enough data to reach a definitive conclusion on this matter. However, based on the findings at hand, it is possible to argue that the land distribution in the Cypriot society in the pre-modern period displayed a different character than say, the Italian, Spanish or Turkish one, and that it was less conducive to the development of rigid vertical linkages –such as the ones between patrons and their clients- that would condition the political development in the modern period (see also Egemen 2006: 97).<sup>170</sup>

Having said that, it should be added that after the introduction of the Legislative Council in the British period, as Loizos suggests, “the potential was available for *enduring* patron-client relationships to emerge” (1977: 117, emphasis in original). There are two notable studies, which analyze to what extent this potential was realized until the abolition of the Legislative Council in 1931. However, it should be mentioned at the outset that both Loizos (admittedly), and Egemen’s analysis on the role of patronage in the elections for Legislative Council are conjectural.

When we analyze the practice of political clientelism in the Greek Cypriot community in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, we see the major role played by moneylenders. As the farmers were constantly in need of credits in this period (Lanitis 1994: 34), a money-lending class had emerged, which subsequently managed to translate their economic

---

<sup>170</sup> Egemen also comes to the conclusion that traditional patron-client relations did not emerge in the Turkish Cypriot community (2006: 89 and 97). The basis of his argument, however, is different (2006: 89-101). He stresses the role of the vakifs as the owners of land, where here the peasant ownership is considered as the decisive factor. Is it so important? It is important because overstating the role of vakifs, and *Evkaf* as an umbrella organization of vakifs, leads one to overestimate the power of *Evkaf*.

power into political influence in the elections.<sup>171</sup> Governor Storrs' (1926 to 1932) memoirs provides a good summary of the situation on the ground:

three-quarters of the population are engaged in agriculture. Most of these were illiterate; seventy per cent were chronically indebted to usurer and merchants whose actions for recovery (more than half the cases in the District Courts) afforded employment to the numerous advocates, who derived the greater part of their professional income from that source. I found on the Council eight advocates, three of whom were money-lenders; one landowner who was also a money-lender; one bishop of the Cyprus Orthodox Church; one merchant and one farmer (1945: 473).<sup>172</sup>

Storrs talks exclusively about the twelve Greek Cypriot members of the Legislative Council. However, it is known that in the Turkish Cypriot community too, peasant indebtedness was a major problem (see for instance Gürkan 2008). However, its political ramifications turned out to be different. The political influence of the moneylenders was virtually nil. Instead, as Nevzat points out, a “more institutionalised patronage” tool was available for “those Turks with access to *Evkaf*<sup>173</sup> resources” (2005: 213). The following excerpt offers us a glimpse of how the Turkish Cypriot delegate in charge of *Evkaf*, İrfan Bey, made use of his status to win a seat in the Legislative Council in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century:

Korkut gives a vivid account of the use, or rather abuse of such power for electioneering purposes, stating that when his brother Osman Cemal ran as a candidate against İrfan Bey for the Legislative Council, a villager who approached him revealed to him that though his campaign speech and rendition of verses of the Koran were impressive enough, he should not expect the people of the village to vote for him, and insinuated that this was because they were financially indebted to the *Evkaf*. Even the High Commissioner was to divulge, in a confidential despatch to the Secretary of State Andrew Bonar Law concerning the elections of 1916 that, “Among the Moslems, who are nearly always rent by party feeling, the supporters of İrfan Bey, the able Moslem Delegate of *Evkaf*, probably derived considerable advantage from the influence he exercises in that capacity” (*ibid.*).<sup>174</sup>

---

<sup>171</sup> As Nevzat points out, it should be highlighted that being peasant proprietors was likely to alleviate the sway of the moneylenders, and other local notables on the villagers (2005: 373).

<sup>172</sup> Storrs talks exclusively about the twelve Greek Cypriot members of the Legislative Council.

<sup>173</sup> *Evkaf* is “the pious foundation, that was in Cyprus the greatest source of accumulated communal wealth, having control of vast resources of land and property charitably donated over the years by members of the Moslem community” (Nevzat 2005: 104). Writing in the early 1960s, Meyer writes “The Moslem religious foundation, *Evcaf*, controls ... 1 to 2 per cent of the island’s farmland” (1962: 32). The Greek Cypriot Church, on the other hand, controlled “an estimated 8 to 10 per cent of the island’s farmland” (*ibid.*).

<sup>174</sup> Nevzat notes that “the British were frequently referring to the undue power of Greek Cypriot moneylenders in determining the outcome of elections,” but did not mention anything about the situation in the Turkish Cypriot community (2005: 213).

Egemen points out that the British made use of the *Evkaf's* power to protect the loyal Turkish Cypriot elites vis-à-vis the contending Turkish nationalists or Kemalists. He argues that using the resources of the *Evkaf*, the British Colonial administration constructed “a patronage network reaching to the smallest units of the Turkish society,” to stem the rising tide of Kemalist movement (2006: 95). Although the role of *Evkaf* cannot be easily dismissed, it is equally important, not to overestimate its power -as Egemen does. For one thing, it should be remembered that Münir Bey, who had replaced İrfan Bey after the latter's death, as the delegate of *Evkaf* and the member of the Legislative assembly, was eventually voted out in the 1930 election and a Kemalist was elected.<sup>175</sup> It is important to note that this election was not an ordinary one. It took place at the height of the ideological struggle between the Kemalists and traditionalists. In Korkut's words, this “was not like a simple election where one candidate wins a membership against another candidate. With this election our community showed that it did not like the 30 years of the *Evkaf*-Government politics” (cited in Nevzat 2005: 377). Given that the stakes were so high for the British, it is only normal to expect a full-scale mobilization of the *Evkaf's* capabilities as a patron in this election. The fact that the patronage power of the *Evkaf* did not suffice to win this critical election, therefore, can be taken to reveal the limits of the power of this institution and the electorate's relative immunity against the *Evkaf's* influence.

The conjectural character of the analyses of Loizos and Egemen regarding the potential for the emergence of patron-client ties in the so called “liberal-constitutional phase” of the British rule aside, one can also see that whatever “potential” there had been for clientelism, was later strongly undermined by the British administration, and the entrenchment of patron-client ties in the years to come was blocked. The studies by Loizos (1977), Attalides (1977) and Faustmann (1998), who worked on the patterns of clientelism in the Greek Cypriot community, demonstrate that the British policy to weaken the moneylending class -which was considered to be the standard bearers of the anti-British *enosis* movement- bore fruit by the 1940s. It can be seen that with the introduction of the cooperatives, and the foundation of an Agricultural Bank in 1925 (Loizos 1977: 117), and the Agricultural

---

<sup>175</sup> Münir was defeated by Necati by 1993 to 1553 votes (Nevzat 2005: 376).

Debtors Relief Law introduced in 1940 (Gürkan 2008: 210), the monopoly of moneylenders was effectively broken.<sup>176</sup> As Hill notes

the lawyer class, from whom were drawn the money-lenders; the richest men in the island were nearly all men who had made their fortunes in this way. But the foundation of Co-operative Societies and of an Agricultural Bank, and other legislation, freed the peasants from the usurer; litigation declined and the lawyers saw the bread being taken out of their mouths (1972: 495).

Moreover, the dissolution of the Legislative Council after the October Revolt of 1931 had left little room for political competition, and hence for political clientelism. As discussed in the previous sections, even when municipal elections were reintroduced in the early 1940s, while the Greek Cypriots embarked on ideological mobilization, the competition in the Turkish Cypriot community did not go beyond personal rivalries; and in that race we cannot observe any indication of patronage politics. As I discussed earlier in this chapter, eventually mass political mobilization of the Turkish Cypriot community was realized around the ideal of *taksim* or Turkish nationalism, and with the help of an armed organization. After independence, the anticipation of inter-communal conflict did not allow normalization, and a military rule was maintained until 1974. In other words, even after independence, obviously there was no need for mass political clientelism as a strategy to mobilize political support against opposition because the crude force of the TMT was there to do the same thing with much less material resources.

To sum up, this is to say that in the pre-democratic period, there is no sign showing that a culture of patronage developed in the Turkish Cypriot community. Therefore, presenting political clientelism in the post-1974 period, as a legacy inherited from ancestors is apologetic, and devoid of empirical substance. If we are to account for the emergence of political clientelism, I argue, we need to turn our attention to more recent history; the period of state-building and initial mass electoral mobilization. This is what I will do in Chapter Three.

---

<sup>176</sup> Therefore, even if we assume that the *Evkaf* had had a monopolistic role similar to the moneylenders in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, it can be said that it broke down towards the middle of the century.

### Chapter 3: Why Political Clientelism? Priorities of the Political Elite and their Choice of Mass Political Mobilization Strategy

As discussed earlier in Chapter One, in the literature, political clientelism has come increasingly to be taken as a *strategy* to mobilize mass political support rather than a political anomaly or an anachronistic remnant from pre-modern times dictated by structural factors. As such, its adoption is a matter of choice; a choice made by the leadership of a political party at the time of establishment between alternative paths of mass political mobilization: basically, a choice between program and patronage. This choice is naturally not made in a political vacuum. Rather, it is heavily influenced by different parameters, which can be broadly categorized as demand and supply side of political clientelism.

Which of these forces is more decisive in the choice made and therefore merit further elaboration? According to Shefter, the pioneer of the demand-supply approach, emphasis should be on the supply side, and the way “the strategic behavior of leaders is shaped by and in turn shapes political institutions,” should be analyzed (1994: 3).<sup>177</sup> This, in his opinion, is the key to explain not only the reasons behind the adoption of political clientelism but also many other political phenomena of significance (*ibid.*). Piattoni, who is influenced by Shefter, builds on this and argues that the supply side should be “integrated with the analysis of the demand for clientelism,” if we are to explain its prevalence -or its decline- in a wider cross-country context (2001a: 24).

Having said that, she adds that in some clear-cut cases looking only at one side may be sufficient. For the case of Greece, for instance, looking only at the supply side may reveal how the choice was made. This is to say, essentially the nuance between the approaches of these two scholars is not so big. Besides, Shefter does not deny the role of demand side altogether. He considers “the orientations of the voters to whom the party is appealing for support” as one of the three factors, party leaders have to take into consideration when deciding whether to adopt a clientelist strategy or not (1994: 26). What he suggests is that the voter demand can be altered/manipulated by the political actors. In other words, it

---

<sup>177</sup> It should be underlined that in the final analysis, other major theoretical works (Piattoni 2001; Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007; see also, for instance Chubb 1982: 8-9) emphasize the importance of the strategic considerations of the party elites in the decision to adopt political clientelism as a strategy.

should not be treated as an exogenous given or an independent variable but rather as a dependent variable.

In this framework, Shefter argues that a party is likely to adopt clientelism as a strategy if:

[t]he voters whose support it is seeking...value the particularistic benefits it distributes; the party...enjoy access to a pool of resources from which such benefits can be generated; and the party leadership...calculate that, considering the reactions of elites as well as voters, the gains to be realized exceed the losses the party might incur, including the opportunities it forgoes, if it uses these resources in this way (1994: 26).

To have access to a pool of resources, the party should be in government.<sup>178</sup> In other words, it has to be an “internally mobilized party”. However, though necessary, being in government is not sufficient for a party to have access to public resources. It should also be in a position to dictate its terms to the bureaucracy. It should be able to bend public decision-making in such a way to promote individual, particularistic considerations as opposed to collective ones (Piattoni 2001a: 17). To put it in a different way, the emergence of systemic political clientelism “depends on whether the structures of public decision-making –elected government and nonelected bureaucracy– are, respectively, interested in and available for this kind of exchange” (2001b: 194-5). This makes it imperative to focus on “the process through which such structures were formed, that is, state-building and the creation of autonomous structures of routinized decision-making, in particular, the administration” (Piattoni 2001a: 17). Therefore, explaining the supply side requires focusing on the twin processes of state-building and mass political mobilization.

It should also be highlighted in this juncture that the role played by *the strategic choices of individual actors* in the whole process is a decisive one. As pointed out by Piattoni, as the development of post-World War II Christian Democratic parties in France and Italy shows, even in cases where identical institutional circumstances prevail, the mobilization strategies may diverge because of the way political leaders assess their priorities (2001a: 25). In this particular case, these parties became quite different from each other as the party leaderships had different calculations and priorities (*ibid.*; see also Warner 2001).

---

<sup>178</sup> Alternatively, it should be allied with elites with access to patronage (Shefter 1994: 27).

In this theoretical context, following Shefter and Piattoni's approach, in this chapter I aim to explore the emergence of political clientelism in the Turkish Cypriot politics by analyzing the interaction of supply and demand sides with a special attention on the strategic choices of political actors. I will mainly focus on the state-building process in the transitional period, which starts with the Turkish intervention/invasion in July 1974 and comes to an end with the first multi party elections held in June 1976. In the first section, the socio-economic state of the Turkish Cypriot society will be taken up as an indicator for potential demand for political clientelism. The second section will investigate availability of resources to satisfy this demand, and the presence or absence of constraints that could hinder politicians' access to these resources. The effect of broader contextual circumstances, or Cyprus conflict to be more precise, on the strategic calculations of the political elite who made the eventual choice will be analyzed in the third section. Finally, the last section will dwell on the wider domestic political context, and deal with the formation of other key political institutions, which would condition the politico-economic developments in the decades to come.

### **3.1 Demand Side: Socio-Economic Structure of the Population**

Socially and economically disempowered social groups, not least immigrants, displaced peasants, and poor are considered to be more prone to exchange their votes for particularistic benefits (see Shefter 1994; Piattoni 2001; Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007). Considering the turbulent recent history of the island and in the light of the analysis provided by the previous chapter, then, even intuitively one can conclude that the circumstances in the immediate post-1974 period provided a perfect breeding ground for a strong demand for political clientelism. This section seeks to verify the validity of this intuition. The socio-economic state of the Turkish Cypriot community in the immediate post-1974 period will be examined with a view to assessing how receptive the electorate was to clientelistic appeals by focusing on the social composition and the economic welfare of the population in the eve of first full-scale electoral mobilization.

Demographic data on the post-1974 Turkish Cypriot community are not easy to come by because for a long time the authorities treated the population issue as a highly sensitive political matter. The overall population figures were inflated to justify controlling some 36 percent of the island, and hence to avoid territorial concession, while its composition was

distorted to fend off the colonization allegations of the Greek Cypriot administration. Accordingly, there are big discrepancies between figures provided by different sources. While the Greek Cypriot sources estimated the Turkish Cypriot population at 116,400 in 1973 (Symeonides 1977: 257)<sup>179</sup>, the first official Turkish Cypriot figure, published in 1979, put the 1978 population at 145 thousand.<sup>180</sup> Yet, according to Aydın Samioğlu<sup>181</sup>, the highest-ranking Turkish Cypriot officer at the *Bayraktar's* Office in the 1960s and 1970s, the “de facto census,” conducted in January 1975<sup>182</sup>, revealed that the figure was only 85 thousand.<sup>183</sup>

These complications aside, the post-1974 population in the northern part of Cyprus can be divided into five broad categories. In the first group, there were some 23 thousand people who moved to the north individually or as small groups when the exchange of prisoners of war took place, following the ceasefire.<sup>184</sup> In the second group, there were some nine thousand<sup>185</sup> people who sought refuge in the British bases when the war had broken out. They were transferred to the north after the Anglo-Turkish arrangement agreed in January 1975.<sup>186</sup> The third group was comprised of those who had been cut off in the south. They came to the north after the Third Vienna Agreement signed in August 1975, and their number was in the vicinity of 8 thousand.<sup>187</sup> Overall, the number of Turkish Cypriots who moved to the north in the 1974-5 period was somewhere between 36 thousand and 45 thousand.<sup>188</sup> In the fourth group, there were some 30 thousand Turkish “settlers” who

---

<sup>179</sup> Of whom 71,170 lived in what would become the Turkish controlled area after 1974.

<sup>180</sup> Devlet Planlama Örgütü (1979: 9).

<sup>181</sup> Interviewed by author. Nazif Borman, then the Commissioner of Cooperatives gives a similar figure (Interviewed by author).

<sup>182</sup> The “de-facto census” did not cover, those who were cut off in the south, and therefore was “not counted valid” (and its result was not disclosed). However, according to the State Planning Organization, it was later used to estimate the population in 1978 (Devlet Planlama Örgütü 1979: 8).

<sup>183</sup> Given the turmoil in the preceding decades, the sharp decline in population is hardly surprising. Olgun provides two sets of statistics about the number of Turkish Cypriots emigrating from Cyprus in the pre-1974 period. According to the first set, from 1959 to 1967, 10,330 people, and according to the second set, from 1955 to 1974, 17,106 people had left the island (1993: 270-1).

<sup>184</sup> ECHR 1976: Paragraph 102.

<sup>185</sup> According to Ziya Rızıkı, a Limassol MP, who oversaw the whole process, the exact figure was 9400 (“Ziya Rızıkı: Göçmen Mücadelesi Başarıyla Sonuçlandı [The struggle for displaced successfully completed].” *Zaman*, 13.02.1975.

<sup>186</sup> ECHR 1976: Paragraph 102.

<sup>187</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>188</sup> Statistics compiled by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and International Committee of the Red Cross (as of September 15, 1974) put the total number of Turkish Cypriots displaced, and cut-off at 42 thousand (Crisis on Cyprus 1975: 18). According to a revised set of statistics compiled by the Government of Cyprus, UNFICYP, the UNHCR and ICRC, the number Turkish Cypriot displaced and cut-off (as of November 1,

were relocated from Anatolia starting in late 1974 (Atun 2007: 387), under the disguise of “agricultural labour force”.<sup>189</sup> Stavrinides notes that reportedly by July 1975, “the Turkish Cypriot authorities had already moved eight thousand mainland Turks into the north of the island” (1999: 99). According to İsmet Kotak, the then minister responsible for resettlement, the number reached slightly above 22 thousand by July 1976.<sup>190</sup> In many respects, this was the most disempowered of the five groups, and therefore easiest to be manipulated because firstly, they were transferred from a different country following a war, which made their existence in the island, legally and politically precarious at best. Secondly, as the name given to them i.e. “agricultural labour force” suggests, they were most of the time uneducated peasants, mainly from most conservative parts of Anatolia.<sup>191</sup> In the last category were those who used to live in the north prior to the Turkish intervention/invasion, and hence not being displaced in 1974.<sup>192</sup> However, it should be noted that this group included some of those who had been already uprooted earlier in 1963.<sup>193</sup> Furthermore, though they were not displaced in 1974, it should be noted that they had been living in a state of deprivation like the rest of the community for more than a decade in the enclaves they had retreated after the inter-communal clashes of 1963.

Mention of the enclaves brings the state of the economy in general into the foreground. After a decade in isolation, in the eve of the Turkish intervention/invasion, the Turkish Cypriot community was economically almost completely demobilized and impoverished. The “enclaves had little in the way of productive economic activity, which could provide employment opportunities other than some village agriculture” (Pollis 1977: 62). Indeed,

---

1974) was 39 thousand including some of the Turkish Cypriots, who had moved after the inter-communal clashes of 1963-4 (Crisis on Cyprus 1975: 19). According to Mustafa Çağatay, the Turkish Cypriot Premier, it was over 45 thousand (Cited in Kasımoğlu 1980: 18). According to Osman Örek, the vice president of the Autonomous Turkish Cypriot Administration, it was around 36 thousand (“Örek Makarios’un Konuşmasını Cevaplandırdı [Örek answered the speech of Makarios].” *Zaman*. 12.12.1974).

<sup>189</sup> This figure gradually climbed up to 45 thousand towards the end of the decade (Çağatay cited in Kasımoğlu 1980: 18).

<sup>190</sup> “Until my last day in the Ministry, I resettled some 82,500 people, of whom some 60 thousand were from the south, and the rest immigrants from Turkey” (interviewed by author). Mehmet Ali Birand notes that reportedly their number already reached to 30 thousand in June 1976 (“Kıbrıs’ta Madalyonun İki Yüzü [Two sides of the medallion in Cyprus] (5).” *Milliyet*, 27.6.1976).

<sup>191</sup> Mehmet Ali Birand: “Kıbrıs’ta Madalyonun İki Yüzü [Two sides of the medallion in Cyprus] (4).” *Milliyet*, 26.6.1976.

<sup>192</sup> The total number of people living in the north prior to 1974 is also contested.

<sup>193</sup> As discussed before some 20-25 thousand Turkish Cypriots were displaced after the inter-communal clashes of 1963-4. There are statements from the Turkish Cypriot authorities saying the number of displaced Turkish Cypriots resettled was 60 thousand. This figure obviously includes a considerable number of these people, if not all of them.

agricultural production capacity was also severely curtailed because, by retreating into the enclaves, the Turkish Cypriots left thirty to forty percent of their land behind (Nötel cited in Stavrinides 1999: 82). When we add the civil servants, who were cut off from the payroll of the Republic and became dependent on “the maximum allowance of £30 per month irrespective of their rank or station in life,”<sup>194</sup> a more complete picture of the economic situation emerges.

In Kadritzke and Wagner’s words, “[t]his was the logical end of separatism because the small Turkish community was only viable either as integral part of an economically homogenous Cypriot society or as a Turkish enclave totally dependent on the mainland” (1977: 101). Obviously, the Turkish Cypriot administration opted for the second option. As a result, in the 1964-74 period, “total budget expenditure of the Turkish Community amounted to 2,690 million Turkish Liras of which 2,417 million was met by aid from” Turkey.<sup>195</sup> In other words, in average, annually 90 percent of the budget was funded by Ankara. In fact, starting from early 1968, the Greek Cypriot administration’s economic blockade was eased. Yet, this did not help to improve the public finances. Towards the end of the period, the share of domestic revenues stood at a mere seven percent in 1973.<sup>196</sup>

The extent of economic stagnation suffered by the Turkish Cypriot community, becomes more striking when the development trends of per capita income levels of the two communities are compared:

Average per capita income of the Turkish Cypriot population in 1961 ... was assumed to have been 20 percent lower, i.e. £130–135 as compared with the Greek Cypriot population’s £160–165. Ten years later (in 1971) it was ... 50 percent lower, i.e. about £150 as compared with £300 for the Greek Cypriot population (Nötel cited in Kedourie 2005: 653).<sup>197</sup>

In the immediate aftermath of the 1974 war, inevitably, the economic situation got even worse as this meant the whole economy or whatever was left of it grinding to a complete halt. Rampant inflation, scarcity of certain commodities and hard currency, and black-

---

<sup>194</sup> State Planning Organization (1979: 3).

<sup>195</sup> State Planning Organization (1979: 4). See also Salih 1978. According to Salih, “[f]rom the time the Turkish Cypriot civil servants lost their jobs in the Makarios administration, they have depended heavily in the \$20 million they receive annually from Turkey” (1978: 75).

<sup>196</sup> Maliye ve İktisadi İşler Üyeliği (1973: 1).

<sup>197</sup> “All calculations at constant 1970 prices”.

marketing were major problems reported almost daily in the local newspapers. Furthermore, though, for those who were already on the payroll of the administration, not much had changed at least in terms of income, for some 10 thousand people who used to work for the Greek Cypriot employers (Stavrinos 1999: 83; see also Attalides 1977b: 86), this meant instantly joining the ranks of the thousands of unemployed and underemployed.

At any rate, a big majority of the population was made up of displaced/migrants of one sort or another<sup>198</sup>, and unemployed who had no option but to turn to the state for their livelihood. Given this context, no wonder a big chunk of the community was dependent on the benefits from the administration. According to the official statistics, in 1975, in total 24,034 people were given social welfare benefits of whom, 20,574 have received displaced person benefit.<sup>199</sup> A different set of official statistics, show that rather than going down, the number of welfare paychecks issued monthly by the Social Welfare Department steadily climbed up from 2,094 in 1974 to 11,150 in 1977<sup>200</sup>, showing that the economic circumstances did not improve for a long time.

The reasons behind the sluggishness of the normalization process are discussed at length in the latter sections. Suffice it here to say that it stemmed largely from disorganization or lack of planning and coordination because as mentioned above, flow of people to the north stretched over time buying the administration considerable time for preparation -unlike the situation faced by the Greek Cypriot leadership who had to deal with a flood of refugees instantly. The consequence of this mismanagement was further disempowerment of the society vis-à-vis the state. In many cases people from the same town or village were dispersed and not settled as communities.<sup>201</sup> Hakkı Atun, the then undersecretary of the ministry responsible for resettlement, admits that this was one of the biggest mistakes

---

<sup>198</sup> According to the official statistics, from 1974 to 1982, 91,225 persons were (re-)settled (Kuzey Kıbrıs Haber Ajansı 1983: 28).

<sup>199</sup> KTFD 1976 Geçiş Yılı Programı, p. 98.

<sup>200</sup> Devlet Planlama Örgütü (1978: 63).

<sup>201</sup> Orhan Kahya, the chairman of the Aggrieved Southerners Association (Zarar Görmüş Güneyliler Derneği), cited in "Muhtıra [Memorandum]." *Yeni Devir*, 25.10.1978; see also Ekrem Avcıoğlu's (Limassol) Parliamentary speech (Otonom Kıbrıs Türk Yönetimi Meclisi Zabıtları [Minutes of the Parliament of Autonomous Turkish Cypriot Administration], 28.1.1975, p.19). Here Avcıoğlu says "with a view to putting an end to the mentality of regionalism, and reasoning that 'now we have all become northerners,' towns and villages have been dismembered. Furthermore, curiously there are even many cases where parents and children, and siblings were settled in different places without any reasonable justification".

made in the whole process.<sup>202</sup> This mistake delayed the rehabilitation process by disrupting the social and economic fabric of certain towns and villages, and hence made it more difficult for the displaced to attain economic independence.<sup>203</sup>

In a similar vein, some could not become productive because their professional backgrounds were not taken into consideration when they were resettled. Some farmers were resettled in urban areas and some city dwellers were resettled in villages.<sup>204</sup> To cite two specific cases, “I’m a fisherman but they had me settled in a village where they cultivate land. I don’t know how to do that,” protested a Limassollian to Denктаş in campaign trail. “They gave 66 tractors to the neighboring village, while they gave only one to us. How can I till the land?” complained another.<sup>205</sup>

Overall, it can be argued that the population’s socio-economic structure, the divisible nature of their immediate needs (shelter, job, land, credit), and the general circumstances prevailing at the time were conducive for a clientelistic mobilization strategy. In the next section, I will turn my attention to the supply side and investigate (a) whether there was enough resources to satisfy the needs of the populace, and (b) whether these resources were protected by a constituency of bureaucratic autonomy or not.

### **3.2 Supply Side: The Resource Base and the State of Bureaucracy**

If a political party is to adopt a clientelistic strategy it has to have access to a “pool of resources” out of which it can dole out particularistic benefits to its clients (Shefter 1994: 27). To have that, first, the party needs to be in the government, and second, there should not be a strong “constituency for bureaucratic autonomy,” which can restrict its control over the use of public resources (*ibid.*). In this section, the aim is to show that due to the special circumstances of the island, at the time of mass mobilization, in addition to resources available to any party in government anywhere in the world there was an extraordinary amount of resources available for distribution under the disposal of the

---

<sup>202</sup> Hakkı Atun interviewed by author.

<sup>203</sup> Ekrem Ural interviewed by author.

<sup>204</sup> Mehmet Ali Birand: “Kıbrıs’ta Madalyonun İki Yüzü [Two sides of the medallion in Cyprus] (4).” *Milliyet*, 26.6.1976. See also Orhan Kahya, the chairman of the Aggrieved Southerners Association, cited in “Muhtıra [Memorandum].” *Yeni Devir*, 25.10.1978.

<sup>205</sup> Cited in Mehmet Ali Birand: “Kıbrıs’ta Madalyonun İki Yüzü [Two sides of the medallion in Cyprus] (4).” *Milliyet*, 26.6.1976.

Turkish Cypriot administration. Of particular importance for this study is the divisible nature of these resources i.e. their suitability for particularistic distribution. The second condition, whether the politicians had access to this huge pool or not; in other words, to what extent these resources were protected by an autonomous bureaucracy will be addressed later in this section, and it will be shown that let alone its strength, it was difficult even to talk about the presence of bureaucracy at the time.

In the weeks following the Turkish intervention/invasion, there was a striking optimism about the future of the Turkish Cypriot economy.<sup>206</sup> When asked about the prospects of, what was then called the Turkish Cypriot Autonomous Region, gaining its economic self-sufficiency, Ziya Müezzinoğlu (henceforth, Müezzinoğlu), the chairman of the Cyprus Coordination Committee responded

both its natural resources and established facilities indicate that this region will be self-sufficient in a very short period of time. ... That is why we envisage providing economic development assistance i.e. project credits, rather than grants at this stage of our relationship with Cyprus.<sup>207</sup>

Accordingly, *T.C. Yardım Heyeti* (T.R. Board of Financial Assistance), an organization “similar to the American A.I.D.” was established to monitor the implementation of infrastructure projects financed by Turkey.<sup>208</sup> In line with Müezzinoğlu’s statements, in the budget for 1975, domestic revenues were envisaged to finance current expenditures.<sup>209</sup> The source of this optimism was the massive amount of assets abandoned by the Greek Cypriots. From the beginning both Turkish and Turkish Cypriot authorities never hesitated to declare that they would make full use of these resources to boost economic growth. As

---

<sup>206</sup> See for instance the statements of Korkut Özal, the Turkish Minister of Agriculture, during his visit to Cyprus cited in “Askeri Harekat Bitti, Ekonomik ve Sosyal Harekat Başlıyor [The military operation came to an end, economic and social operation is starting].” *Zaman*, 26.08.1974.

<sup>207</sup> Interviewed by Abdi İpekçi, *Milliyet*, 14.10.1974; “Yılbaşından Sonra 5 Yıllık Bir Kalkınma Planı Uygulanacak [From the January 1st on, a 5-year economic development plan will be implemented].” *Bozkurt*, 26.10.1974. See also the statements made by Bülent Ecevit during his visit to Cyprus: “Ecevit: ‘Kıbrıs Türk Halkı Kısa Zamanda Kendine Yeter Bir Hale Gelecektir’ [Ecevit: ‘The Turkish Cypriot people will be self-sufficient soon].” *Zaman*, 6.1.1975.

<sup>208</sup> Nilüfer Yalçın: “Türkiye Kıbrıs’ta Bir Yardım Heyeti Kurdu [Turkey established a board of financial assistance in Cyprus].” *Milliyet*, 23.3.1975. *Yardım Heyeti* was established as an extension of the Cyprus Coordination Committee based in Ankara.

<sup>209</sup> “Müezzinoğlu: ‘Bazı Dar Boğazlar Mevcuttur’ [Müezzinoğlu: There are some bottlenecks].” *Kurtuluş* and *Zaman*, 3.4.1975. Even the budget was prepared in Ankara by the Cyprus Coordination Committee (İnhan: “Makarios’u Ne Bir Devlet Ne de Hükümet Olarak Tanımıyoruz [İnhan: We do not recognize Makarios in any capacity].” *Zaman*, 22.03.1975).

the *Time* magazine reported at the time “on every second building, signs proclaim: ‘What we have gained by blood we shall build by sweat’”.<sup>210</sup>

If we put the immorality of building an economy on stolen property aside, it can be argued that the Turkish Cypriot community was sitting on a huge potential for development. According to Symeonides, the area, which came under the Turkish Cypriot rule, was “by far the richest part of the island which in 1975 [*sic*]<sup>211</sup> produced nearly 70 percent of the Gross Output, accounted for 50 percent of exports and attracted 70 percent of the tourists” (1977: 255). *The Economist* gives similar figures: the source of 70 percent of the GNP, 46 percent of the agricultural and 26 percent of the industrial production, as well as 65 percent of the hotel beds were now in the hands of the Turkish Cypriot authorities.<sup>212</sup> Likewise, *Time* reports, “Turkish-held territory contains something like 70 percent of the island's wealth-producing farms, factories and tourist facilities”.<sup>213</sup>

There is also countless anecdotal evidence confirming these sources. To mention but few, in the words of a Turkish Cypriot observer, “under our disposal, we have gifts, ‘elements of economic development,’ no other community enjoys. Industrial facilities that will work once we press a button; groves where we can pick the produce once we water; enough animals to set up farms”.<sup>214</sup> “Now all the Greeks have left is their grapes,” the Turkish Cypriots were telling the foreigners visiting the north boastfully, a foreign journalist reports in December 1974.<sup>215</sup> Finally, in Dr Küçük’s words, “the Turkish Cypriots were up to their chins in wealth; wealth that has never been bestowed upon any other community throughout history”.<sup>216</sup>

Quantifying the amount of movable property left behind is probably impossible<sup>217</sup>, and for the purposes of this study not vital. However, given the fact that “[p]eople moved the

---

<sup>210</sup> “Separation: A Sense of Betrayal.” *Time*, 24.12.1975.

<sup>211</sup> It must be 1973.

<sup>212</sup> 27 August 1977 edition cited in *Yeni Kıbrıs*, October 1977.

<sup>213</sup> “Looking for Paradise Lost.” *Time*, 2.9.1974.

<sup>214</sup> Eşref Nidai: “Belirlenecek Ekonomik Yöntem [The economic method that will be determined].” *Bozkurt*, 4.11.1974.

<sup>215</sup> Paul Martin: “Now the Turks Must Decide What to Do With the Part of Cyprus They Won.” *The Times* (London), 31.12.1974. Reprinted in *Crisis on Cyprus* (1975: 57-8).

<sup>216</sup> Dr Küçük: “Sayın Demirel’in Nasihatı [Mr Demirel’s advice].” *Halkın Sesi*, 2.8.1980.

<sup>217</sup> The parliamentary committee dealing with the Greek Cypriot properties had asked the ministry concerned the amount of moveable property left behind by the Greek Cypriots but the question was simply not

instant they saw or thought the Turkish army was advancing towards their town or village” and that “they moved *instantly* –dropping everything, taking very little with them,” as the Subcommittee Report of the US Senate put it<sup>218</sup>, it will not be a wild guess to assume that tens of thousands of houses (see below) left behind were intact with furniture, kitchen appliances and other personal belongings when their owners left. In a similar vein, it is widely known that the fleeing Greek Cypriots did not have time or means to evacuate their shops, warehouses and factories. Many cars, other motor vehicles<sup>219</sup>, agricultural implements, spare parts and raw materials were also left behind providing the Turkish Cypriot administration with a plethora of moveable property at hand, even after those lost due to looting and vandalism were factored out.

As for the amount of immovable properties, more tangible figures are available provided by different sources from both sides of the divide. One of the most important and most valuable considering the profile of the post-1974 Turkish Cypriot population items that can be investigated under the rubric of immovable properties is housing. Although the exact number of displaced persons is open to debate, there is no room for discussion that the number of Greek Cypriots crossing to the south was at least triple the number of Turkish Cypriots moving to the north. This translates into the number of housing units left behind. The Greek Cypriot sources put the number of housing units Turkish Cypriots evacuated in the south at around 15 thousand, while the number of housing units left behind by Greek Cypriots was around 45 thousand (Symeonides 1977: 260).<sup>220</sup> The number provided by the Turkish Cypriot officials regarding the latter figure, on the other hand, was 36,400.<sup>221</sup> The number of houses available for distribution initially, which is more important for the

---

answered by the ministry without any explanation (İsmail Bozkurt’s (TKP, Famagusta) parliamentary speech, *Kıbrıs Türk Federe Meclisi Zabıtları* [Minutes of the TFSC Parliament], 30.6.1977, p. 67).

<sup>218</sup> Crisis on Cyprus (1975: 27). “Most refugees,” according to the *Time* magazine, “both Greek and Turk, had left their homes with little more than the clothes on their backs...” (“Looking for Paradise Lost.” 2.9.1974).

<sup>219</sup> According to one account the number of motor vehicles left behind by the fleeing Greek Cypriots was around thirty thousand (Öztunç: “Gerçekleri Görelim [Let’s see the realities].” *Halkın Sesi*, 10.6.1976).

<sup>220</sup> According to the Chairman of the Cyprus Land and Property Owners Association, the number of Greek Cypriot housing units was 48,611 (See the report of the European Commission of Human Rights: Paragraph 438).

<sup>221</sup> Memorandum submitted to the Minister of Interior and Settlement (The copy of the memo from the personal archive of an anonymous interviewee) (n.d.).

purposes of this study, stood at approximately 22 thousand<sup>222</sup>, obviously more than enough to accommodate the Turkish Cypriot displaced persons.<sup>223</sup>

A considerable amount of agricultural land also came under the disposal of the Turkish Cypriot side. The Turkish Cypriot authorities estimated that the total agricultural area in the north at 1,279,099 donums<sup>224</sup> of which 280,093 was under the Turkish Cypriot ownership, and 29,252 owned by the Greek Cypriots who stayed in the north after 1974, leaving the total area under the control of the state at 872,778 donums.<sup>225</sup> As for the business facilities, it can be seen that the Greek Cypriots left behind 3463 businesses according to the official Turkish Cypriot sources.<sup>226</sup> The number of industrial facilities left behind by Greek Cypriots was 230, of which 138 employed more than 5 employees (Çelik 1990: 66). The number of hotel beds was around 15 thousand.<sup>227</sup> Overall, it can be seen that there were a considerable amount of resources at hand.

So far I established that there was indeed a huge pool of economic resources available under the disposal of the Turkish Cypriot administration. Next step is to establish whether politicians' access to these resources was restricted or not. To answer this question, two dimensions have to be separately taken up. The first has something to do with the resettlement and rehabilitation of the families. The second involves the handling of the bigger assets like industrial and tourism facilities, and hence broader economic policymaking.

To start with the resettlement and rehabilitation dimension, it can be observed that the ministry responsible for resettlement distributed most of the houses, small businesses and some of the agricultural land in a rather hasty manner as the displaced persons and settlers arrived. The immobile properties such as household goods required to furnish the houses

---

<sup>222</sup> Upon the written request of the parliamentary committee, the ministry concerned provided the figures (İsmail Bozkurt's (TKP, Famagusta) parliamentary speech, *Kıbrıs Türk Federe Meclisi Zabıtları* [Minutes of the TFSC Parliament], 30.6.1977, p. 67).

<sup>223</sup> The discrepancy between the figures can be explained by the fact that some villages and towns such as Varosha were not opened to settlement at all, and some of them were used as military bases.

<sup>224</sup> For the figures provided by the Greek Cypriot authorities see Symeonides (1977: 259).

<sup>225</sup> Bozkurt's speech, p. 66.

<sup>226</sup> Başbakanlık Basın Bürosu (1981: 98).

<sup>227</sup> *KTFD 1976 Yılı Geçiş Programı Taslağı*, p. 69. It is important to note that the most of the tourism capacity was in the Varosha region, which was not opened to settlement. According to the Statistical Yearbook 1979, the total number of beds available in the north in 1976 stood at 3526 (State Planning Organization 1980: 148).

and the agricultural implements required to cultivate the land, on the other hand, were stored in the warehouses, which were under the control of the ministry of finance. As it will be shown in Chapter Four, the distribution of a large amount of immobile property was delayed until the beginning of the 1976 election campaign. But a certain amount was also distributed in this period parallel to the resettlement process.

On what legal basis did this distribution take place? The first attempt of the Turkish Cypriot administration to put the distribution of the Greek Cypriot immovable properties in order was the directive published in the Official Gazette on 22 November 1974. Apparently, the directive was prepared by a group of experts from Ankara.<sup>228</sup> Yet, it should be noted that the resettlement of the displaced Turkish Cypriots in the areas vacated by the fleeing Greek Cypriots had started earlier under the initiative of both the military and civilian authorities at the district level (Atun 2007: 387-8), and by the mid-November, 20 thousand people had been already resettled<sup>229</sup>, in the absence of any legal basis whatsoever.

Eventually, the first legislation regulating the distribution process, the so-called İTEM (*İskan Topraklandırma ve Eşdeğer Mal Yasası* [Settlement, Land Distribution and Equivalent Property Law]) would be passed in the parliament as late as in August 1977. As Gürel puts it, “this is a very elaborate and important piece of legislation that lays down the rules regarding allocation of use ... of property which Greek Cypriots left behind in the north to Turkish Cypriot citizens residing in that area” (2012: 23). The problem was that it was passed too late. In the meantime, with the Law for Allocation and Investment in Properties of Foreigners, dated 15 September 1975, the Constituent Assembly of the TFSC, put the foreigners’ immovable properties i.e. “in effect of Greek Cypriot property left in the northern part of Cyprus” (Gürel 2012: 22) “in the control, management and allocation of the Council of Ministers” (Atun 2007: 388), which used this authority extensively.<sup>230</sup> Therefore, by the time it was finally passed, the İTEM became nothing but a blanket

---

<sup>228</sup> “Toprak Dağıtımı ve Göçmenlerin Yerleştirilmesi Kurala Bağlanacak [The distribution of land and the settlement of the displaced will be tied to rules].” *Zaman*, 7.11.1974. See also “Yeni Yönetmelik Birçok Problemleri Halledecek [The new directive will solve many problems].” *Zaman*, 14.11.1974.

<sup>229</sup> “20 bin göçmen Soydaşımız İskan Edildiler [20 thousand of our displaced kinsmen have been resettled].” *Zaman*, 20.11.1974.

<sup>230</sup> For a brief summary of the Turkish Cypriot legal framework regarding the immovable property issue see Gürel (2012).

legislation legalizing the allocations that have been already made in the preceding three years.

It should be added that although legally the allocation was made on temporary basis and initially no title deed was granted (until 1995), by and large, the political message given to the new “owners” was that these allocations would be permanent. This was so because since February 1976, the official Turkish Cypriot position regarding the settlement of the property issue was the so-called “global exchange and collective compensation formula” (see Gürel 2012: 15)<sup>231</sup>, which to a large extent, was in line with Denktaş’s broader policy that ruled out any major dislocation of the Turkish Cypriots in case of a political settlement. As Atun puts it, İTEM was a major “watershed,” and with its passage in the parliament “Turkish Cypriot people made a definitive decision to renounce their properties in the south and to live under the roof of the state they established in the northern Cyprus. The state policy was based on this” (2007: 390).

In this juncture, also the strength and autonomy of the bureaucracy, which could have potentially excluded the politicians’ clientelistic meddling in the process, come into play. When we look at the legal dimension, we see that the Public Service Commission, which was established in line with the Article 123 of the Constitution of the RoC was still in place. As in the other institutions of the Republic, three Turkish Cypriot members of the Commission continued to perform their tasks under the Turkish Cypriot administration after the inter-communal clashes of 1963.<sup>232</sup> The members of the commission were appointed jointly by the president and the vice-president of the new administration, for a period of six years and could not be “removed from office except on the like grounds and in the like manner as a judge of the High Court” (Article 124). The commission was entrusted with the duty “to appoint, confirm, emplace on the permanent or pensionable establishment, promote, transfer, retire and exercise disciplinary control over, including

---

<sup>231</sup> In Gürel’s words, this formula “translates as a kind of ‘lump-sum agreement’ between the two Cypriot administrations, entailing an exchange of all Turkish Cypriot properties in the south for all Greek Cypriot properties in the north, with compensation to be paid, if necessary, for any difference in the value of properties, taking into account the Turkish Cypriot losses before 1974” (2012: 15).

<sup>232</sup> The Section 15 of the Basic Provisions of the Provisional Cyprus Turkish Administration dated 29 December 1967 was as follows: “the functions of the Public Service Commission as envisaged in the 16 August 1960 Constitution shall be exercised in respect of all public officers of the Provisional Turkish Administration by a commission composed of three members. The members of the Turkish Public Service Commission shall be appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the Vice-President of the Executive Council” (Cited in Salih 1978: 154).

dismissal or removal from office of, public officers” (Article 125). Therefore, on paper, hiring, firing, and advancement of the civil servants were regulated by impersonal rules.

Yet, as Shefter points out, such rules “are not self-enforcing” therefore their presence per se does not give the bureaucracy any autonomy vis-à-vis the politicians in power unless there is a wider constituency for bureaucratic autonomy (1994: 28). But beyond that, it is important to note that in order to be able to talk about a constituency for bureaucratic autonomy, we need to be in a position to talk about a coherent bureaucracy in the first place. Judging by the problems identified in the Draft Transition Program for 1976, one can conclude that the public service as a whole was in a complete disarray.<sup>233</sup> According to this draft, *inter alia*, the statutes regulating the internal structures of the ministries were not made; the duties, authorities and responsibilities of the ministries were not determined; division of labour between the ministries were not regulated to ensure efficient and productive provision of services. Most significantly, it was pointed out that the Turkish Cypriot public service was deprived of an effective auditing mechanism.

This is small wonder because in the immediate post-1974 period, in the words of Müezzinoğlu “the Turkish Cypriot administration was not more advanced than an association”.<sup>234</sup> The civil service inherited from the pre-1974 period was primitive. Among other things, it lacked the ability to act independently (a) because the personnel were in effect in a chain of command, as a military rule had been in force since 1963, and (b) because it was staffed by personnel who just finished their university studies, and had been employed in the public service just to make sure that they did not emigrate. Furthermore, there were 73 different administrative units scattered around the island before 1974.<sup>235</sup> After division of the island, the scene was completely different as some of these units were now in the south while their personnel were in the north.

Indeed, the problem was not limited to the civil service. The whole administration including the political executive was in a shambles. As pointed out by Ecevit at the time, though the circumstances fundamentally have changed after 1974, the administrative

---

<sup>233</sup> KTFD 1976 Yılı Geçiş Programı Taslağı, p. 110. See also Turhan Feyzioğlu cited in Mehmet Ali Birand: “Kıbrıs’ta Madalyonun İki Yüzü [Two sides of the medallion in Cyprus] (7).” *Milliyet*, 29.6.1976.

<sup>234</sup> Müezzinoğlu cited in Mehmet Ali Birand: “Kıbrıs’ta Madalyonun İki Yüzü [Two sides of the medallion in Cyprus] (7).” *Milliyet*, 29.6.1976.

<sup>235</sup> State Planning Organization (1979: 4).

structure, which had been established in the pre-1974 period just to ensure the survival of the community, was not reformed. This resulted in an administrative cacophony. “The clearing of the administration from the remnants of the past administration model is an urgency. Unless the coherence, functionality and efficiency of the administration is secured, the Turkish Cypriot economy cannot be kick-started,” Ecevit concluded.<sup>236</sup> This is to say let alone protecting the public resources, it is safe to say that, the civil service was not capable of performing its basic functions in this period.

Given these circumstances, it can be concluded that the resettlement and rehabilitation dimension was conducted without any major bureaucratic “obstacle,” at least, from the local actors. There was an alternative authority, however, which could exercise influence on the executive. This was the Cyprus Coordination Committee. The Committee was set up as a sub unit of Cyprus Coordination Board in Ankara, which was tasked to deal with the normalization of day-to-day affairs.<sup>237</sup> Its chairman was a veteran ambassador, Müezzinoğlu<sup>238</sup>, who had earlier served as the undersecretary of the State Planning Organization –the institutional home of indicative planning in Turkey.

The Committee’s priority was stabilizing the economy and revitalizing the socio-economic life. In line with the broader Cyprus policy of the Turkish government, the aim was to lift the Turkish Cypriot community’s per capita income to the level of the Greek Cypriots as soon as possible. The main target of the Turkish Cypriot community, according to Müezzinoğlu was “to gain strength in the field of economy, to become an independent economic community and to establish the Autonomous Turkish Cypriot Administration, as a fully-fledged structure within a state based on geographic federation”.<sup>239</sup> In other words, the Committee had a political aim and a vision to achieve it. In this context, as Müezzinoğlu later admitted, the Committee had concentrated its efforts on macro projects and left the

---

<sup>236</sup> “Ecevit: ‘Kıbrıs Sorununu Askıda Bırakmak, Çözümü Gitgide Zorlaştıracaktır’ [Delaying the solution of the Cyprus problem will make it more intractable].” *Milliyet*, 21.7.1975.

<sup>237</sup> The Board was comprised of five cabinet ministers headed by a state minister (see “İnhan: Makarios’u Ne Bir Devlet Ne de Hükümet Olarak Tanımıyoruz [İnhan: We do not recognize Makarios in any capacity].” *Zaman*, 22.03.1975).

<sup>238</sup> Considering his power on the Turkish Cypriot administration, it wouldn’t be exaggeration to call Müezzinoğlu a viceroy, at least as long as economic affairs were concerned.

<sup>239</sup> “Müezzinoğlu: Türkiye OKT Yönetimine Uluslararası Nitelikte Yardımlar Yapmaktadır [Turkey’s assistance to the Autonomous Turkish Cypriot administration is like international aid].” *Zaman*, 28.12.1974.

resettlement and rehabilitation issue to the Turkish Cypriot administration.<sup>240</sup> So, in this regard, the politicians were given a free hand.

It is not possible to say the same thing about the wider economic policymaking, and handling of the factories and tourism facilities. Although the tendency in the council of ministers was in favour of privatizing the economic enterprises left behind by the Greek Cypriots<sup>241</sup>, the Committee introduced a mixed-economic model, in line with the economic development policy pursued by Republican People's Party (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*, CHP) in Turkey. Accordingly, for the running of industrial and tourism facilities several state economic enterprises (SEEs) were established as joint ventures with the Turkish SEEs.<sup>242</sup> In a similar vein, some of the agricultural land and production facilities were transferred to the newly established state farms. In other words, the Committee effectively intervened and prevented the distribution of these facilities to the cronies and political allies.

Furthermore, Alper Orhon, a Turkish Cypriot professor of economics, who was also working for the Committee<sup>243</sup>, was sent to Cyprus to establish the ministry of planning and coordination and to head it. Simultaneously, a ministry of tourism was also established.<sup>244</sup> Obviously, Ankara was serious about planning and devising a state-led economic development model. Having secured the full backing of Müezzinoğlu, Orhon was like a

---

<sup>240</sup> "In that period the process could not be stopped to avoid individual grievances," he said in June 1976, adding that now that the transition period was completed "the time was due for addressing individual grievances, and redressing injustices" (Interviewed by Mehmet Ali Birand: "Kıbrıs'ta Madalyonun İki Yüzü [Two sides of the medallion in Cyprus] (7)." *Milliyet*, 29.6.1976).

<sup>241</sup> Kotak interviewed by author. In our interview, Mr Kotak said that the chamber of commerce and some of his fellow ministers targeted him in the 1976 elections and its aftermath because he opposed privatization when he had served as the minister of resettlement. See also Alper Orhon's interview with Abdi İpekçi cited below.

<sup>242</sup> The decision was made as early as in September 1974, in a meeting attended by Müezzinoğlu, and the Turkish Cypriot high-level economic bureaucrats (Hilmi Refik interviewed by author). By the end of 1975, 40 of the industrial facilities were allocated to a state enterprise (K.T. Sanayi Holding İşletmeleri); 18 of them to the cooperative bank (K.T. Kooperatif Merkez Bankası) and village cooperatives; and 12 of them to another public enterprise (Cypfruvex) (KTFD 1976 Yılı Geçiş Programı Taslağı, p. 51). It is worth noting that the Turkish partners had the majority (51 percent) of stakes in the joint ventures.

<sup>243</sup> "Prof. Alper Orhon Çok Yakında Görev Alıyor [Prof. Alper Orhon will be in office very soon]." *Zaman*, 29.9.1974; "Prof. Orhon Bakanlığı İçin Dinamik Bir Şama Hazırlıyor [Prof. Orhon is preparing a dynamic scheme for his ministry]." *Bozkurt*, 21.10.1974.

<sup>244</sup> Çağlar Yasal, a Turkish Cypriot who until then had been working for the Turkish ministry of tourism was sent to the island to take over the newly established ministry of tourism and promotion ("Çağlar Yasal Turizm ve Tanıtma Bakanlığı Görevine Getirildi [Çağlar Yasal appointed as the minister of tourism]." *Zaman*, 2.10.1974).

prime minister.<sup>245</sup> As a proponent of state-led economic development and an expert of economic planning, Orhon started with conducting economic censuses to make the inventory of resources, and drew up a one-year transitional plan, which was to be followed by a five-year economic development plan.<sup>246</sup> Yet, Orhon's stint as the minister would not last long enough to see to the implementation of these plans. As soon as a right-wing government with more liberal tendencies in economy came to power in Turkey and it became apparent that Müezzinoğlu would be replaced, Denктаş sacked Orhon<sup>247</sup>, and shelved his development plan –until the CHP came to power again in 1978.

What Orhon said about his short stint in the council of ministers in an interview few months later, reflects the fundamental disagreements between the Committee, and Turkish Cypriot administration over the handling of the public resources. Just as importantly it shows why the SEEs were condemned to failure.

I had difficulty to have certain bills passed in the cabinet. Even when I managed to pass them, they never made it to the parliament to become law. ... To give an example ... seven-eight SEEs have been established. However, there is no law to manage and audit them. Though the council of ministers had approved the bill eight-nine months ago, it has not been passed in the parliament yet. Because of this, public companies holding the biggest employment potential cannot be audited or forced to meet the economic expectations of the administration ... They support the idea that state cannot play an effective role in running the industrial facilities. Accordingly, their approach is 'let's transfer these facilities to individuals'. They justify this by saying 'it's been one year and a half but the state still has not been able to run them'.<sup>248</sup> ... Although there is a five-year plan available, the current government has blocked its implementation. They don't believe in a planned economy ... The findings of the censuses conducted have not been evaluated. A statistic department, which was supposed to be set up to provide data required in the decision-making process, has not been established so far. It is not known on what basis the state mechanism is making decisions. Even a price index is not available.<sup>249</sup>

---

<sup>245</sup> Indeed, it was believed by many that he had been sent to take over domestic affairs from Denктаş (Alpay Durduran interviewed by author; Hakkı Atun interviewed by author; see also Konuk cited in Besim 2011: 107).

<sup>246</sup> Alper Orhon interviewed by Abdi İpekçi, *Milliyet*, 5.1.1976.

<sup>247</sup> "Alper Orhon Bakanlıktan Affedildi [Alper Orhon dismissed]." *Zaman*, 11.4.1975.

<sup>248</sup> Müezzinoğlu was also quoted saying, "those who blame our approach as socialist were in favor of a practical approach i.e. distributing the industrial facilities to individuals" (Cited in Mehmet Ali Birand: "Kıbrıs'ta Madalyonun İki Yüzü [Two sides of the medallion in Cyprus] (7)." *Milliyet*, 29.6.1976.

<sup>249</sup> Interviewed by Abdi İpekçi, *Milliyet*, 5.1.1976.

In the period following the dismissal of Orhon, the government's policy can be summarized as kicking the can down the road, which would prove extremely costly in socio-economic terms in the long run. What made things even worse was the fact that in the six-year period following the 1974 war, Turkey saw seven different governments. With every government change in Ankara, also changed the economic policies pursued in Nicosia. Furthermore, the executive boards of the SEEs became patronage posts to be filled by the Turkish parties taking part in the coalitions.<sup>250</sup> As a result, the huge potential for economic development inherited from the Greek Cypriots was not utilized effectively to establish a self-sufficient and sustainable economy that would lessen the dependence (a) of its citizens on state for sources of livelihood, and (b) of its treasury on funds from Ankara.

But how can we explain the government's lack of concern for economy? The answer lies in the strategic priorities of the political elites, which will be discussed in the next section. Suffice it here to say that unlike the Coordination Committee, the ruling nationalist elite never envisaged the Turkish Cypriots as a political community independent from Turkey, and did not consider a self-sufficient economy as a priority. Neither it occurred to them that this state of limbo would last almost four decades.

### **3.3 The *Taksim* Policy and Legitimacy Crisis of the Ruling Political Elite**

Based on the analysis made in the first two sections, it can be argued that the balance was heavily tilted towards a patronage strategy: The socio-economic situation of the people made them receptive to clientelistic offers; there were huge resources under the control of the administration; bureaucracy was extremely weak and only institution, which could and did initially constrain the politicians had lost its capacity to do so when the government changed in Ankara. The analysis is still incomplete, however, unless the priorities of the ruling nationalist elite are introduced into the equation. As Piattoni notes, sometimes the broader political context at the time of mass political mobilization, such as the advent of the Cold War in the case of post-World War II Italy, may completely change the calculations of the ruling political elite and make political clientelism "a more appealing strategy" (2001: 24-6). This section aims to locate the strategic priorities of the Turkish Cypriot

---

<sup>250</sup> See for instance "Anavatan Başbakanına Açık Mektup [Open letter to the motherland's prime minister]." *Yeni Kıbrıs*, June-July 1977; see also Dr Küçük: "Sayın Demirel'in Nasihati [Mr Demirel's advice]." *Halkın Sesi*, 2.8.1980.

leadership regarding the Cyprus conflict into the equation of the demand and supply of political clientelism to account for their opting for a clientelistic strategy to mobilize mass support.

Basically, I will argue that, what made the ruling elite adopt a full-scale clientelistic strategy when the time to mass political mobilization came was more than anything else, the legitimacy crisis it faced. The reason behind this crisis was its vision for the solution of the Cyprus problem: *taksim*. The *taksim* policy of Denktaş was accepted neither by the international community, nor by the Turkish government nor by the Turkish Cypriot opposition. In the face of this external and internal legitimacy crisis, the easiest possible way out was securing a mass following in the domestic political arena and in doing so delegitimizing the pro-reunification policies internally and externally. Just like the Cold War conditions in Italy in the time of political mobilization after the World War II “pressured the anti-Communist parties into gaining and keeping power almost by all means, clientelism included” (Piattoni 2001b: 199), it can be said that their approach to the solution of the Cyprus problem or simply their ideology, pressured the founders of the UBP to do the same thing. In the following two sub-sections, I will elaborate on the external and internal dimension of this legitimacy crisis.

### **3.3.1 External Dimension**

In his long political career, Denktaş’s position on the solution of the Cyprus problem did not move an inch from what had been declared in the late 1950s, which was simply *taksim*. On the way to reaching this ultimate goal, the ethnic/geographic segregation, which was practically achieved after the Turkish military intervention/invasion and the ensuing Third Vienna Agreement<sup>251</sup>, was a major milestone. Having tackled the most formidable challenge on the way to permanent partition, next step for Denktaş was to capitalize on these new

---

<sup>251</sup> The Third Vienna Agreement, signed on 2 August 1975, envisaged, inter alia, “the Turkish Cypriots at present in the South of the Island will be allowed, if they want to do so, to proceed North with their belongings under an organized programme and with the assistance of UNFICYP” and in a similar vein, “the Greek Cypriots at present in the North who, at their own request and without having been subjected to any kind of pressure, wish to move to the South will be permitted to do so”. The population exchange took place within a month from 14 August to 14 September 1975 (İsmet Kotak interviewed by author). Around 10 thousand Turkish Cypriots who sought refuge in the British Base in Episcopi had been flown to Turkey earlier when Britain finally allowed them to leave in January 1975 (Steven F. Roberts: “Cyprus Split Seems Closer as Turks Plan to Evacuate Refugees.” *The New York Times*, 17 January 1975). Reprinted in *Crisis on Cyprus* (1975: 56).

facts on the ground to make the status quo irreversible in the political arena (see also Kızılyürek 2003). All political manoeuvres in this period, domestic and international alike were guided by this overarching political ideal. This dogmatic approach, which ruled out even the slightest deviation as treason, in the long run inevitably created contradictions. And almost all the ills from which Turkish Cypriot community suffers today, from social tension between the “original” Turkish Cypriots and “settlers” to the bankruptcy of public finances, from a huge, inefficient public sector to international isolation, have all their origins in these contradictions.

Ironically, the biggest hurdle for Denктаş in his quest for permanent partition was the Turkish government’s Cyprus policy. As in the 1960s, once again Denктаş was at loggerheads with the Turkish mainstream establishment. Ecevit, the Turkish premier clearly ruled out “*taksim* or annexation” in the immediate aftermath of the Turkish intervention/invasion.<sup>252</sup> In a similar vein, Turan Güneş, the Turkish foreign minister, stated that the government’s policy was in line with the rest of the international community, and envisaged the “territorial integrity, independence, and sovereignty of Cyprus”.<sup>253</sup> Consequently, the official Turkish position in the inter-communal negotiations for the settlement of the Cyprus problem was forming an independent, geographic federation comprised of Turkish and Greek Cypriot federated states. Given his ideological disposition, it is not difficult to see that a common state was an anathema to Denктаş. Even when he was discussing the formation of a federation on the negotiation table and touting geographical federation as the “only untested system” to the international press<sup>254</sup>, obviously at the behest of Ankara, he was asking “the Turkish government to establish the

---

<sup>252</sup> “Ecevit ‘Kıbrıs için Taksim veya İlhakı Düşmüyoruz’ dedi [‘We do not contemplate partition or annexation in Cyprus,’ Ecevit said].” *Zaman*, 24.08.1974.

<sup>253</sup> “Güneş ‘Adadaki Durumumuzun Değeri ve Gücü Vardır’ dedi [‘Our position in the island is valuable and powerful’ Güneş said].” *Bozkurt*, 27.10.1974. See also his interview with Robert Kroon: “Blunt Voice from Turkey.” *Time*, 26.08.1974, where he says “in its new federative form, Cyprus can remain independent. We don’t want double enosis [union with Greece and Turkey]”.

<sup>254</sup> “Rauf Denктаş Fransız Haber Ajansına Demeç Verdi: ‘Denenmemiş Tek Sistem Coğrafi Federasyondur’ [Rauf Denктаş gave a statement to the French News Agency: ‘Only untested system is geographical federation’].” *Zaman*, 3.2.1975. See also “Federal Sistem Kaçınılmazdır [Federal system is inevitable].” *Zaman*, 28.08.1974.

Turkish wing of Confederal Cyprus State,” and preparing the Turkish Cypriot public opinion for a confederation.<sup>255</sup>

Furthermore, whenever he deemed circumstances favourable, Denктаş floated the idea of declaring a separate, independent state<sup>256</sup>, only to be dissuaded by Ankara.<sup>257</sup> These moves were not welcomed by the Turkish public opinion. “Turkey cannot drift behind Denктаş’s *fait accompli* decisions,” stated a declaration issued by the CHP, as a reaction to Denктаş’s statements about proclaiming an independent state.<sup>258</sup> Reportedly, Ecevit also found his endeavours “untimely”.<sup>259</sup> The other major party in Turkey, Demirel’s Justice Party (*Adalet Partisi*), was also against a unilateral declaration of independence.<sup>260</sup> The National Front government headed by Demirel was criticized for being too soft on Denктаş. Ahmet Şükrü Esmer<sup>261</sup>, for instance, lambasted the government over its silence in the face of Denктаş’s “intemperance” and identified Denктаş’s attitude as “irresponsible”:

Turkey intervened in Cyprus based on the rights provided by the Zurich and London agreements. If Denктаş thinks that he can drag the Turkish army to an adventure

---

<sup>255</sup> “Türkiye Hükümeti’ne Önemli Bir Mesaj Gönderen Denктаş: Konfedere Kıbrıs Devleti’nin Türk Kanadının Kurulması İsteğinde Bulundu [Denктаş sent an important message to the Turkish government and asked the formation of the Turkish wing of the Confederal Republic of Cyprus].” *Zaman*, 6.2.1975; In an editorial in his son’s newspaper *Zaman*, titled “Why Confederation?” it was argued that the confederation was the only way to slam the borders closed to persons like Nicos Sampson (“Niye Konfederasyon [Why confederation]?” *Zaman*, 9.2.1975).

<sup>256</sup> In our interview, he said his biggest regret was to heed to the then Turkish minister of foreign affairs Esenbel’s advice not to declare independence in 1975 when the international conditions were more favourable.

<sup>257</sup> See for instance, Denктаş’s article titled “Why a separate state?” in *Zaman*, 19.12.1975. See also “Denктаş: Ayrı Bir Devlet İlan Edilecek [Denктаş: A separate state will be declared].” *Halkın Sesi*, 8.5.1976; “Denктаş: Kolombo’dan Çıkacak Karar Makarios’un Konuşması Paralelinde ise Ayrı Bağımsızlık İlanı İçin Fazla Beklememize Lüzum Kalmaz [Denктаş: If the decision in Colombo will be parallel to what Makarios said in his speech, then there will be no need to wait for a long time for the declaration of independence].” *Zaman*, 19.08.1976; Upon his arrival in Istanbul from New York, where he had attended meetings on the Cyprus problem, Denктаş was quoted as saying “Declaring independence is one of the ways out. It’s futile to still expect good will from Greek Cypriots. The final decision needs to be made boldly. The issue of greatest priority is independence” (“Denктаş: ‘Artık Rumlar’dan İyi Niyet Beklemek Fuzulidir’ [Denктаş: It’s futile to expect good will from Greek Cypriots].” *Milliyet*, 01.12.1978). A day later he announced that the Turkish premier did not agree with him (“Denктаş: ‘Sayın Ecevit, Kıbrıs’ta Bağımsızlık İlanını Şimdilik Uygun Bulmuyorlar’ [Denктаş: For the moment Mr Ecevit does not see it fit to declare independence in Cyprus].” *Milliyet*, 2.12.1978).

<sup>258</sup> Cited in *Halkın Sesi*, 2.12.1975.

<sup>259</sup> Kasım Yargıcı: “Kıbrıs ve Türk-ABD İlişkileri [Cyprus and the Turco-American Relations].” *Milliyet*, 30.9.1975.

<sup>260</sup> Ali Sirmen: “Denктаş Ne İstiyor [What does Denктаş want]?” *Cumhuriyet* cited in *Halkın Sesi*, 2.12.1975.

<sup>261</sup> Mr Esmer was a veteran academic and foreign policy columnist. According to Mümtaz Soysal, Professor Esmer was “one of the most experienced foreign policy commentators with the youngest mindset” (Mümtaz Soysal: “Devlet Olmak [To be a state].” *Milliyet*, 10.12.1975).

with a *fait accompli*, he is mistaken. If he is bluffing, then the Turkish army cannot be used as a tool in his bluff.<sup>262</sup>

In a similar vein, according to Mümtaz Soysal, a respected professor of constitutional law and a columnist in the left-leaning *Milliyet*, with his statements about independence Denктаş was undermining the credibility of the official Turkish position in the eyes of the international community and in doing so he was providing the Greek side with diplomatic ammunition to say, “Turks have never intended to form a common, independent, federal, Cyprus state”.<sup>263</sup>

Yet, Denктаş was undeterred. Although it was obvious that the deal would involve returning a considerable amount of land to the Greek Cypriot side, he constantly reiterated his determination “not to give away at the negotiation table what was obtained on the battlefield” with a strong nationalistic rhetoric. The following excerpt from a speech he delivered during the celebrations of a national holiday is a good illustration of his way of thinking and what he made of inter-communal negotiations:

Turkish Cypriots have not attained the status they enjoy today through negotiation. Current situation is a reasonable one, where historical rights have been secured. We are going to stay loyal to this status, which has not been attained through negotiation. Because what has formed the borders, the existence of the current situation as a foundation stone is not land but blood; not land but fatherland; not land but liberty, freedom, which was acquired at the expense of life and blood, and hundreds of martyrs.<sup>264</sup>

In a different speech, while criticizing an opposition leader, who had earlier talked about making territorial concessions, he was indeed expressing his resolve to maintain the status quo forever: “he has no right to do so. ... Only those who had conquered the land can make concessions on land, [and] those who had conquered the land are now lying under the ground”.<sup>265</sup> He was not only speaking against territorial concession but also taking concrete steps to avoid it. In the remainder of this sub-section, I will attempt to show how he managed not to make any territorial concession and at what cost. To do this, I will bring

---

<sup>262</sup> A. Ş. Esmer cited in Soysal, *Milliyet*, 10.12.1975.

<sup>263</sup> Soysal, 10.12.1975.

<sup>264</sup> “Denктаş: ‘Kıbrıs Türkü Bugünkü Duruma Pazarlıkla Gelmemiştir’ [Denктаş: ‘Turkish Cypriots have not attained the status they enjoy today through negotiation’].” *Zaman*, 24.04.1975; see also for instance his statement in *Zaman*, 22.3.1977.

<sup>265</sup> “Denктаş: ‘Toprak Tavizini Ancak Toprağı Alanlar Verir’ [Denктаş: ‘Only those who had conquered the land can make concessions on land’].” *Milliyet*, 19.6.1976.

the handling of the resources left by the fleeing Greek Cypriots once again in the center of the discussion and illustrate how this fit into his *taksim* policy.

To start with, when we look at the general domestic situation at the time, we see that Denktaş administration was constantly under fire for lack of planning and coordination, arbitrariness and favouritism in its efforts in resettling the displaced. An orderly resettlement process and avoiding the squandering what was left from the Greek Cypriots, which came to be seen as “national wealth” however, seemed not to be a priority for the administration even though many members of the parliament repeatedly expressed their uneasiness about the process<sup>266</sup> and the newspapers were full of complaints. How can we explain this chaotic situation, especially given the availability of vast amount of resources and sufficient time to deal with the issue in a more orderly manner?

Certainly, part of the explanation for setbacks lies with the weakness of the state apparatus. Yet for a larger part of the explanation, the attention has to be turned once again to the strategic calculations. The disorder in the resettlement process was indeed serving a purpose: creating new facts on the ground to avoid territorial concessions in the negotiations.<sup>267</sup> The international pressure on the Turkish side to make concessions was mounting by the day.<sup>268</sup> As pointed out by Alpay Durduran, there were thousands of vacant houses in the north, while their owners were suffering in the south in tent camps.<sup>269</sup> Looking from this perspective, no matter how frustrating this was for the community at large, hasty distribution of Greek Cypriot houses and businesses made political sense. The clumsy population transfer from Turkey<sup>270</sup> should also be considered in this context.

---

<sup>266</sup> See for instance minutes of the general parliamentary debate on the resettlement and rehabilitation of the displaced persons dated 28.1.1975.

<sup>267</sup> The following excerpt from the *Time* magazine, which was published in the wake of the proclamation of TFSC gives a rough idea about the Greek Cypriot position in the negotiations. “Makarios ... had approved a plan that would have created a ‘substantial’ Turkish zone in northern Cyprus —a major concession— and would have allowed permanent settlement of Turkish refugees in the north. Glafkos Clerides, negotiator for the Greek Cypriots, insisted that major areas now under Turkish occupation must be restored to Greek control in order that some of the Greek refugees might be resettled” (“Separation: A Sense of Betrayal.” *Time*, 24.2.1975).

<sup>268</sup> The U.S. Congress, for instance, imposed an arms embargo on Turkey, which aimed “to pressure Ankara into withdrawing its troops from Cyprus and allowing the resettlement of the 200 thousand refugees (mostly Greek Cypriots) who were left homeless by the war” (“Strains in an Old Alliance.” *Time*, 17.2.1975).

<sup>269</sup> Interviewed by author.

<sup>270</sup> Regarding the settlement of Turkish “agricultural labour brought from Turkey,” İnal Batu, a former Turkish ambassador notes, “We couldn’t manage to do what the Ottomans successfully did five centuries ago; in a sense, we messed it up” (cited in İnanç 2007: 96).

Nothing would serve better and quicker to this political aim than filling the vacant houses as quickly as possible, and turning a blind eye to looting of the Greek Cypriot properties. This would not only complicate things to the point of no return but also send a simple political message to the Greek Cypriot side: Forget about coming back to your homes because there is no home left! The following statement made by Denктаş is a telling example of how his *taksim* and hasty distribution strategies went hand in hand in practice:

We have disclosed our criteria about land. One of them is that we are not going to re-evacuate areas where we have already settled. During the Second Vienna negotiations the area we had already opened to settlement was smaller than today. Therefore, when territorial/border adjustment was discussed, the line could have been drawn differently. There used to be more flexibility. As months passed by, and homeless people came and settled, [flexibility] has diminished ... Between the Second Vienna Negotiations and today, the territorial/border adjustment became more rigid to the detriment of Greek Cypriots. We have not created this. Time and events have.<sup>271</sup>

The urgency in the international front tramped the domestic concerns. The stakes for Denктаş were high enough to justify taking all the criticisms posed against him in the domestic front regarding injustices in the resettlement process. To rephrase what Sidney Tarrow said of the Italian peasants in the 1950s after the Agrarian Reform (1967: 355), without any property the Turkish Cypriot population, which had suffered from economic deprivation in the enclaves for years, would have become volatile and rebellious, and probably would favour a solution, which would prompt their going back to the south. But as “property owners” they simply became conservatives and proponents of the new status quo. In this way, indeed Denктаş created a natural constituency for partition, which would support him in the decades to come.

Beyond its direct involvement in the distribution of immobile properties, the administration played a subtler role by triggering a “*ganimet* (spoils of war) rush” by simply condoning looting. In a minister’s words, “after the war the country was in a looting frenzy” (Konuk cited in Besim 2011: 108).<sup>272</sup> Kyrenia, for instance, was “looted beyond

---

<sup>271</sup> “Başkan Denктаş Rum İddialarını Cevaplandırdı ve Hudut Düzeltmesi ile İlgili Elastikiyet Azalmıştır dedi [President Denктаş answered the Greek Cypriot allegations and said that flexibility regarding border adjustment had decreased].” *Zaman*, 3.7.1976.

<sup>272</sup> When he was asked to quit his ministerial portfolio to represent the cabinet in the constituent assembly, Konuk accepted the offer instantly as this would keep him away from “the looting frenzy”. Denктаş was so surprised to hear that Konuk was willing to leave the cabinet, he had the urge to ask a colleague of Konuk’s if

description”.<sup>273</sup> It is remarkable that Bedreddin Demirel, the commander of the Turkish forces in the island held Denктаş personally responsible for this: “You! All these robberies are going on with your orders and condoning,” said Demirel in a reception pointing his finger at Denктаş.<sup>274</sup> It is true that all these created vested interests that would prove useful in the elections. Yet, it is important to note that everything covered so far was random in the sense that all these would have been done even if there had been no elections. Certainly, some politicians had taken advantage of their status to cultivate personal *clientela* in this period. However, nothing was done at this stage to particularly mobilize mass political support.

Basically, this is to say, the nature of the ruling elite’s strategic calculations outlined here tilted the balance further in favor of a clientelistic strategy. Yet, still there was a chance to opt for a programmatic mobilization strategy, only if the political elite as a whole had played along and supported the *taksim* policy of the administration. Then the pressure on Denктаş to resort to clientelism would have been much less. But this was not the case; there were politicians who were opposed to *taksim*, whose stance was legitimized by Ankara’s official policy on this matter. Therefore, there was a polarization at the elite level, and as Kitschelt and Wilkinson put it, polarization, or the presence of “programmatic distance between alternative party blocs competing for executive office is a strong incentive for the party in power to opt for a clientelist strategy” (2007: 28). Accordingly, as it will be illustrated in the next chapter, come the establishment phase of the UBP and time to go to the polls, a new round of distribution started, this time exclusively to mobilize mass political support for the party. I will discuss the political polarization issue in the following sub-section.

Before coming to this, two brief points about the socio-economic consequences of the process outlined above should be made. For Denктаş, avoiding loss of land was a huge success, which could not be measured in economic terms. Yet, what might look politically

---

he had understood that representing the cabinet in the constituent assembly would mean he had to quit as a minister (cited in Besim 2011: 108).

<sup>273</sup> Crisis on Cyprus (1975: 30). The report continues like this: “in driving across the island to Famagusta, there is wide-spread evidence of looting of Greek Cypriot villages along the road. In fact, the Study Mission observed two military trucks and a lorry loaded with miscellaneous pieces of furniture heading for some unknown destination down the road from Famagusta”.

<sup>274</sup> Anonymous interviewee who was present at the reception.

expedient does not necessarily make economic sense. The adverse effects of distribution without regard for long-term prospects of economic growth became evident as early as some five months after the Turkish intervention/invasion. Evaluating the economic situation, Paul Martin of *the Times* comments “anyone asked to draw a comparison between the two areas at this stage would come to the conclusion that the Greeks were the victors and the Turks the vanquished”.<sup>275</sup> Martin continues as follows:

Though the Turks boast that they will resurrect the now dead hotel trade in the north, officially condoned looting of deserted hotels continues. And, so bad has the Turkish record been on this score, Turkish families from the south find themselves inheriting vacated Greek houses stripped bare. This has sparked off another cycle of looting.<sup>276</sup>

It took a little bit more before the negative effect of unrestrained looting on the social fabric became visible. By condoning looting, as well as other illicit activities like smuggling and black-marketing, the administration paved the way for the emergence of a culture of impunity, which would build up in the years to come. If what Banfield coined “amoral familism,”<sup>277</sup> or a private-regarding or individualist political ethos prevails in the contemporary Turkish Cypriot community, as some former Turkish ambassadors to Nicosia seem to imply (see İnanç 2007: 9; 44), its seeds were definitely sown in this period. Alper Orhon’s statements made few years later in a roundtable discussion is worth citing in this context: “By a policy of condoning, not controlling, and letting the thieves to get away with what they steal, the UBP paved the way for the emergence of millionaires of looting, and in doing so it pushed the society into a moral depression” (cited in Kasımoğlu 1980: 17).

### 3.3.2 Internal Dimension

The dichotomy between Denktaş and the Turkish Cypriot opposition should be discussed in the context of statehood and political identity because diverging views on this issue is the line dividing what has come to be called left and right in the Turkish Cypriot politics (Cf. Egemen 2006: 159-61).

---

<sup>275</sup> “Now the Turks Must Decide What to Do with the Part of Cyprus They Won.” 31.12.1974. Reprinted in *Crisis on Cyprus*: 57-8.

<sup>276</sup> 31 December 1974. Reprinted in *Crisis on Cyprus*: 57-8.

<sup>277</sup> A mentality of maximizing “the material, short-run advantage of the nuclear family; assume that all others will do likewise” (Banfield 1958: 85).

Denktaş's insistence on statehood derived from his belief that having a state was "necessary for the survival of the Turkish ethnic community and identity" (Çolak 2004: 3), and on that, indeed both sides agreed. Accordingly, when the TFSC was proclaimed in February 1975, the Turkish Cypriot opposition welcomed the decision<sup>278</sup>, and eagerly accepted to take part in the constituent assembly. The ratification of the TFSC constitution with over 99 percent of the vote in the referendum (Dodd 1993: 108) was an obvious manifestation of this unanimity. However, while establishing the federated wing of a federal state was an end in itself sufficient to guarantee political survival of the Turkish Cypriot community on the island for the opposition; for Denktaş, setting up a federated state, or even a confederated state was nothing but a stepping stone to reach the ultimate goal of full integration/unification with Turkey.

In line with this political vision, Denktaş embarked on a "Turkification" process to completely "nationalize" the northern part of the island (Kızılyürek 2003: 291-2). The Turkish identity needed to be consolidated to justify unification with Turkey. By the same token, Cypriotness or Cypriot identity should be downplayed.<sup>279</sup> In the perception of the leadership, Cypriotness was something dangerous; as Denktaş once stated, "if we are deceived into thinking we are Cypriots we shall boil in the Greek Cypriot pot" (cited in Dodd 1993: 149). As highlighted by Kızılyürek, "[t]his approach, which went as far as denying the Turkish Cypriot community, derived from a search for legitimacy for *taksim*-oriented political preferences, rather than 'an intellectual illusion'" (Kızılyürek 2003: 293). By denying the element of Cypriotness in the identity of "Turks in Cyprus<sup>280</sup>," the Turkish Cypriot nationalists tried to demonstrate the impossibility of a future common state with Greek Cypriots because of "identity differentiations between the two communities" (Vural and Rüstemli 2006: 332).

---

<sup>278</sup> Berberoğlu, the leader of CTP, for instance, said that this was the "right step on the way to a Federal Republic of Cyprus," ("Berberoğlu Bir Mesaj Yayınladı: Karar, Federal Kıbrıs Cumhuriyetine Doğru Önemli Bir Aşamadır [Berberoğlu issued a message: the decision is an important step on the way to the Federal Republic of Cyprus]." *Halkın Sesi*, 14.2.1975).

<sup>279</sup> Historically, "Cypriotness has been the territorial-civic component of collective identity, which was used by members of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities to separate their identity from mainland Greece and mainland Turkey respectively" (Vural and Rüstemli 2006: 332).

<sup>280</sup> According to the official discourse espoused by the nationalists, there are Turks in Cyprus, not Turkish Cypriots.

The opposition, which initially rejected the *taksim* idea, arguably just because Ecevit did so, on the other hand, in time gradually developed a “stance of identity” emphasizing “Cypriotness,” and resisted the variant of Turkish nationalism imposed by Denktaş (Kızılyürek 2005: 249). It should be underlined that one particular element of the Turkification process backfired heavily and facilitated the development of Cypriot identity. This was the population transfer from Turkey, which was orchestrated by Denktaş.<sup>281</sup> When the Turkish Cypriots began to live side by side with the Turkish settlers, and discovered the cultural differences between Turkish Cypriots and the mainlanders (Kızılyürek 2003: 292), they felt the urge to distinguish themselves, subsequently opting for a prioritization of the “Cypriot dimension of their identity” (Özejder cited in Kızılyürek 2005: 250; see also Pollis 1979b: 99). To quote Kızılyürek once again, “Cypriots who had been once Turkified in the face of Hellenic nationalism, were being re-Cypriotified” in the face of Turkish nationalism (Kızılyürek 2005: 259). “Against the ‘everyone is Turk’ discourse of the administration, different segments of the community, though in different tones,” developed an understanding that can be best captured by the words “I am a Turkish Cypriot and on this land, which belongs to me, it’s my right to live with my distinct identity” (Özejder cited in Kızılyürek 2005: 251). The left opposition came to represent this identity movement and have become the vanguard of reunification.

To delegitimize the opposition, Denktaş did not hesitate to resort to his time-and-battle-tested strategy of monopolizing Turkish (ultra-)nationalism, which worked perfectly in the 1950s, 1960s and early 1970s in pacifying the opposition, and anything to do with Turkey. In line with that, he created an “imaginary enemy within<sup>282</sup>,” which was not only pro-Greek but also communist. Whoever criticized Denktaş or his government was either *Rumcu* (Pro-Greek/Phil-Hellene)<sup>283</sup> or communist<sup>284</sup>, or at best playing to the hands of the Greek

---

<sup>281</sup> “It is not true that Turkey sent them. Denktaş passed a resolution in the council of ministers. As the majority of the population was cut off in the south, we required labor force. That is why they were brought” (Kotak interviewed by author). According to Atun, a protocol was signed between the Turkish government and the TFSC (Atun 2007: 387).

<sup>282</sup> In an editorial in his newspaper, Dr Küçük, argued that “an artificial class of traitors” was fabricated just to divert attention from the failure in domestic politics (“Dış ve İç İşlerimiz [Our external and internal affairs].” *Halkın Sesi*, 30.6.1976).

<sup>283</sup> It is worth mentioning that politicians whose nationalistic credentials cannot be disputed were all tarred with the same brush. Among them, the former community leader Dr Küçük; one of the 3 co-founders of the TMT, Dr Nalbantoğlu; and the *serdar* of Limassol, Zıya Rızki’s names can be counted to demonstrate the extent of this smear campaign. “For a long time, those politicians who were disliked or seen as competitors were smeared with reports sent to Ankara” (“CTP ve Denktaş [CTP and Denktaş].” *Olay*, 8.5.1978, p.9).

Cypriots. As an opposition leader highlighted in an interview, Denктаş “links his independence initiative to nationalism. Those who oppose this are said to be sheltered under Makarios’ gown and blamed as traitors”.<sup>285</sup> Significantly, because Denктаş was seen in Turkey as the embodiment of the Turkish Cypriot cause, whatever he said was taken seriously in the Turkish public opinion. In the rare chances they found to reach the Turkish public opinion, the opposition figures who lacked such stature were forced to answer Denктаş’s allegations, and hence had to take a defensive position. When Berberođlu, the leader of CTP, for instance, was asked about Denктаş’s accusations<sup>286</sup>, “we are in favour of an independent, sovereign, non-aligned Cyprus based on a bi-zonal federation. Is that collaboration?” he exclaimed.<sup>287</sup> It is ironic that those who were only advocating the Turkish government’s official Cyprus policy were accused in the Turkish public opinion of treason.

This also served as a smokescreen blocking the bread-and-butter issues. To quote Orhon, once again:

In our speeches, we talk about the daily problems of the people. Our opponents say, ‘we brought you freedom. Isn’t that enough? Communists will trick you and bring Greek Cypriots back’ they respond. They are trying to deceive people ... No opposition party has a view of solution, which will bring the Greek Cypriots back. But this is what they spread.<sup>288</sup>

To come back to where I started, given these circumstances, it was only normal for Denктаş to resort to political clientelism as a means to outmobilize and choke the fledgling opposition. The UBP founders had to show Ankara and the rest of the world that the

---

<sup>284</sup> For instance see “Denктаş Solcu Muhalefete Çattı [Denктаş lambasted the leftist opposition].” *Milliyet*, 6.6.1976 or “CTP Mensuplarının Londra’da Rumlarla İşbirliđi Yaptıkları Belgeleriyle Kanıtlandı [The CTP members’ cooperation with the Greek Cypriots in London proven by documents].” *Zaman*, 28.6.1976. The dove in the TKP emblem, according to Denктаş, was the dove of Makarios (cited in “Cumhurbaşkanı Ağzı [The presidential discourse].” *Kurtuluş*, 7.6.1976); Mehmet Ali Birand: “Kıbrıs’ta Madalyonun İki Yüzü [Two sides of the medallion in Cyprus] (5).” *Milliyet*, 27.6.1976.

<sup>285</sup> Alper Orhon interviewed by Abdi İpekçi, *Milliyet*, 5.1.1976.

<sup>286</sup> As part of the same special report on Cyprus published in *Milliyet*, for instance, Denктаş was quoted as saying “Opposition says ‘the fascist Turkish army out of Cyprus. Socialist Makarios is better than fascist Denктаş,’ they say. They want to bring Greek Cypriots back” cited in Mehmet Ali Birand: “Kıbrıs’ta Madalyonun İki Yüzü [Two sides of the medallion in Cyprus](5).” *Milliyet*, 27.6.1976.

<sup>287</sup> Interviewed by Mehmet Ali Birand (*ibid.*).

<sup>288</sup> Interviewed by Mehmet Ali Birand (*ibid.*).

Turkish Cypriot society was firmly behind Denктаş in his pro-*taksim* policies.<sup>289</sup> As Kuomintang (KMT), which faced a similar problem, did in Taiwan, it can be said that Denктаş instrumentalized political distribution “as a vital mechanism, maintaining the legitimacy of the political system through creation of an image of mass support” (for the case of the KMT, see Wang 1994: 181). I will elaborate on this in Chapter Four. Before this, in the last section of this chapter, I will briefly look into the wider political context and the institution/state-building process.

### 3.4 Setting the Stage: The Wider Political and Institutional Context

As discussed in the previous chapter, until the emergence of the *taksim* movement, the Turkish Cypriot community was in a state of political paralysis. The development of embryonic trade union and cooperative movements, which could have laid the foundations of ideological organizations (horizontal linkages) as they did in the Greek Cypriot community, was arrested by the emergence of the TMT, which took the control of these movements. As Kadritzke and Wagner put it, dependence on Turkey “in economic, military and political terms” made it possible for the Turkish Cypriot leadership to “build up their own puppet dictatorship over its community, an aim which its EOKA B colleagues never managed to achieve” (1977: 101). Therefore, although dissidence against the political leadership was growing within the community even in the 1960s and early 1970s, there was no organized opposition. True, the CTP was established in December 1970. However, the political circumstances of the time i.e. military rule, did not allow it to function as a real opposition party, and it took another four years before the first organized opposition emerged in the parliament.

On 1 November 1974, eight deputies formed the “Freedom Group”.<sup>290</sup> This was an initiative, which emerged as a reaction to the rumours over the administration’s preparation to form

---

<sup>289</sup> When asked about the benefits of his electoral success, Denктаş’s response was “When I say my public opinion want this or that, my words will have greater weight” (Interviewed by Mehmet Ali Birand: “Kıbrıs’ta Madalyonun İki Yüzü [Two sides of the medallion in Cyprus] (8).” *Milliyet*, 30.6.1976.

<sup>290</sup> Mahide Ergün: “Türk Toplumunun Siyasi Hayatında Yeni ve Önemli Bir Aşama: Meclis’te Özgürlük Grubu Oluşturdu [A new era in the political life of the Turkish community: The freedom group has been set up in the parliament].” *Halkın Sesi*, 2.11.1974. The group was made up of the following members: Fuat Veziroğlu (Famagusta), Dr Burhan Nalbantoğlu (Famagusta), İsmail Bozkurt (Larnaca), Mehmet Küçük (Nicosia), Dr Şemsi Kazım (Paphos), Özker Yaşın (Nicosia), Dr Haluk Avni (Larnaca), Dr Hasan Güvener (Famagusta) (Otonom Kıbrıs Türk Meclisi Zabıtları [Minutes of the Parliament of Autonomous Turkish Cypriot Administration], 1.11.1974, pp. 3-4).

a constituent assembly to draw up a new constitution.<sup>291</sup> What brought these deputies together was not their ideological affinity but their concern about losing their seats in the parliament because of their opposition to Denктаş.<sup>292</sup> The group was in favour of a new constitution but against the establishment of a constituent assembly fretting that this would mean the dissolution of the current parliament.<sup>293</sup>

The group was strongly critical of Denктаş. In his column in *Halkın Sesi*, Fuat Veziroğlu, an ally turned dissident and one of the most influential members of the parliamentary opposition, argued that dissolving the parliament, which was made up of elected members and forming a constituent assembly by appointment would be an undemocratic move and a manifestation of Denктаş's "dictatorial tendencies".<sup>294</sup> He argued that such an assembly would be nothing but a puppet in the hands of the executive. Criticizing the Denктаş administration of absolute failure in domestic affairs, he called for not only parliamentary but also presidential election. Few days later, in an open letter to Ecevit, he reminded that Denктаş was not elected to the presidency, and that it would be disappointing for the public to leave him in his position especially considering that some of his statements about the Cyprus problem put even Ankara diplomatically in a difficult position.<sup>295</sup>

Although the idea of drafting a new constitution and setting up of a constituent assembly was being floated since early November<sup>296</sup>, it did not take off until Denктаş seized the right moment to declare the TFSC.<sup>297</sup> Whether Denктаş had bowed because of the reaction of the Freedom Group or he had not intended to dissolve the parliament anyway, remains to be a moot point. What is known for a fact is that he settled for forming a constituent assembly

---

<sup>291</sup> Fuat Veziroğlu: "Kurucu Meclis [Constituent assembly]." *Halkın Sesi*, 2.11.1974.

<sup>292</sup> Veziroğlu interviewed by author.

<sup>293</sup> "Bir Bildiri Yayınlayan Özgürlük Grubu Kurucu Meclis Fikrine Karşı Çıktı: 'Özgürlük Grubu Yeni Bir Anayasaya Taraftar' [The freedom group issued a statement and opposed the idea to form a constituent assembly: The freedom group in favor of a new constitution]." *Halkın Sesi* 5.11.1974.

<sup>294</sup> Fuat Veziroğlu: "Kurucu Meclis [Constituent assembly]." *Halkın Sesi*, 2.11.1974

<sup>295</sup> Fuat Veziroğlu: "Sayın Ecevit'e Açık Mektup [Open letter to Mr Ecevit]." *Halkın Sesi*, 4.11.1974. It is worth mentioning that the letter covered the upper half of the front page of *Halkın Sesi*.

<sup>296</sup> "R. Denктаş Gazetemize Özel Bir Demeç Verdi: 'Toplumumuz Yeni Bir Oluşum İçerisindedir.' [R. Denктаş gave a special statement to our newspaper: 'our community is in a new formation process]." *Zaman*, 3.11.1974.

<sup>297</sup> The declaration coincided with the American Congress' decision to suspend arms assistance and sales to Turkey. The suspension was based on an earlier decision of the Senate, which set 5 February 1975 as a deadline for Turkey to withdraw a major number of troops or to allow a major number of the Greek Cypriot displaced people to return their homes. In the eve of the decision, *Time* reports, Denктаş "warned that the aid cutoff might provoke the proclamation of an independent Turkish-Cypriot state" ("Strains in an Old Alliance." *Time*, 17.2.1975).

by adding 25 new seats, representing different professional organizations to the existing 25-strong parliament.<sup>298</sup>

Few days after the declaration, on 18 February 1975, an extraordinary, joint meeting of the Executive Council and the Legislative Assembly of the Autonomous Turkish Cypriot Administration was convened to decide on the composition of the constituent assembly, which would draw up the constitution and function as the legislative body until the first multi-party election. Curiously, the president and deputy president of the assembly were elected in this first meeting; before almost half of its members even joined.<sup>299</sup> Now, Denktaş was not only the president of the executive but also the president of the legislature. The composition of the assembly also showed who would be calling the shots. Evidently, it was designed to secure a handsome majority for Denktaş loyalists.<sup>300</sup>

Decisively outnumbered, though now a bigger group after the participation of the representatives of certain professional organizations, the opposition's strategy was to do their utmost to strengthen the parliament vis-à-vis the president as much as possible in the new constitution.<sup>301</sup> They had serious concerns that Denktaş would continue acting like a dictator should he be allowed to continue with a presidential system.<sup>302</sup> Similar to the case of the post World War II Italy, where the constituent assembly "established a parliamentary form of government that jealously guarded against the possibility of a powerful executive branch" (Gilbert and Nilsson 2007: 17), the opposition pushed for a parliamentary system.

---

<sup>298</sup> The "corporatist" approach espoused in the formation of the constituent assembly reminds the Turkish experience in the drafting of the 1961 constitution (Mümtaz Soysal: "Kuruluşun Başlangıcı [The beginning of establishment]." *Milliyet*, 22.3.1975).

<sup>299</sup> Otonom Kıbrıs Türk Yönetimi Yürütme Kurulu ve Meclisinin Olağanüstü Müşterek Birleşim Zabıtları [Minutes of the extraordinary joint session of the Executive Council and Parliament of the Autonomous Turkish Cypriot Administration], 18.2.1975, p. 5.

<sup>300</sup> Denktaş, who was a member himself, had a personal quota of 4. There was a quota for the Executive Council, which was the handpicked cabinet of Denktaş. Another Denktaş appointee, the head of Evkaf was also a member. Farmers Union, and Türksen, which were known to be very close to Denktaş had 5 among themselves. Artisans, for instance, were not represented at all. The displaced people, who constituted a big chunk of the population, were also excluded.

<sup>301</sup> Veziroğlu interviewed by author. See also, for instance, Akay Cemal: "Kıbrıs Anayasası Taslağı Anti Demokratik Olarak Niteleniyor [The draft constitution in Cyprus found anti-democratic]." *Milliyet*, 6.4.1975.

<sup>302</sup> At the apex of his popularity at that time, Denktaş, in the words of a member of his wider entourage, "was like a mythological figure" (Erdal Andız interviewed by author).

Denktaş's protégés, on the other hand, were in favour of a presidential system. In their view, the state of the national cause made such a system imperative. Denktaş was attributed almost a God-like status; the one and only person, who would never stray from the course, while all others could go off the track:

The prime minister and his ministers may stray from the path of our national cause, and as they rely on the majority in the parliament, the majority in the parliament may stray too. Let's give the head of state power to bring them back into line should they do so.<sup>303</sup>

The model they had in mind was similar to that of the French Fifth Republic, where a "belief in the need for charismatic leaders who are capable of being 'above politics' and expressing the will of the nation," had given rise to "a highly personalistic system of presidential rule" (Webb and White 2007: 352). This would mean to a large extent, continuation of the de facto situation adopted after 1968. Although he had started as the deputy president of the executive council -in effect, the prime minister- under Dr Küçük's presidency, it was known that Denktaş was the one pulling the strings behind the scenes both in domestic politics and in the inter-communal negotiations. When he became the president himself in 1973, he continued to control the executive council by abolishing the post of deputy president (Şemsi (n.d.): 313; see also Egemen 2006: 150-1).<sup>304</sup>

When the committee, which was tasked to draw up the constitution<sup>305</sup>, submitted its draft on 4 April 1975<sup>306</sup>, it was seen that to the disappointment of the opposition, the draft envisaged a semi-presidential system, where the executive power was vested in the president. The draft was disappointing for the opposition because an earlier report prepared by the legislative assembly to be submitted to Ecevit upon his request concluded, "[i]n the light of the experiences acquired during the implementation of the presidential

---

<sup>303</sup> This was the justification given by the members of the constitution committee who were close to Denktaş for their insistence on a presidential system (Cited in İsmail Bozkurt's parliamentary speech, KTFD Kurucu Meclis Zabıtları [Minutes of the TFSC Constituent Assembly], 10.4.1975, p. 117).

<sup>304</sup> Later, in October 1974, Denktaş restored the post, and appointed Osman Örek as his deputy ("Osman Örek Denktaş'ın Yardımcılığına Atandı [Örek appointed as Denktaş's deputy]." *Bozkurt*, 6.10.1974).

<sup>305</sup> The committee was comprised of 7 people: Two experts from Turkey, Professor Suat Bilge and Professor Şeref Gözübüyük; the President of the High Court (as a consultant), Necati Munir and, four members of the constituent assembly, Mustafa Çağatay, Nejat Konuk, Zaim Necati, Mehmet Zeka (Zeka Bey) ("KTFD Kurucu Meclisi Anayasa Komitesinin, KTFD Anayasası Taslağı'na İlişkin Raporu [The report of the constitution committee on the draft TFSC constitution]." KTFD Kurucu Meclis Zabıtları [Minutes of the TFSC Constituent Assembly], 3.4.1975, p. 4).

<sup>306</sup> To the dismay of many members of the assembly, before it was submitted to the members of the Constituent Assembly, the draft was published by *Zaman*, the pro-Denktaş newspaper of Raif Denktaş.

system, we believe the parliamentary regime suits the community better”.<sup>307</sup> Given that, when released, no wonder, the draft, and particularly the part on the executive, stirred a big controversy. The opposition sent a delegation to Ankara to seek Ecevit’s and Turkish public opinion’s support to change the draft.<sup>308</sup> Although initially Denктаş reacted by dismissing the opposition by saying, “the air created by the opponents of the constitution is not conducive to our common national cause,”<sup>309</sup> at the end of a process, which turned out to be an exercise in brinkmanship<sup>310</sup>, he accepted to make amendments which would limit the powers of the president. Other major concessions he made, which turned out to be crucial with the passage of time, were accepting the Article 79(1) of the constitution, which limits the presidency to two consecutive terms, and the article 81, which stipulates “[t]he same person cannot be both the President and the Chairman of a party”.

Why did Denктаş eventually bow to the demands of the opposition on the form of government although he had the majority required to push for anything he wanted? To answer this question, one needs to take different calculations over domestic and international politics into consideration. First, according to Vedat Çelik, one of Denктаş’s closest aides at the time, he did not want to be involved in an open conflict with Ankara, which seemed to favour a parliamentary system.<sup>311</sup> Second, he could not afford a show of disunity. He was keen on sitting on the table with a broad public support behind him. If the opposition had walked out and campaigned against the constitution, this would have been taken as a manifestation of a chasm within the Turkish Cypriot community, and would have further undermined his external legitimacy in the eve of the new round of inter-communal

---

<sup>307</sup> Cited in the parliamentary speech of Özker Yaşın, Kıbrıs Türk Federe Devleti Kurucu Meclis Zabıtları [Minutes of the TFSC Constituent Assembly], 9.4.1975, p. 42; see also the speeches of Fuat Veziroğlu (*ibid.*: 7) and Ümit Süleyman (*ibid.*: 25-6). It is important to note that the report was prepared by a non-partisan committee.

<sup>308</sup> Although Ecevit was no longer the prime minister, his prestige in Cyprus as the liberator was unshakeable.

<sup>309</sup> Cited in Akay Cemal: “Kıbrıs Anayasası Taslağı Anti Demokratik Olarak Niteleniyor [The draft constitution in Cyprus found anti-democratic]”. *Milliyet*, 6.4.1975.

<sup>310</sup> Denктаş backed down, when the Freedom Group (Fuat Veziroğlu, Burhan Nalbantoğlu, İsmail Bozkurt, Mehmet Küçük and Özker Yaşın) stood up to walk out of the parliament (KTFD Kurucu Meclis Zabıtları [Minutes of the TFSC Constituent Assembly], 10.4.1975, p. 124-5); “this article is totally anti-democratic. ... We cannot assume the responsibility of the adoption of this clause. We cannot even assume the responsibility of having voted against it. We are walking out of this assembly,” said Veziroğlu.

<sup>311</sup> Interviewed by author. Veziroğlu also said, “Denктаş is not kind of person who swims against the tide.” When he realized that Ankara was against a presidential system, he took a more conciliatory stance (Interviewed by author).

negotiations.<sup>312</sup> Third, the constitution gave him what he wanted anyway; a prime minister, which would act as a lightning rod for the public fury over domestic problems. It is important to note that, unlike his protégés, he did not want to have a presidential system. “It was we, Nejat Konuk and I, who pushed for a presidential system,” recounts İsmet Kotak; “Denktaş did not want it, ‘I don’t have time to deal with trivial issues like determining egg prices,’ he used to say”.<sup>313</sup> In a similar vein, “I personally visited and told him ‘please sir, the issue of powers of the president is very important, do not make any concessions,’” Nejat Konuk says in an interview (cited in Besim 2011: 100).

Obviously, at least to a certain extent, Denktaş wanted to distance himself from the daily, petty squabbles of domestic politics.<sup>314</sup> Being at the apex of his power, this would not mean giving away too much power anyway. After all, he would enjoy the legitimacy of being directly elected by the people, the right to appoint the prime minister, and under certain circumstances, to dissolve the parliament. Having a similar, “unique historical legitimacy,” and being elected by popular vote, something de Gaulle himself lacked when he had been elected for the first time in 1958, it would not be difficult for Denktaş to establish a presidential primacy like de Gaulle did (For the French case see Knapp and Wright 2006: 55). As long as Denktaş continued to hold the reins of the party, in effect, the system would work quite similar to the operation of the Fifth Republic, where “presidents like to get their prime ministers to take the blame when things go wrong”.<sup>315</sup> As it will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four, this would prove to be the case in north Cyprus too, and in his first term in office as the president of the TFSC, he would work with three different prime ministers.

The effect of this shift on the political arena would be felt only gradually. The whole system was designed in anticipation of *cohabitation*; a possible power struggle between Denktaş and a prime minister from the opposing camp. The opposition tried to reduce the

---

<sup>312</sup> “Anayasanın Halk Oyuna Sunulmasının Viyana Toplantısından Önce Bitmesi Bekleniyor [The constitution expected to be put to a referendum before the Vienna meeting].” *Zaman*, 12.4.1975. See also the parliamentary speech of Fuat Veziroğlu (Kıbrıs Türk Federe Devleti Kurucu Meclis Zabıtları [Minutes of the TFSC Constituent Assembly], 9.4.1975, p. 7-8).

<sup>313</sup> Interviewed by author.

<sup>314</sup> Furthermore, Denktaş said, he never regretted this decision as this system helped him to gain time during the inter-communal negotiations. “I have to consult with the government and parliament, I used to say, when they put pressure on me” (interviewed by author).

<sup>315</sup> “The nobody who became somebody: The secret of an unknown prime minister’s survival.” *The Economist*, 18.11.2010.

president's power, while his loyalists tried to fortify it. However, eventually, the challenge to the power of Denktaş would not come from a prime minister from the opposition but from his own party. With the ascendance of Eroğlu first as the party chairman and then as the premier, a situation arose where a president and the prime minister from the same camp found themselves on a collision course; not a typical but a possible consequence of semi-presidential systems.<sup>316</sup> The causes and effects of this power struggle, which is of great significance in the multi party political life, will be discussed in detail in Chapters Five and Six.

In this context, it is also important to note that, in the new system, the cabinet became accountable to the parliament and prime minister who appoints them rather than the president. Furthermore, unlike in the French system, where “parliamentarians’ appetites for governmental office” was limited by making ministerial posts “incompatible with office as Deputy or Senator,” (Knapp and Wright 2006: 54), the TFSC constitution allowed the ministers to be selected from amongst the deputies. This would have two consequences. The first has something to do with the cases where a power struggle between the president and prime minister erupt. It makes the ministers more likely to switch their allegiance to the prime minister, who appoints and sacks them. The second is directly related to political clientelism as it makes the ministers more receptive to particularistic demands from the voters because as members of the parliament they have to seek re-election.

As for the electoral system, we see that after having to make a big concession in the government system by settling for a relatively weak president, the UBP group tried to make up for the initial loss by formulating an electoral law, which would help to form strong, single-party governments. Despite the protests of the opposition as well as independents, they pushed through an electoral system, which would eventually give them 75 percent of the seats with only 53 percent of the votes.<sup>317</sup> The majoritarian character of the system stemmed from the “seat bonus,” which gave the party extra seats for each candidate receiving more than 50 percent of the votes. Another important element of the electoral

---

<sup>316</sup> As Knapp and Wright put it “A president and prime minister from the same camp may be extremely close, like Chirac and Alain Juppé, or endure execrable personal and political relations, as Mitterrand did with Michel Rocard” (2006: 59).

<sup>317</sup> It is interesting to note that the DC passed a similar electoral law in the mid-1950s, but suffered when it backfired (Chubb 1982: 62).

law was its provision, which made voting for individual candidates possible. It envisaged a multimember system with an open party list, which allowed the voter to use personal preference votes across party lists.<sup>318</sup>

Both of these elements of the electoral law turned out to play an important role in the institutionalization of political clientelism. The seat bonus turned the first multi-party election into an all-out-war.<sup>319</sup> As it will be illustrated in the next chapter, to secure a clear majority in the first multi-party election, the UBP used the might of the state to its limits. The article on intraparty preference voting, on the other hand, paved the way for personalization of electoral competition and acted as an incentive for politicians to pursue clientelism (see Kitschelt 2000: 861; Müller 2007: 271).<sup>320</sup> According to Müller, this system is the one in which the incentive for a politician to pursue a clientelist strategy is the greatest (2007: 271). Furthermore, this has an adverse effect on the party unity. As Katz put it “[w]hether or not cohesion is the ‘natural’ state of a political party, effective intraparty preference voting creates a powerful incentive to disunity” (2003: 101). These effects are elaborated in detail in Chapter Four.

Finally, another important element of the 1975 constitution, was the Article 93(6) on “provisions in connection with the public officers,” which stipulates: “Public officers carrying out the duties of an administrator at high level shall be appointed by decree carrying the signatures of the Minister concerned, the Prime Minister and the Head of State”. This provision would pave the way for the complete politicization of the high level bureaucracy. In this way, the high level bureaucrats would lose their autonomy and become subject to the will of the ruling party. This would also break the link between merit and promotion and trigger the deterioration in the quality of public services.

---

<sup>318</sup> Ranking made by the party becomes relevant only when the voter votes for a single party without indicating any preference for individual candidates.

<sup>319</sup> This was a brainchild of Nejat Konuk (Kotak interviewed by author). Though it was implemented in the first two elections, its effect was felt only in the first one, as in the second election in 1981, no candidate managed to pass the 50 percent threshold.

<sup>320</sup> Italy was a perfect case in point until the electoral system was changed in 1992. The research on the geographical distribution of preference votes showed that the use of preference vote is relatively higher in the “clientelistic” south than “civic” north (Putnam 1993: 94). This does not necessarily mean that the electoral system alone determines the level of clientelism. Countries like Austria and Venezuela, for instance, which are considered as countries where political clientelism is widespread, have closed-list multimember district system (Kitschelt 2000: 859).

## Chapter 4: UBP: The Anatomy of a Machine

The previous chapter explored the interplay between demand and supply for political clientelism, which shaped the UBP founders' choice over the initial mobilization strategy during the formative years of the new political entity. This chapter will elaborate on the anatomy of the party, which have emerged when this decision was put into practice. The chapter will start with a brief analysis of the wider political context and dividing lines between political forces, which for the first time came to be represented by political parties. Then, it will be shown that curiously for an internally mobilized party, the UBP founders adopted a bottom-up organization model, and attached great importance to the building up of an organization based on mass membership. The details of this process will be studied in Sections Two and Three, where the program, constitution and social composition of the party, as well as the nature of the party organization will be elaborated in detail. In Section Four, I will look into the role of clientelism, first, in the recruitment and then, in the election process, which will be discussed both at inter- and intra-party level.

Overall, in this chapter, I aim to show that although its founders presented it as a mass party, the UBP has always been a clientelistic catch-all party, which relied on a clientele rather than active participation of members bound together by ideology and programme. In doing so, I will also lay the foundations necessary to explain the intensity of intra-party power struggle, which will be discussed in the following two chapters.

### 4.1 Dividing Lines Between Parties and Denктаş's Catch 22

As discussed in the previous chapters, Denктаş was not particularly keen on multi-party politics<sup>321</sup>, and he did everything to fend off a real electoral competition in the pre-1974 period. Needless to say, he achieved this by securing the backing of the Turkish authorities, who shared his conviction that electoral competition could be detrimental to the unity of the community. After 1974, however, conditions were less conducive to outright

---

<sup>321</sup> In their study on the political parties in new democracies, Webb and White refer to cases where parties are considered pathological elements of political system as they are "regarded as embodiments of partial group interests, and sources of national disunity" (2007: 352). Tellingly, few years later, in the wake of the coup d'état in Turkey, Denктаş likened the multi-party politics (*particilik*) to a disease in a statement published in Turkish daily *Günaydın* (cited in Kurtuluş, 12.12.1980).

repression of the opposition.<sup>322</sup> Ankara, especially when the Ecevit-led governments were in power, was willing to give the image to the world that Turkey was in Cyprus to liberate the Turkish Cypriots and to institutionalize democracy.<sup>323</sup>

The first attempt of the opposition deputies, who called themselves the Freedom Group, to set up a party had been interrupted earlier when Denktaş suddenly decided to proclaim the federated state. Once the political parties law passed in May 1975 at the constituent assembly and the constitution was ratified in the referendum the following month, the stage was finally set for the establishment of parties. All four parties, namely the CTP, Populist Party (*Halkçı Parti*, HP), UBP and Communal Liberation Party (*Toplumcu Kurtuluş Partisi*, TKP), which emerged in this period managed to gain representation in the first parliament. However, only three of them maintained their public support, and became constant players in the Turkish Cypriot body politic: the UBP, TKP and CTP. Before turning the attention to the UBP, in the rest of this section, the origins of other parties will be briefly discussed.

As mentioned before, the CTP was established in December 1970 and Berberoğlu, its chairman stood against Denktaş in 1973 as a presidential candidate. However, in the absence of a law regulating the parties at the time, it had been registered as an association and officially it became a political party only in 1975. In the meantime, it went through a transformation and became very different from what the founders had envisaged at the outset, when more radical elements joined and eventually captured the party (see Kızılyürek 2005: 253). These were the university graduates who espoused leftist values during their studies in Turkey in the 1960s and 1970s, a period when ideological polarization between the left and right, and student activism reached its apex in this country. The CTP came to have two members in the constituent assembly when Özker

---

<sup>322</sup> In a similar vein, the conservative parties of Italy, Germany, and Japan in the late 1940s, had to compete with the working class parties in elections rather than simply repressing them because the US would not have tolerated such an action (Shefter 1994: 10).

<sup>323</sup> Mümtaz Soysal, for instance, urged the government to show the international community that they did not “export despotism/tyranny” to Cyprus (*Milliyet*, 16.4.1975). See also “Anavatan Basını Ne Diyor [What does the motherland’s press say]?” *Halkın Sesi*, 1.6.1976 (Originally published in *Cumhuriyet* (Istanbul) and “Ecevit: ‘Kıbrıs Sorununu Askıda Bırakmak, Çözümü Gitgide Zorlaştıracaktır [Ecevit: Delaying the solution of the Cyprus problem will make it more intractable].’ *Milliyet*, 21.7.1975. According to Kotak, Müezzinoğlu was constantly pressuring the administration into holding multi-party elections as soon as possible (interviewed by author).

Özgür, the representative of the High School Teachers' Union, joined its ranks.<sup>324</sup> In few years time, the party would complete its transformation by replacing its founding chairman Berberoğlu with Özgür, and positioning itself on the far left of the political spectrum. The party adopted a Marxist-Leninist, anti-West and anti-NATO position.<sup>325</sup>

The second party came into being when an initial attempt to unite under the banner of the CTP failed, and six members of the parliamentary opposition<sup>326</sup> joined their forces to establish the HP.<sup>327</sup> Soon, four other deputies joined them.<sup>328</sup> According to the party's secretary general, their grassroots membership reached 3,372 when its first conference was held in October 1975.<sup>329</sup> This promising start notwithstanding, the party would fail to maintain its integrity. In fact, the party was stillborn as it was split into two factions right from the beginning.<sup>330</sup> The first faction comprised of the parliamentary party, whose backbone was the Freedom Group, as well as the representatives of civil society organizations, who came to be known as the Group of Six.<sup>331</sup> These two groups came to realize that they had many things in common during the constituent assembly and decided to set up a party. The second faction was made up of the members close to the party chairman, Alper Orhon, the former minister of planning. The first group had decided to invite Orhon to the party and nominate him as their chairman (a) to avoid any competition among themselves for the leadership, which could divide the party, and (b) to capitalize on Orhon's popularity.<sup>332</sup> Since his appointment as the minister of planning by Denктаş, Orhon had been portrayed as an alternative/successor to Denктаş.<sup>333</sup> He was also perceived as

---

<sup>324</sup> The party was represented at the constituent assembly by its secretary general, Naci Talat.

<sup>325</sup> See for instance the party's 1976 election manifesto ("Cumhuriyetçi Türk Partisi Seçim Bildirgesi [The CTP's Election Manifesto]." *Yenidüzen*, 29.5.1976).

<sup>326</sup> In addition to the seasoned members of the parliament, like Nalbantoğlu, Bozkurt, Veziroğlu, Mehmet Küçük and Özker Yaşın, a freshman Durduran (Representative of Architects and Engineers), was among the founding members.

<sup>327</sup> "Siyasi Parti Kuruldu [A political party established]." *Zaman*, 5.8.1975; "Alper Orhon 'Berberoğlu'nun CTP'siyle Yoldaşlığımız var' dedi ['We have comradeship with Berberoğlu's CTP,' Orhon said]." *Zaman*, 6.8.1975.

<sup>328</sup> Fatma Sezer (Representative of Pharmacists), Turgut Mustafa (Representative of the Primary School Teachers), Mustafa Akıncı (Representative of the University Graduates), and Ziya Rızıkı (Limassol).

<sup>329</sup> İsmail Bozkurt cited in "Birçok Delege HP Kurultayına Katılmadı [Many delegates did not attend the HP congress]." *Zaman*, 13.10.1975.

<sup>330</sup> Ekrem Ural, the representative of the civil servants in the constituent assembly (and a member of the Group of Six), did not join the party exactly because of this reason (Interviewed by author).

<sup>331</sup> Özker Özgür, who was also a part of the Group of Six, did not join the party.

<sup>332</sup> Durduran interviewed by author.

<sup>333</sup> Ural interviewed by author; "I and Raif [Denктаş] used to present Alper as the next leader after Denктаş (Erdal Andız interviewed by author).

someone close to Ecevit, who was a hero among the Turkish Cypriots at the time. Ecevit's prestige was so high that even the party's name was chosen to imply a connection with his *Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*.<sup>334</sup>

Things did not work out as expected, however. Soon, a rift appeared between the two factions, and this led to the hasty establishment of a third party on the left by the parliamentary party, only few weeks before the elections when a second attempt to join the CTP had collapsed: the TKP.<sup>335</sup> What made the TKP a strong contender for power was the profile of its deputies: The party managed to bring together members with the TMT background, whose popularity had been proven by an earlier electoral success like Nalbantoğlu and Bozkurt, with the young and dynamic civil society representatives. Of particular importance was the involvement of the Primary School Teachers Union (*Kıbrıs Türk Öğretmenler Sendikası, KTÖS*) – probably the most cohesive and best organized of all. The party also secured the former community leader, Dr Küçük's endorsement, who was at the time publishing one of the three dailies, *Halkın Sesi*. Like the HP, the TKP identified itself as “democratic left”.

Crucially, besides their disapproval of the handling of the domestic affairs, common denominator of these three parties was their opposition to Denktaş's *taksim* policy. When Denktaş asked the constituent assembly to grant him authorization to declare independence whenever he deems necessary/appropriate, the opposition did not hesitate to boycott the vote<sup>336</sup>, and in doing so showed that they would never give Denktaş a free hand to pursue a line, which would lead to a unilateral declaration of independence. Later, they confirmed this position in their election manifestos too. According to the CTP, *taksim* was in conflict with the interests of both Turkey and Turkish Cypriots. The party was in favour of a geographical federation that would grant full autonomy to the component units in their domestic affairs.<sup>337</sup> In a similar vein, the TKP was in favour of a bi-zonal

---

<sup>334</sup> In his speech in the first party conference, Özker Yaşın, one of the founders said “the programme of our party is inspired by the programme of CHP, and our party is on the CHP's path” (“Alper Orhon Başkan Seçildi [Orhon elected as chairman].” *Halkın Sesi*, 1.9.1975).

<sup>335</sup> İsmail Bozkurt interviewed by author.

<sup>336</sup> “Bağımsızlık Konusunda Dün Bütün Gün ve Gece Geç Vakte Kadar Süren Görüşmelerden Sonra: Muhalefet Meclisi Terketti [After deliberations over independence, which lasted whole day and until the late hours of the night: The opposition walked out of the parliament].” *Halkın Sesi*, 23.9.1975.

<sup>337</sup> See the foreign policy section in their 1976 election manifesto (*Yenidüzen*).

geographical federation.<sup>338</sup> It should be noted again that the opposition was following the official line adopted by the Turkish government and mainstream political parties like CHP and AP, and it was Denктаş who opposed the Ankara's official position.

This programmatic distance or polarization on the Cyprus issue was indeed what drove Denктаş to setting up his own party, and pursuing a vigorously negative campaign against the opposition. As the Turkish Cypriot on top of the civilian administration, who had also organized the resistance and delivered redemption, he commanded natural deference of all segments of the society. Furthermore, he was in control of all influential organizations. The support of former TMT commanders and veteran organizations; Türk-Sen, the biggest trade union; Farmers Union, as well as the KTTO were all secured. Furthermore, his appointees held all the key posts. This is to say, Denктаş could have got himself elected without a party, and remain above politics<sup>339</sup>, if he was interested in being the president for the sake of status. This would have distanced him from the challenges of daily politics and helped him to protect his popularity.

If he was to achieve his mission, *taksim*, however, he had to wield power. The presidency was symbolic as the president's power was largely crippled by the constitution. In other words, he could not afford loosening his grip in domestic affairs in order not to risk his position as the community leader and negotiator. He had to control the majority in the parliament because he was conducting the negotiations on its behalf. Therefore, to avoid a probable change of course in the direction of *taksim*, he had to control the parliament, and hence the establishment of a party loyal to him was an absolute necessity.

Why was this so? David Hannay has the best answer. In the excerpt cited below, he provides an analysis of Denктаş's perspective on the solution of the Cyprus problem, and strategic thinking behind his manoeuvres throughout his long political life including his dealings with Turkish governments:

It often seemed to me that Denктаş's own preferred solution was that north Cyprus should become part of Turkey. *He clearly did not trust his successors, whoever they*

---

<sup>338</sup> See their 1976 election manifesto ("TKP Seçim Bildirgesinin Özetini Basına Dağıttı [The TKP distributed the summary of its election manifesto to the press]." *Bozkurt*, 18.6.1976).

<sup>339</sup> According to Shefter this is one of the conditions necessary for incumbent political leaders to remain in power without building a broad based party (1994: 9).

*might be, to hold to the firm line he had established, and he certainly did not trust Turkish governments, either present or future, to do so either. So the only way to lock the door and throw away the key was through annexation.* Unfortunately for him this was the one solution that no Turkish government with a concern for its international standing and aspirations to join the European Union could contemplate. So he was forced to make do with what he regarded as second best, although that did not stop him hankering after his ideal solution or trying to edge his way towards it (2005: 18-9, emphasis added).

This analysis explains not only one of the reasons behind the failure of inter-communal negotiations but also sheds light on the development of Turkish Cypriot domestic politics by showing the motives guiding the UBP's establishment and political evolution. Denktaş's vision entailed a simple division of labour between the UBP and himself: The party would provide him unwavering support in his handling of the negotiations, while he would shield it against the opposition in domestic politics. As the party was meant to be more than anything else, an instrument to support Denktaş, its strength should be carefully calibrated. A strong party would mean a potential contender for his power, and hence not desirable. The party and its leader should be strong enough to fend off opposition but not too strong to challenge Denktaş. This search for a delicate balance, as it would soon be found out, was a perfect recipe for a party robust enough to win elections but at the same time so internally divided that could not do anything beyond muddling through when it comes to governing; hence spectacularly failing in delivering public goods, particularly economic development.

#### **4.2 A Brief Overview of the UBP's Establishment Process, Program, and Social Composition**

After some foot-dragging Denktaş eventually announced the setting up of his party, the UBP, on 12 August 1975.<sup>340</sup> The party officially came into being on 11 October 1975, when it was registered at the ministry of interior. Chronologically, it may appear to be the third party established, however it should be noted that it had the longest roots of all because given the personalities involved in, and common aims defined i.e. *taksim*, in effect it was the reincarnation or natural successor of the Cyprus is Turkish Party, which was established in the mid-1950s and became defunct after the first elections of the Republic. This is to say, the UBP is an "internally mobilized party," to use Shefter's terminology; a type of party

---

<sup>340</sup> "Halkımızın Siyasal Örgütlenmesi Gerçekleşiyor: Ulusal Birlik Partisi [The political organization of our people is materializing: the National Unity Party]." *Zaman*, 12.8.1975.

“founded by politicians who do occupy leadership positions in the prevailing regime ... [who] seek to secure their hold over the government in the face of a challenge by an externally mobilized party” (1994: 5).

It would not be wrong to say that the party was established only half-heartedly. Its leaders’ initial resistance to the idea of multi-party politics was so fierce that, during the early stages of the party’s establishment, the leadership felt the need to express their reluctance to do so in every occasion.<sup>341</sup> In their view, multi-party politics was not something desirable, yet they were forced to follow suit when others started setting up political parties. This can be clearly sensed in the following statement made by the founding committee: “we set up the party to shoulder the cause (*dava*) in accordance with the national interests after seeing those eager to divide the community by splitting into political parties”.<sup>342</sup> As tacitly acknowledged in this statement, the party was established around what Katz and Mair call “single national interest that cut across sectional boundaries” (1995: 12), the single national interest in this case being the national cause (*milli dava*) as it had been formulated in the 1950s.

My aim in this section is to show that the UBP as an internally mobilized party capitalized on this position in its recruitment and mobilization process, and that it was essentially held together not by program or ideology but rather with clientelistic linkages by illustrating the incohesiveness of its program, and fundamental conflicts of interest in its cadres, who for the most part made strange bedfellows given their social backgrounds. To do that I will analyze the nature of the UBP by referring to the public speeches made by its founders, press statements it issued, its constitution and program, as well as its social composition.

The party’s position was that the national struggle was not over, and would continue “until integration with Turkey” was achieved.<sup>343</sup> The first article of the party program, entitled “Commitment to the Motherland” concludes: “The Turkish community’s elimination of the current national threats; claiming of its integrity and enjoying of all its rights;

---

<sup>341</sup> See for instance Denктаş’s speech cited in “Rauf Denктаş: UBP Güçlüdür Çünkü Gücünü Halktan Alır [Rauf Denктаş: The UBP is powerful because it derives its power from the people].” *Zaman*, 10.6.1976).

<sup>342</sup> “Ulusal Birlik Partisi Kuruluş Çalışmaları Devam Ediyor [The UBP’s organization process underway].” 15.8.1975.

<sup>343</sup> “Ulusal Birlik Partisi Mesaj Yayınladı: Ulusal Kavga Türkiye’yle Bütünleşinceye dek Sürecek [The UBP issued a message: national fight will last until the integration with Turkey].” *Bozkurt*, 31.8.1975.

successful development in the political, national security, social and economic fields, depend solely on its development as an inseparable and indivisible part of the Turkish nation".<sup>344</sup> As this required the maintaining of the "national unity" -hence the party's name- and therefore the collaboration of different segments of the society, the party was to embrace people from all walks of life.

When we look at the backgrounds of the founders, we see that this was exactly the impression Denктаş wanted to give in his selection of the 51 names among thousands of founding members to sign the founding document to be submitted to the ministry of interior: According to *Zaman*, which published the founders' names along with their occupations, there were eight lawyers, eight tradesmen, seven medical doctors/dentists, five farmers, four trade unionists, three teachers, three engineers, one artisan, one mechanic, and one housewife, among founders.<sup>345</sup>

In line with its social composition, another striking feature of the party was its pragmatic, non-ideological character, which was also manifested by the founders' overt hostility to ideologies in their speeches. In one of the first statements made during the early phases of the establishment process "rigid ideologies" were declared "useless and unrealistic in Cyprus".<sup>346</sup> Elsewhere, Denктаş likened "foreign ideologies" to poison.<sup>347</sup> In a similar vein, in a speech in the same period Denктаş said "ideological approaches" were dangerous as they could lead to defeat in the national cause; avoiding this would be one of the aims of the party. "In the principles of Atatürk, there is social justice and equality; everything required for social progress," Denктаş continued; and concluded that "we do not need to be inspired by foreign ideologies whose roots are abroad".<sup>348</sup> Accordingly, the party program emphasized Atatürkism -whose tenets could be seen as "policy goals rather than ideology" (McLaren 2008:7)-, which make room for interpretation in various ways, providing a middle ground.

---

<sup>344</sup> The UBP's Program (Published in *Zaman*, 14-21 October 1975).

<sup>345</sup> "Denктаş: UBP Halkın Partisidir [Denктаş: The UBP is the party of people]." *Zaman*, 12.10.1975.

<sup>346</sup> "Halkımızın Siyasal Örgütlenmesi Gerçekleşiyor: Ulusal Birlik Partisi [The political organization of our people is materializing: the National Unity Party]." *Zaman*, 12.8.1975.

<sup>347</sup> "Rauf Raif Denктаş Ulusal Birlik Partisi Genel Başkanı Oldu [Denктаş elected as the president of the UBP]." *Zaman*, 26.4.1976.

<sup>348</sup> "Denктаş: 'Daha Büyük Hedeflere Doğru Gönül Gönüle Yürüyeceğiz' [Denктаş: we will walk hand in hand towards bigger targets]." *Zaman*, 5.10.1975.

Before elaborating on the program in detail, the groupings within the party should be briefly discussed. Regardless of the anti-ideological discourse, the existence of different ideological tendencies within the party was obvious. Similar to the DC of Italy<sup>349</sup>, the UBP was a big club: While one wing of the party was espousing the social democratic values of Ecevit's CHP, the other was flirting with Türkeş's ultra-nationalist Nationalist Action Party (*Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi*, MHP)<sup>350</sup>, and yet another group was trying to promote laissez faire policies. Although it is difficult to make a clear categorization, the first group can be roughly labelled as the old guard, and the latter two as the new guard. One of the most important points that should be taken into consideration here is the fact that Denktaş did not actively take part in the writing of the program but rather delegated it to a committee presided over by Nejat Konuk.<sup>351</sup> Konuk was a social democrat, who had been an active CHP member in the 1950s when he was practicing law in Bursa (Turkey) (cited in Besim 2011: 92). So were İsmet Kotak, Çağlar Yasal, and Özel Tahsin, the other three members of the committee.<sup>352</sup> Therefore, in the drawing up of the program, it was the old guard members who were inspired by CHP, who had the upper hand.<sup>353</sup>

It does not take an exhaustive analysis of the program to confirm the influence of CHP on it. A quick overview, however, also shows that certain modifications were made in order to accommodate the new guard. The program adopted the four of the so-called six arrows of the CHP, namely nationalism, laicism, populism, revolutionism/reformism.<sup>354</sup> The fifth and sixth arrows, republicanism and statism were dropped, however. The former would not make any sense at all in the Turkish Cypriot context anyway, as this was adopted in Turkey after the abolition of sultanate. The latter, on the other hand, was obviously crossed out as a concession to the new guard. Nevertheless, the program was essentially social democratic with repeated emphasis on social justice, fair income distribution, social security, promotion of cooperatives and people's entrepreneurship.

---

<sup>349</sup> See for instance Tarrow, who talks about the "coexistence of its left-wing trade unionists with conservative local notables" to point out the non-ideological character of the DC (1967: 341).

<sup>350</sup> Mehmet Ali Birand: "Kıbrıs'ta Madalyonun İki Yüzü [Two sides of the medallion in Cyprus] (5)." *Milliyet*, 27.6.1976).

<sup>351</sup> See for instance "Toplumumuzda Siyasal Örgütlenme Hızlanıyor: Denktaş'ın Kadro Yenilemesi UBP İçinde Gerçekleşecek [Political organization within our community is gaining momentum: Denktaş will renew his team within the UBP]." *Bozkurt*, 26.8.1975.

<sup>352</sup> İsmet Kotak interviewed by author. See also Özel Tahsin's resignation statement (*Olay*, 17.7.1978, p.6).

<sup>353</sup> Later, both Konuk and Kotak confirmed that the program of the CHP inspired them, when they were preparing the UBP's (Kotak interviewed by author; Konuk cited in Besim 2011: 113).

<sup>354</sup> The UBP's Program (Published in *Zaman*, 14-21 October 1975).

Still, all these do not necessarily make the party social democratic or an ideological party in disguise. When we look at the profile of the party's organizers, we see that its left-leaning program did not drive away the newly thriving business community. To the contrary, scratching the surface and looking into the cadres of the party and KTTO reveal the overlap between the two. Of the 18-strong executive assembly of the KTTO elected in January 1976, twelve were (already or would be) also directly involved in the UBP: Three of them as the members of the UBP's party assembly (Ergün Şevket, Mehmet Can and Enver Emin); six as delegates at the local UBP congresses (Önder Atai, Mustafa Yıldırım, İsmail Sadıkoğlu, Adem Kader, Ali Babaliki, Rehavi Piskobulu); two as founding members (Memduh Erdal and Ömer Kale); and one as a candidate in the primary election for the parliamentary elections (Şinasi Başaran).<sup>355</sup> It should be also added that the representative of the KTTO (Ahmet Raşit Mustafa) as well as the representative of the Employers Association (Mustafa Toros) in the constituent assembly, joined the parliamentary group of the UBP.<sup>356</sup> Obviously, if not by its program, by its business-friendly policies, the party managed to lure this important group to its ranks.

The business community's interest in taking part in the UBP's establishment process was hardly surprising. Commerce was the only vibrant sector of the economy in this period. The number of members of the KTTO boomed after July 1974: In the first four-five months to January 1975, 210 new businesses were set up.<sup>357</sup> As the chairman of the chamber stated, their membership more than tripled from "some 300 to over 1000" in the 18 months following the division.<sup>358</sup> The Turkish Cypriot business community, which accounted for only two percent of the imports and exports before 1974<sup>359</sup>, came to control not only the whole Turkish Cypriot market but also gained an indirect access to the vast Turkish market,

---

<sup>355</sup> For the executive assembly of the chamber see "KT Ticaret Odası 16. Genel Kurulu Yapıldı [The Chamber of Commerce's 16th general meeting held]." *Zaman*, 19.1.1976; for the party assembly of the UBP see "UBP Parti Meclisine Seçilenler [The list of those who got elected to the UBP party assembly]." *Zaman*, 26.4.1976; for the delegates of the UBP see "UBP Girne Mahalli Kongresi Yapıldı [The UBP Kyrenia local congress held]." *Zaman*, 8.3.1976, "Mağusa Kurultay Delegeleri [The congress delegates of Famagusta]." *Zaman*, and "Lefkoşa UBP Yerel Kuruluş Kongresi Muhteşem Oldu [The UBP Nicosia local congress was magnificent]." *Zaman*, 8.4.1976; for the candidates in the primary election see "UBP'nin Lefkoşa Aday Adayları Belli oldu [The UBP's candidates for Nicosia primary election disclosed]." *Zaman*, 2.5.1976.

<sup>356</sup> See "K.M. Temsilcileri Seçimine Başlandı [Elections for the C.A. representatives have started]." *Zaman*, 21.2.1975, and "UBP Meclis Grubu Listesi Dün Meclis Başkanlığına Verildi [The list of the UBP parliamentary group submitted to the presidency of the parliament]." *Zaman*, 29.10.1975.

<sup>357</sup> "Ticaret Odası'na 20 Temmuz'dan Sonra 210 Üye Kaydoldu [After July 20th, 210 new members have joined the chamber of commerce]." *Zaman*, 29.1.1975.

<sup>358</sup> Mehmet Can interviewed by the reporter of TAK cited in *Zaman*, 20.1.1976.

<sup>359</sup> Ziya Müezzinoğlu interviewed by Abdi İpekçi, *Milliyet*, 14.10.1974.

which was otherwise strictly protected against foreign luxury goods, via luggage tourism and a smuggling network between the southern Cyprus, northern Cyprus and Turkey.<sup>360</sup> Their economic power did not initially translate into political influence, however, especially when Müezzinoğlu was in charge. They felt to be left out in the cold when the economic structure of the new political entity was being designed. Earlier, they expressed their resentment with a report submitted to Ecevit, where basically they argued that the extent of statism had gone too far.<sup>361</sup> Now, with the establishment of political parties, they found a channel to gain political influence too. Naturally, the UBP was the only address for them. Not only the other three opposition parties promised more statist policies but also they advocated a federal solution, which was an anathema to this group, as this would jeopardize their newly acquired privileges and market share. Under these circumstances, a symbiotic relationship between the UBP and the KTTO became inevitable. In the decades to come, the chamber would be one of the staunchest advocates of Denktaş's pro-*taksim* policies.

### 4.3 The Party Organization

Looking at their social composition and program is not sufficient to understand political parties. In Duverger's words, "Hume ... made the shrewd observation that the programme plays an essential part in the initial phase, when it serves to bring together scattered individuals, but later on organization comes to the fore, the 'platform' becoming subordinate. Nothing could be truer" (1978: xvi-xvii). Following this line, this section focuses on the UBP's organizational structure. Here, first, I will attempt to show that looking from a broad perspective, by opting for a mass party format, the UBP leadership made a puzzling choice. Then, I will seek to come up with possible explanations for this choice to shed further light on the context in which this decision was made, which in turn help to understand the dynamics of the intra-party struggle to come.

Given the party's characteristics discussed in the preceding section, one would expect the organizers to opt for a model akin to Kirchheimer's catch-all party, whose primary distinguishing characteristics are its "shallow organization, superficial and vague ideology,

---

<sup>360</sup> See, for instance Mümtaz Soysal: "Nea Sintesis [New formula (in Greek)]." *Milliyet*, 2.1.1976.

<sup>361</sup> "Kıbrıs Türk İşadamlarının Sorunları [The problems of Turkish Cypriot businessmen]." Cited in *Halkın Sesi*, 10.01.1975.

and overwhelmingly electoral orientation, as well as ... the prominent leadership and electoral roles of the party's top-ranked national candidates" (see Gunther 2005: 259; see also Katz and Mair 1995; Allum and Allum 2008). Especially, the mass party model should not have been an option, as this model is known to be something for "externally mobilized parties," which are "established by leaders who do not occupy positions of power in the prevailing regime and who seek to bludgeon their way into the political system by mobilizing and organizing a mass constituency" (Shefter 1994: 5). Furthermore, contrary to the UBP's approach, such parties, "explicitly claimed to represent the interests of only one segment of society" (Katz and Mair 1995: 10). Having said that we see that the UBP officially adopted a mass party model. But to what extent did it stick to this model in practice? Before answering this question, first the model has to be properly defined.

Duverger explains the basic characteristics of mass parties by referring to the case of the French Socialist Party:

in its eyes the recruiting of members is a fundamental activity, both from the political and the financial standpoints. In the first place, the party aims at the political education of the working class, at picking out from it an elite capable of taking over the government and the administration of the country: the members are therefore the very substance of the party, the stuff of its activity. Without members, the party would be like a teacher without pupils. Secondly, from the financial point of view, the party is essentially based upon the subscriptions paid by its members: the first duty of branch is to ensure that they are regularly collected. In this way, the party gathers the funds required for its work of political education and for its day-to-day activity; in the same way it is enabled to finance electioneering: the financial and political are here at one (1978: 63).

The UBP constitution stipulated the members to sign an undertaking to the party (Article 5)<sup>362</sup>, to pay an annual subscription (Article 10.3), and the branches to hold a system of registration (Article 5), which are all indispensable features of mass parties (see Duverger 1978: 64; 71). However, "[c]onstitutions and rules never give more than a partial idea of what happens, if indeed they describe reality at all, for they are rarely strictly applied" (*ibid.*: xviii). The UBP constitution was no exception. In practice, it can be seen that the UBP had never collected subscription<sup>363</sup>; nor it ever had a system of registration of its members (Christophorou 2006: 534). As Duverger puts it, "the absence of any system of registration

---

<sup>362</sup> The TKP did not have such an article for instance.

<sup>363</sup> Hakkı Atun, who also served as the secretary general of the party, for instance, does not remember ever paying membership fee (interviewed by author).

of members or of any regular collection of subscriptions is a fairly reliable criterion,” to decide whether a party is a mass party or not: “no true membership is conceivable in their absence” (1978: 64-5). From “the financial point of view,” therefore, it was not a necessity for the UBP to organize as a mass party.<sup>364</sup> Obviously, it did not need mass membership for financial reasons.

When we look from the political standpoint, we see that although Denктаş portrayed the party organization as a mechanism for recruitment of the new members and leaders, where they would also be educated and work even more intensively after the election period<sup>365</sup>, we see that the education aspect was also clearly missing in practice.

If these aspects are missing, then, can we say that the UBP was simply a mass party only on paper? Not exactly. Given the mass party model’s success, indeed, seeing a cadre/internally mobilized party imitating the mass party model should not come as a surprise (Duverger 1978: 64-6; see also Katz and Mair 1995: 11-2). Indeed, this was what, the DC went through under Fanfani in the mid-1950s (Allum and Allum 2008: 343; Chubb 1982; Tarrow 1967) – due to different reasons but with almost identical consequences. From a theoretical standpoint, what drew the UBP closer to the mass party model was the active involvement of the grassroots in the selection of the candidates as well as the other party cadres. To quote Duverger once again, “activity connected with the nomination of candidates presented at elections by a party constitutes one of the activities typical of party membership,” and such parties, like the “American parties in States which operate the system of ‘closed primaries’ with registration of electors ... resemble mass parties from the political point of view ... [and] should be classified as semi-mass parties” (1978: 65).

In this respect, it can be said that the UBP founders, in a way, went too far in their imitation. During the establishment process, the extent of participation of the grassroots in decision-

---

<sup>364</sup> In addition to its easy access to other sources of financing, like public resources it firmly controlled, or the donations from the business circles, it should be noted that the availability of financial assistance to the political parties provided by the state reduces the need for collecting subscriptions. According to the Article 45 of the Political Parties Law, every year the 0.3 percent of the budget is earmarked for political parties. The parties, represented in the parliament, which took part in the previous parliamentary election, share this money on the basis of number of seats they have in the parliament (For more on the financing of the political parties see Dodd 1993c: 187-8).

<sup>365</sup> “Denктаş Halkımıza Bir Çağrıda Bulunarak Mahalli UBP Örgütlerinin Kurulmasını İstedi: ‘Partiyi Siz Kurdunuz ve Siz Yaşatacaksınız’ [Denктаş urged our people to establish the local organizations of the UBP: ‘You established the party and you will make it survive’].” *Zaman*, 13.10.1976.

making and selecting the party officials is striking. Oddly enough for an internally mobilized party, mass participation was strongly encouraged, and great importance was attached to internal democracy. Unlike the other parties, “the party’s leadership cadres will not be occupied in advance,” it was said during the early phases of the organization process.<sup>366</sup> In his statement launching the party, Denктаş was quoted as saying “the UBP is people’s party,” and that the signatories of the founding document were only fulfilling a legal requirement. They would not set up the party with a top-down approach but rather the party would be formed from bottom-up: “The party will be formed in the villages. Their representatives will join the ones from towns and neighbourhoods to establish the party organization,” he said.<sup>367</sup> Before departing for a long trip in the wake of the party’s establishment, he exhorted the people to establish their local party organizations:

Push aside petty and sterile feuds and jealousies; be aware that you are all brothers; and unite in every village and neighbourhood! Select a committee of minimum seven, maximum nine people. Help them to recruit new members, and hold a general meeting as soon as possible to select an executive committee and the delegates to be sent to the first party conference. ... In our first party conference, you are going to elect the chairman, the members of the party assembly and disciplinary board, and ratify the program and constitution of the party.<sup>368</sup>

Unlike the ones on party financing and political education, what Denктаş said, and the articles of the constitution, which empowered the rank and file party members, were followed to the letter. As a result of an aggressive organization and recruitment strategy, the number of members reached to 20 thousand by the end of December 1975.<sup>369</sup> By the time the organization process was completed in April 1976, the party boasted 40,200 members.<sup>370</sup> This figure was obviously overblown.<sup>371</sup> However, it would not be

---

<sup>366</sup> “Ulusal Birlik Partisi Kuruluş Çalışmaları Devam Ediyor [The UBP’s organization process underway].” *Zaman*, 15.8.1975.

<sup>367</sup> “Denктаş: UBP Halkın Partisidir [The UBP is the party of people].” *Zaman*, 12.10.1975; See also “Halkımızın Siyasal Örgütlenmesi Gerçekleşiyor: Ulusal Birlik Partisi [The political organization of our people is materializing: the National Unity Party].” *Zaman*, 12.08.1976.

<sup>368</sup> “Denктаş Halkımıza Bir Çağrıda Bulunarak Mahalli UBP Örgütlerinin Kurulmasını İstedi: ‘Partiyi Siz Kurdunuz ve Siz Yaşatacaksınız’ [Denктаş urged our people to establish the local organizations of the UBP: ‘You established the party and you will make it survive’].” *Zaman*, 13.10.1976.

<sup>369</sup> Ülkü Cem (the penname of Raif Denктаş): “Utanma Olmayınca [When there is no shame].” 23.12.1975.

<sup>370</sup> “UBP Belediye Başkan Adayları Denктаş’ı Ziyaret Etiler [The UBP’s mayoral candidates visited Denктаş].” *Zaman*, 28.4.1976; see also the statements of Nejat Konuk, the secretary general of the party in “UBP Demokratik Siyasal Hayatımızın En Güçlü Partisidir [The UBP is the strongest party of our democratic political life].” *Ulus*, 20.4.1976.

<sup>371</sup> The total number of eligible voters at the time was 75,824, of whom only 56,346 went to the polls in the 1976 elections (Aydoğdu 2005: 93).

exaggeration to say that the UBP was established in a rather participatory manner. At the village and neighbourhood level some 1,600<sup>372</sup> branch delegates (*şube delegesi*) were selected to participate at the three branch conferences to be held in Nicosia, Famagusta and Kyrenia. At the branch conferences, the branch delegates selected the executive board of their branches as well as the 404 conference delegates (*kurultay delegesi*)<sup>373</sup>, who would represent the branch at the party conference. The conference delegates, along with the ex officio members of the conference i.e. the party chairman, the parliamentary group, ministers etc.<sup>374</sup>, selected 40-member party assembly as well as the party chairman. Then, the party assembly elected the secretary general and the central executive board made up of nine members.

Going back to Duverger's point about the candidate selection process, it can be seen that the task of selecting their district's candidates in the parliamentary election was also given to the branch delegates by the candidate selection regulation.<sup>375</sup> The effects of this method of candidate selection on the intra-party balance of power in practice will be elaborated in the following sections. Suffice it here to say that by removing the discretion of party leaders on the selection of candidates, this system had detrimental effects on the old guard's prospects of maintaining their position, and paved the way for the ascendance of a different breed of politicians who would before long capture the party administration. In other words, in a way, the old guard UBP founders went too far in their endeavour to encourage mass participation, and in doing so undermined the privileged position normally the party leadership enjoys. This paved the way for the renewal of the party cadres in a rapid fashion; so rapid that even Denктаş would lose control of the party in a relatively short period of time. Furthermore, when coupled together with the open list electoral system discussed in the previous chapter, this method of candidate selection is known to encourage cultivation of a personal vote (see Carey and Shugart 1995: 427-8), which is closely associated with political clientelism.

---

<sup>372</sup> Calculated by author based on the list of delegates published in the party's publication *Ulus*, 20.4.1976.

<sup>373</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>374</sup> For the full list see the article 25 of the constitution.

<sup>375</sup> The regulation was published by *Zaman* on 30.4.1976; see also Raif Denктаş: "Demokrasi ve Politik Gücün Yaygınlığı [Democracy and the pervasiveness of political power]." *Zaman*, 3.4.1976.

Why did the party leadership deem mass membership so important if it would not rely on them to raise funds? In other words, why did they organize themselves as a semi-mass party? Political ideology of those responsible for the drawing up of the party constitution was one factor. Apart from that, I suggest, this served to three main purposes: Firstly, it was an attempt to outdo the HP, which adopted a similar model and reached over three thousand members by the time its first conference was held in October 1975.<sup>376</sup>

Second purpose had to do with what has been said in the previous chapter when the factors making a clientelist mobilization strategy more favourable were analyzed. Denктаş wanted to legitimize his leadership by pointing to a large and empowered membership. He was aware that his pro-*taksim* position was pushing him into isolation not only internationally but also in the eyes of mainstream political actors in Ankara.<sup>377</sup> After being cold-shouldered by the Turkish government in his quest to declare an independent state in late September 1975, he made the following statement: “If from time to time we get into rough terrain and become isolated/marginalized and solitary, this is because it is imperative for the cause we are trying to rescue. We become solitary not because we are dimwitted. We have a purpose. We want to show, prove what you long for [i.e. *taksim*] because we believe the time has come”.<sup>378</sup> A mass flow into his party would show that he was speaking on behalf of the Turkish Cypriot community. To quote him once again, “when the international community wants to know what the Turks of Cyprus want, they will look at the National Unity Party, and take their answer from the program of the party where the big majority of the Turkish community have united”.<sup>379</sup> The advantages of the numerical strength that would come with mass membership, therefore, should be considered in this context rather than its financial advantages as it would be in a real mass party.

---

<sup>376</sup> The HP Secretary General, İsmail Bozkurt cited in “Birçok Delege HP Kurultayına Katılmadı [Many delegates did not attend the HP congress].” *Zaman*, 13.10.1975.

<sup>377</sup> The Turkish premier Demirel was in an awkward position. On the one hand, he was willing to mend the fences with the international community, particularly with the US. On the other, he did not want to be portrayed as a weak prime minister in domestic politics by taking steps that could be exploited in domestic politics as “concessions,” lest everyone saying “Demirel gave away, what had been taken by Ecevit”. Furthermore, his coalition partner, in the so-called Nationalist Front, MSP, held a very tough position, and made “no territorial concession in Cyprus” a pre-condition for the continuation of the coalition (“MSP Koalisyonunun Devamı için AP’ye Bildirilecek Şartları Saptadı [The MSP ascertained the conditions for maintaining the coalition with the AP].” *Milliyet*, 20.10.1975).

<sup>378</sup> “Denктаş: Bir Millet, Bir Toplumun Davasını Omuzlayıp Yürümek Yalnızlık Değildir [Denктаş: It is not a solitary predicament to shoulder a nation’s, a community’s cause and walk on].” *Zaman*, 5.12.1975.

<sup>379</sup> Denктаş cited in “Dünya Kıbrıs Türkünün Parçalanmaz Bir Bütün Olduğunu Görecektir [The world will see the indivisible integrity of the Cyprus’ Turks]” and “Davamızdan Tek Bir Adım Geriye Dönüş Olmayacak [There will not be even a single step back from our cause].” *Zaman*, 8.12.1975.

Finally, though the way he was conducting the Cyprus negotiations was widely praised, Denktaş's cabinet was criticized heavily even by independent observers like Eşref Nidai and Ahmet Tolgay of daily *Bozkurt*. He was said to be out of touch with what's going on internally.<sup>380</sup> What makes these columnists' views more notable is the fact that both of them worked at the same time for the *Bayraktar's* office, and therefore what they say could not be easily dismissed by the administration as communist or subversive propaganda. But Denktaş did not want to alienate anyone in his cabinet by sacking those who had been heavily criticized. Therefore, he presented the party mechanism or internal democracy within the party as a method of democratic selection, which would help the renewal of the cadres. As *Bozkurt* reported quoting "the circles close to the party," nobody would be imposed as party functionaries and "renewal of Denktaş's cadres would be realized in the form of a people's movement within the UBP".<sup>381</sup>

#### **4.4 The First Wave of Mass Political Mobilization and the Setting Up of the Machine**

No matter how it tried to portray itself, the party was *initially*, to a large extent, a party of notables. It should be noted, however, that the majority of these notables, unlike in the case of Italy, for instance, did not earn their status because of their role as patrons or intermediaries in a traditional society, which was in the eve of transition to mass politics as it was identified in the theoretical chapter. Rather, very few, like Mustafa Hacıahmetoğlu or Osman Civisilli aside, they owed their status to their role in the administration. As they did not require a solid base to get elected in the past, they were disconnected from the voters. Such was this detachment that one of the heavyweights, Osman Örek, on his way to stumping could not find his way to a village only 12 miles from Nicosia and asked passers by for directions, and hence ridiculed by the opposition.<sup>382</sup>

The politics acquired its clientelistic character when the UBP embarked on an aggressive recruitment strategy to create a following for the party, which was based on the use of the

---

<sup>380</sup> Eşref Nidai: "Başkanın İşlevi ve Yeni Danışman [The function of the president and the new advisor]." *Bozkurt*, 23.8.1975.

<sup>381</sup> See for instance "Toplumumuzda Siyasal Örgütlenme Hızlanıyor: Denktaş'ın Kadro Yenilemesi UBP İçinde Gerçekleşecek [Political organization within our community is gaining momentum: Denktaş will renew his team within the UBP]." *Bozkurt*, 26.8.1975; see also Denktaş: "Daha Büyük Hedeflere Doğru Gönül Gönüle Yürüyeceğiz [Denktaş: we will walk hand in hand towards bigger targets]." *Zaman*, 5.10.1975.

<sup>382</sup> "Sarılacak Dal Arayanlar [Those who are seeking a branch to hold on to]." *Halkın Sesi*, 17.12.1975.

public resources including the public personnel. This was the first time politicians resorted to the public resources to lure masses. This is, of course, not to say that the party owed its success in recruiting members solely to providing/promising of material benefits or the threat of exclusion from them. Denктаş's charisma, his historical personality, and the way he monopolized the roles of being the champion of the national cause and Turkish nationalism would attract a considerable chunk of the electorate to his party anyway. However, the role of political clientelism cannot be denied either. What started as random nepotism in the chaotic atmosphere of the immediate post-war period, was now, with the establishment of the party, put into the service of a full-scale political machine.

In a statement talking about the recruitment process, the spokesperson of the party said that people were "in a race with each other to become a founding member" of the UBP.<sup>383</sup> Closer scrutiny reveals that this race was rigged to say the least. The UBP relied heavily on the utilization of the power and resources of the state in this process. The strategy was based partly on intimidation and partly on promises, and involved, as an early indication of the conflation of party and state, active participation of civil servants in the recruitment process.<sup>384</sup>

The following observation captures the atmosphere very well:

On behalf of the UBP, some civil servants have been going around house-by-house, door-by-door to recruit new members for the party. The first question they ask to the household members opening the door is: "Do you have any complaints about Denктаş?" Before the respondent recovers from the shock of the first question, the second question comes: "Do you approve of Denктаş?" It takes real courage to say no. This is not easy. Your, and your children's livelihoods are at stake. And the UBP member civil servant continues: "As you have no complaints about Denктаş, and you approve of him, then please sign this paper". Presto! You have become a UBP member.<sup>385</sup>

---

<sup>383</sup> "Ulusal Birlik Partisi Kuruluş Çalışmaları Devam Ediyor [The National Unity Party establishment process underway]." *Zaman*, 15.8.1975.

<sup>384</sup> See particularly İsmail Bozkurt cited in "Halkçı Parti Partizanlık Yapan Görevlilerden Hesap Soracak [The Populist Party will hold accountable the officials involved in clientelism]." *Halkın Sesi*, 13.10.1975; Fuat Veziroğlu: "Halka Telgraf [Telegram to people]." *Halkın Sesi*, 13.10.1975.

<sup>385</sup> Sabahattin İsmail: "Bu Ne Biçim Demokrasi? Bu Ne Biçim Particilik [What kind of democracy is this? What kind of party politics is this?]" *Halkın Sesi*, 2.9.1975; see also "Türkiye'de Ecevit Partizanlık Yapan Memurların Cezalandırılacağını Söylerken Kıbrıs'ta Bazı Memurlar İktidar Partisine Üye Yazmak İçin Halka Baskı Yapıyor [While Ecevit is saying that the civil servants involved in clientelism would be punished in Turkey, some civil servants in Cyprus are pressuring people to join the government party]." *Halkın Sesi*, 15.9.1975; Fuat Veziroğlu: "Muhafif Halka Mektup [Letter to the dissident people]." *Halkın Sesi*, 17.12.1975.

Some of the civil servants who did not accept to take part were intimidated or banished.<sup>386</sup> Specifically, the employees working at the SEEs like Cypfruvex, and Salamis Bay Hotel as well as the employees of certain directorates attached to the ministry of finance were forced to join the party by their superiors.<sup>387</sup> In an observer's words, "in the villages too, diverse forms of shenanigans are employed to recruit members".<sup>388</sup> "Those who did not join the party of Denктаş would not be given credits or chemical fertilizers, and their produces would not be bought" it was said<sup>389</sup>, while those who accepted to join were promised credit, land and welfare benefits.<sup>390</sup>

In one particular case, civil servants from the department of social benefits (*sosyal yardım dairesi*) toured the village, and forced the *mukhtar* to give the names of those who had earlier joined the HP. Later, reportedly, a villager who called at the Kyrenia branch of the department was told the village would suffer because of their support for the HP.<sup>391</sup> In another case, those who attended the meeting of the HP were held subject to investigation.<sup>392</sup>

Ultimately, the anatomy of UBP was identical to what Allum and Allum say of the DC: "formally like that of the mass party, but, in fact, based on a following or clientele and not of an active participant membership" (Allum and Allum 2008: 343; see also Chubb 1982: 72-3). This anatomy would become more palpable in the election period when a larger segment of the society had to be mobilized.

The constitution stipulated the holding of elections within six months upon its entry into force. In other words, the elections were supposed to be held in December 1975. However,

---

<sup>386</sup> İsmail Bozkurt cited in "Halkçı Parti Partizanlık Yapan Görevlilerden Hesap Soracak [The Populist Party will hold accountable the officials involved in clientelism]." *Halkın Sesi*, 13.10.1975.

<sup>387</sup> "UBP'nin Örgütlenmesi Baskı ve Vaade Dayanıyor [The UBP's organization is based on pressure and promises]." *Yenidüzen*, 12.12.1975 and, Sabahattin İsmail: "Bu Ne Biçim Demokrasi? Bu Ne Biçim Particilik? [What kind of democracy is this? What kind of party politics is this?]" *Halkın Sesi*, 2.9.1975

<sup>388</sup> Sabahattin İsmail: "Bu Ne Biçim Demokrasi? Bu Ne Biçim Particilik? [What kind of democracy is this? What kind of party politics is this?]" *Halkın Sesi*, 2.9.1975

<sup>389</sup> "Türkiye'de Ecevit Partizanlık Yapan Memurların Cezalandırılacağını Söylerken Kıbrıs'ta Bazı Memurlar İktidar Partisine Üye Yazmak İçin Halka Baskı Yapıyor [While Ecevit is saying that the civil servants involved in clientelism would be punished in Turkey, some civil servants in Cyprus are pressuring people to join the government party]." *Halkın Sesi*, 15.9.1975; Vefa Fırtına: "Gerçek Hikayeler [True stories]." *Halkın Sesi*, 1.10.1975.

<sup>390</sup> See for instance "Köyden Sesler [Voices from village]." *Halkın Sesi*, 9.12.1975;

<sup>391</sup> See the letter from a resident of Çamlıbel village: "Bu da Benden [And this is from me]." *Halkın Sesi*, 21.11.1975.

<sup>392</sup> The village concerned was Değirmenlik, see "Köyden Sesler [Voices from village]." *Halkın Sesi*, 9.12.1975;

the UBP postponed them, first to February 1976<sup>393</sup>, and then until the summer of 1976 by delaying the passage of the election and referendum law until March 1976. The aim was to buy time so that Denктаş could be actively involved in the campaign after completing a period of intensive international contacts.<sup>394</sup> The presence of the leader was central to the campaign because as the election results would show, his personal popularity was much higher than of the other leading figures and the party itself. Eventually, both presidential and general elections were scheduled for the same day: 20 June 1976.

As Denктаş's election was a foregone conclusion, the strongest opposition party, the TKP, did not even field a presidential candidate. Therefore the real competition was for the parliamentary election, whose analysis should be done at two levels: Inter-party and intra-party. At the inter-party level, given the weak showing of the UBP in the local elections held a month earlier than the parliamentary election<sup>395</sup>, and in the absence of a real threat at the presidential election against himself, Denктаş's campaign aimed at reversing the rising tide of the opposition and ensuring a majority for the UBP in the parliament to avoid *cohabitation*. He conducted a negative campaign based on defaming the opposition.<sup>396</sup> His message was simple: The community was threatened by a communist takeover and a victory by the opposition would undermine the national cause. To give but two examples, "if the UBP does not come to power with at least 25 [of the 40] seats, the communists will take over," he said in a meeting where he had summoned the *mukhtars*, who had been elected as independent or from the opposition parties.<sup>397</sup> As for the national cause, "other parties are unnational and unserious" and "they are perverting the national cause," he was

---

<sup>393</sup> "Seçimler Ertelendi [Elections postponed]." *Zaman*, 9.12.1975; "Seçimler Şubat Sonu [Elections to be held at the end of February]." *Zaman*, 10.12.1975.

<sup>394</sup> He was abroad between 12 October and 28 November 1975, visiting certain Islamic countries, New York, and Ankara (see Numan Ali Levent: "Başkanın Dönüşü [The return of the president]." *Zaman*, 30.11.1975).

<sup>395</sup> In the municipal elections, the UBP collected 38.2% of the votes against TKP's 17.2%, HP's 14.3%, CTP's 12.7% and independents' 17.6% (Aydoğdu 2005: 148). Remarkably, the opposition candidates won Nicosia and Kyrenia.

<sup>396</sup> For some of his allegations see for instance Naci Talat: "Sözümüz Sizedir Denктаş Bey [Our word is to you Mr Denктаş]." *Yenidüzen*, 5.6.1976; "İktidar Partisi UBP'nin Karalama ve Korkutma Politikası Sürüyor [The UBP's smear and terror campaign is continuing]." *Yenidüzen*, 12.6.1976; Eşref Çetinel: "Kimmiş Komünist [Who is communist?]" *Kurtuluş*, 14.6.1976; "UBP'liler İftira Kampanyasını Sürdürüyor [The UBP members' slander campaign continues]." *Kurtuluş*, 14.6.1976.

<sup>397</sup> In the same meeting, he claimed that the HP leader was an "international communist according to an intelligence report from" the Turkish national intelligence organization (see "HP Seçimlerde Denктаş'ı Desteklemeyeceğini Açıkladı [HP disclosed that it would not support Denктаş in the election]." *Halkın Sesi*, 2.6.1976; "Halkçı Parti Başkanlık Seçiminde Bağımsız Kalacak [Populist party will remain neutral in the presidential election]." *Bozkurt*, 2.6.1976).

quoted as saying, also portraying the opposition as “anti-[Turkish] army” in the Turkish media.<sup>398</sup> In fact, by exaggerating the power of communists and accusing the opposition of treason, Denктаş’s intention was to address the public opinion and particularly the nationalist circles, both civilian and military, in Turkey to engage them against the opposition.

Normally, the most significant violations of the electoral law, the use of public resources to forward the incumbent party’s political campaign, are the hardest to prove. Not in this particular case. Reportedly, the UBP distributed truckfuls of household goods until the last day of the election campaign and did nothing to hide it.<sup>399</sup> In the words of Dr Küçük, the former community leader and the editor of the daily *Halkın Sesi*:

The doors of the warehouses have been opened wide. There is no lunch break or any keepers. 24 hours a day, ten or 15-tonne trucks full of goods are leaving. There is neither salesman nor registration. Don't ask where they are heading to! They are heading to unknown directions. Hundreds of villages... Those who have been neglected for two years ... are now told “to take as much as you want”.<sup>400</sup>

These warehouses (*ambarlar*) were used to store the Greek Cypriot moveable properties after 1974, and were attached to the State Estate and Supplies Directorate (*Devlet Emlak ve Malzeme Dairesi*), which was under the ministry of finance. It was not a secret that these goods were sold to the cronies of the government at giveaway prices<sup>401</sup>, and indeed as Mehmet Hasgüler puts it, this directorate was known to be the center of distribution of

---

<sup>398</sup> “Anavatan Basını Ne Diyor [What does the motherland’s press say]?” *Halkın Sesi*, 1.6.1976 (Originally published in Cumhuriyet (Istanbul); see also “Türkiye Basınında Denктаş [Denктаş in the Turkish press].” *Yenidüzen*, 12.6.1976.

<sup>399</sup> Dr Fazıl Küçük: “Toplum Balık Değildir [The community does not suffer from amnesia] (2).” *Halkın Sesi*, 9.6.1976; “Yağma Hasan’ın Böreği [Corruption and abuse].” *Halkın Sesi*, 10.6.1976; “Ve UBP Oyların Ancak Yüzde 53.7’sini Alabildi [And the UBP managed to garner only 53.7 percent of the votes].” *Kurtuluş*, 28.6.1976; Erten: “Dikmenlilerin Haykırışı: ‘Şimdi Vaad Ettikleri Eşyaları Bir Buçuk Yıl Önce Niye Vermediler?’ [The scream of people of Dikmen: ‘Why did not they give those household goods that they promise now, a year and a half ago?’]” *Halkın Sesi*, 16.6.1976; Fuat Veziroğlu: “Suçluların Telaşı [The panic of the guilty].” *Halkın Sesi*, 6.6.1976; Erten: “Kimin Hakkı [Whose right]...” *Halkın Sesi*, 8.6.1976; Berberoğlu’s speech cited in *Halkın Sesi*, 16.6.1976; Fuat Veziroğlu: “UBP Nasıl Seçim Kazandı [How did the UBP win the election]?” *Halkın Sesi*, 26.6.1976. In some cases, the goods were given away right away, and in some cases promises were made. In the village of Engomi (Tuzla) for instance, distribution took place after the election (see Eşref Çetinel: “Ortada Kalan Sorular [Those unanswered questions].” *Bozkurt*, 2.7.1976).

<sup>400</sup> Dr Fazıl Küçük: “Uçuyor...Uçuyor [Flying...Flying].” *Halkın Sesi*, 16.6.1976.

<sup>401</sup> See for instance Kemal Deniz’s (Independent, Nicosia) speech in the parliament cited in “İktidar Şiddetle Eleştirildi [The government fiercely criticized].” *Halkın Sesi*, 4.11.1975.

*ganimet*.<sup>402</sup> Such was the abuses of the politicians here that its director asked to be transferred to another directorate, even if this would mean a demotion, saying in his resignation “he would not be able to work with thieves”.<sup>403</sup> To cite one of the UBP’s founders, “it was a time when the greedy made fortunes. The UBP became the protector of those who profited from the new, chaotic, economic order, and the party relied on distribution of the *ganimet* to gain support”.<sup>404</sup> Those who already benefited from or expecting to benefit from a lax administration, which subsequently came to form a big “constituency for patronage,” to use Shefter’s term, clustered around the UBP, which became the guarantor of this system. This constituency was so big that Durduran, the chairman of the main opposition party, recalls being half-jokingly warned by an aide that if he kept on saying that the TKP would hold the culprits accountable, no one would vote for them as almost everyone was involved in the *ganimet* frenzy.<sup>405</sup>

One of the novelties of this distribution process or “vote hunting,” as the opposition dubbed it, was the involvement of women in canvassing. The wives of the candidates, particularly ministers, were touring their husband’s constituencies house-by-house, and asking what the voters needed.<sup>406</sup> Their “wishes” were later delivered from the state warehouses.<sup>407</sup> In some instances, the known opposition sympathizers were targeted and offered “favours”; some of them were invited to the ministry of resettlement “orally or in writing” to claim the household goods they wished.<sup>408</sup> *Halkın Sesi*, which openly had sided with the opposition, ran a mock ad where after informing the public that the warehouses were opened to satisfy the cronies, it urged the displaced people or those in need to go and ask for their shares

---

<sup>402</sup> Mehmet Hasgüler: “Umarsız Hayatlar: Kıbrıs Türklerinin Yok Olan İnsan Sermayesi [Desperate Lives: The Turkish Cypriots’ eroding human capital].” *Kıbrıs*, 23.8.2010.

<sup>403</sup> Cited in *ibid*.

<sup>404</sup> Erdal Andız interviewed by author.

<sup>405</sup> Alpay Durduran interviewed by author.

<sup>406</sup> Dr Fazıl Küçük: “Boşuna Yorgunluk [Futile effort].” *Halkın Sesi*, 5.6.1976; Fuat Veziroğlu: “Hanımlar Oy Avcılığında [The wives in vote-hunting].” *Halkın Sesi*, 9.6.1976; Erten: “Ulusal Hamhumcular Partisi [The National Gobblers Party]?” *Halkın Sesi*, 12.6.1976; “‘Burası Oy Dilenme Yeri mi’ [Is here somewhere you beg for votes?]” *Kurtuluş*, 7.6.1976; “Köylüler UBP’nin Propagandası için Kendilerine Verilen Eşyayı Reddetti: Bayan Denктаş Eşya Yüklü Kamyonlarla Köy Köy Geziyor [Villagers refused the household goods given to them as part of the UBP propaganda: Mrs Denктаş is touring villages with trucks full of household goods].” *Yenidüzen*, 12.6.1976; Aytekin Musa: “Daha Neleri Var [What else do they have]!” *Yenidüzen*, 18.6.1976.

<sup>407</sup> “UBP Devlet Ambarlarını Yağma Ediyor [The UBP is pillaging the state warehouses].” *Kurtuluş*, 7.6.1976; see also Dr. Fazıl Küçük: “Tabiat Kanunları [Laws of nature] (2).” *Halkın Sesi*, 4.6.1976; Erten: “Kimin Hakkı [Whose right]...” *Halkın Sesi*, 8.6.1976.

<sup>408</sup> “Lefkoşa Halkı UBP Mitingini Boykot Etti [The people of Nicosia boycotted the UBP rally].” *Halkın Sesi*, 8.6.1976.

before everything ran out.<sup>409</sup> Land, credit, jobs and title deeds for the houses they occupy were also promised to the voters.<sup>410</sup> As the most organized, and best financed party, the UBP also hired all taxis and transported the voters to the polling stations on the ballot day.<sup>411</sup>

In the face of widespread abuse of the state resources<sup>412</sup>, the TKP appealed for help from the government and opposition parties in Ankara<sup>413</sup>, to no avail. In the words of a TKP spokesperson:

We, as the Communal Liberation Party, do not intend to turn a blind eye to the UBP government's frenetic behavior, and pillaging of the budget along with the state warehouses to gain votes for the UBP. We, as a party, who hold the national interest above everything and operates within the boundaries of law, make the due warning, and urge the Motherland's government to duty and intervention. The constitution envisages elections to be conducted at equal conditions. However, there is no equality now. By abusing the state's resources, the UBP is carrying out a privileged election campaign. ... We also invite the press of motherland to send reporters and observers to follow what's going on from a close range because unless this frenetic behavior is brought to an end, we have strong doubts about the security and peacefulness of the election. Even the presence of these doubts alone will cause negative effects in the international arena, and in turn damage the national cause. The responsibility of this damage will be on the shoulders of the sinful UBP.<sup>414</sup>

Certainly, the election campaign was not all about carrots; there were sticks as well. Some of the voters were told that they would be evicted from the houses allocated to them; that their displaced person benefit would be cut or that they would lose their jobs in the public service, should they support the opposition.<sup>415</sup> Denktaş's strong negative campaign also led

---

<sup>409</sup> "İlan [Announcement]." *Halkın Sesi*, 13.6.1976.

<sup>410</sup> See for instance Erten: "Köylü Ne Yapacağını Bilir [Villagers know what to do]." *Halkın Sesi*, 4.6.1976; Dr Fazıl Küçük: "Köylüye Yalan Söylüyorlar [They are lying to villagers]." *Halkın Sesi*, 12.6.1976; Fuat Veziroğlu: "Yurttaş Dikkat [Citizen, pay attention]..." *Halkın Sesi*, 11.6.1976; "Kıbrıs Türk Demokrasi Derneği Halka Çağrıda Bulundu [The Turkish Cypriot Democracy Association called on the people]." *Halkın Sesi*, 11.6.1976.

<sup>411</sup>Fuat Veziroğlu: "Yurttaş Dikkat [Citizen, pay attention]..." *Halkın Sesi*, 11.6.1976; "Oylar Yeniden Sayılıyor [Votes to be recounted]" *Halkın Sesi*, 25.6.1976; Aytekin Musa: "Son Hazırlık [The final preparations]!" *Yenidüzen*, 29.6.1976.

<sup>412</sup> Fuat Veziroğlu: "Ne Bu Şiddet, Bu Celal [What is the reason of this fury]?" *Halkın Sesi*, 2.6.1976; Fuat Veziroğlu: "Suçluların Telaşı [The panic of the guilty]." *Halkın Sesi*, 6.6.1976; Naci Talat: "Seçim Sonuçları Halkın Gerçek İradesini Temsil Etmiyor [The election results do not reflect the real popular will]." *Yenidüzen*, 29.6.1976.

<sup>413</sup> "UBP Devlet Ambarlarını Yağma Ediyor [The UBP is pillaging the state warehouses]." *Kurtuluş*, 7.6.1976.

<sup>414</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>415</sup> "Ve UBP Oyların Ancak Yüzde 53.7'sini Alabildi [And the UBP managed to garner only 53.7 per cent of the votes]." *Kurtuluş*, 28.6.1976; Naci Talat: "UBP'nin Seçim Taktikleri [The UBP's election tactics]." *Yenidüzen*, 22.5.1976; "Azınlık İktidarı Çöküyor [The government of the minority is collapsing]." *Yenidüzen*, 29.5.1976; B.

to polarization especially in the rural areas.<sup>416</sup> In some villages, the opposition candidates and sympathizers were intimidated and harassed<sup>417</sup>, and at times beaten by thugs.<sup>418</sup> In one particular case, a shopkeeper, who had posted a campaign poster of the TKP on his shop window, was beaten by the local police chief.<sup>419</sup> Such was the atmosphere that on the last day of the campaign, in his article, Dr Küçük likened the administration to the government of Mussolini, and urged the voters to cast their votes for the opposition.<sup>420</sup>

To summarize, while Denктаş's strategy was to shift the focus away from the intractable difficulties of governing towards the Cyprus problem by insisting on the slogan "the national struggle is not over yet,"<sup>421</sup> and pointing out the imaginary looming communist takeover, the opposition's election campaign rested on disclosing the partisan treatment of the displaced, squandering of the "national wealth" (i.e. the Greek Cypriot properties)<sup>422</sup>, and the distribution frenzy in the last 10-15 days of the election campaign. "I used to finish my speeches with the same line," recalls Alpay Durduran, the leader of the TKP: "we will hold them accountable".<sup>423</sup> The way Denктаş conducted the Cyprus problem, especially his

---

Azgın: "Bizim Köyde Seçim [Election in our village]." 29.5.1976; "TKP Seçimlerle İlgili Önemli Bildiri Yayımladı [The TKP issued an important statement regarding the elections]." *Halkın Sesi*, 25.6.1976.

<sup>416</sup> Dr Fazıl Küçük: "Tehlikeli Oyunlar [Dangerous games]." *Halkın Sesi*, 1.6.1976; see also "UBP'nin Baskılarına Rağmen Halk Yolundan Dönmüyor [Despite the UBP's oppression, people are determined]." *Kurtuluş*, 17.5.1976; Dr Fazıl Küçük: "Açık Alın [Clear conscience]." *Halkın Sesi*, 11.6.1976.

<sup>417</sup> "Kaba Kuvvete Lanet Olsun [Brute force be damned]!" *Halkın Sesi*, 4.6.1976. See also Dr Fazıl Küçük: "Tehlikeli Oyunlar [Dangerous Games]" *Halkın Sesi*, 1.6.1976; "Özker Özgür'ün Araba Lastiği Bıçakla Parçalandı [Özker Özgür's car tyre ripped apart with a knife]." *Halkın Sesi*, 4.6.1976; "Muhalefetin Afişlerine Tecavüzler Devam Ediyor [The attacks against the opposition's campaign posters continuing]." *Halkın Sesi*, 7.6.1976; Dr Fazıl Küçük: "Kaba Kuvvet Başlıyor mu [Is the use of crude force beginning]?" *Halkın Sesi*, 7.6.1976; Fuat Veziroğlu: "Dava Adamlığı ve Kardeşlik Düzeni [The men of cause and the fraternity order]." *Halkın Sesi*, 7.6.1976; "Hilmi Refik'in Haspolat'ta Konuşmasına Mani Olundu [Refik not allowed to speak in Haspolat]." *Halkın Sesi*, 10.6.1976; "UBP'nin Baskıları Her Yerde Kınanıyor [The UBP's oppression condemned everywhere]." *Halkın Sesi*, 11.6.1976; Dr Fazıl Küçük: "Açık Alın [Clear conscience]." *Halkın Sesi*, 11.6.1976; "Halkımız Seviyesiz Seçim Propagandasını Kınıyor [Our people condemns distasteful election propaganda]." *Yenidüzen*, 5.6.1976; "UBP Seçim Günü Bazı Köylerde Şiddete Başvurdu [The UBP resorted to violence in some villages on the ballot day]." *Yenidüzen*, 29.6.1976.

<sup>418</sup> "Türkmenköy'de Güvercin Uçuran TKP'liler Polislerin Gözleri Önünde Dövüldü [The TKP members flying doves beaten up in front of the police officers]." *Halkın Sesi*, 15.6.1976; "UBP'nin Baskıları Her Yerde Kınanıyor: İki TKP'li Dövüldü, Ağır Yaralı Olan Hastahane'de Tedavi Ediliyor [The UBP's oppression condemned everywhere: Two TKP members beaten up; the heavily wounded one under treatment at the hospital]." *Halkın Sesi*, 11.6.1976.

<sup>419</sup> "Oğuz'un Vücudunda Yara İzleri Var [There are scars on Oğuz's body]." *Kurtuluş*, 14.6.1976.

<sup>420</sup> "Karar Günü Geldi [The decision day has come]." *Halkın Sesi*, 19.6.1976.

<sup>421</sup> See for instance, "Denктаş: Dava Bitmiş Değildir, Mücadele Çetin Bir Safhadadır [Denктаş: The cause is not over; the struggle is in a critical stage]." *Zaman*, 19.9.1975.

<sup>422</sup> See for instance, "Milyarlık Servet Nereye Gitti [Where has the fortune of billions gone]?" *Kurtuluş*, 7.6.1976.

<sup>423</sup> Interviewed by author.

statements about unilateral declaration of independence, was also occasionally criticized.<sup>424</sup>

In the mean time, a parallel competition was going on at the intra-party level. This should also be taken up at two stages. First round was fought in the primaries, and the second in the general elections. Indeed, the division had emerged even earlier. During the establishment of the party a group of self-styled reformers emerged, and declared war against the old guard, particularly the cabinet members. The so-called Reformist wing did not hide its discontent with the incumbent government, and declared that they would support reform-minded candidates in the party conference and primaries. The most prominent member of this group was Raif Denктаş, the president's elder son. In his words "this wing is obviously not content with the current council of ministers and advocate the forming of a better one".<sup>425</sup> In their first press statement, "the UBP is not in power today," and "the UBP is not equal to the government," they claimed, and talked about those party members who attempted "to conceal their failure and effeteness by hiding below the UBP umbrella".<sup>426</sup> The wing was there to clean up the party from "the influence-peddlers, thieves, smugglers and profiteers".<sup>427</sup>

Indeed, an implicit campaign against the old guard had started before. The inner circle around Denктаş was said to fend off criticism from the people by saying "Denктаş is good, but his circle is not" or "don't vote for these ministers if you are not satisfied".<sup>428</sup> The Reformist wing came on top of this, and embodied these efforts. As also pointed out by the opposition at the time, in the final analysis, this renewal movement can be seen as an effort by Denктаş to distance himself from the effete members of his cabinet in the eve of the elections<sup>429</sup> and to deny responsibility for the failure of the cabinet he had appointed as the

---

<sup>424</sup> See for instance Özker Özgür: "Tutarsız Dış Politika [The inconsistent foreign policy]." *Halkın Sesi*, 1.6.1976; Berberoğlu cited in "Akşam Güneşi [The evening sun]." *Yenidüzen*, 18.6.1976.

<sup>425</sup> Raif Denктаş: "Reformcu Kanadın Düşündürdükleri [Thoughts on the reformist wing]." *Zaman*, 10.3.1976

<sup>426</sup> "Reformcu Ulusal Birlik Kanadı Doğdu [The reformist National Unity wing has been born]." *Zaman*, 4.3.1976.

<sup>427</sup> Erdal Andız cited in "UBP Gerçeği [The UBP reality]." *Kurtuluş*, 17.5.1976.

<sup>428</sup> See Tezel Asena: "Mahvedeceğiz [We will ruin]." *Halkın Sesi*, 23.11.1975; Naci Talat: "Reformcu Denктаşçılar [The Reformist Denktashists]." *Yenidüzen*, 12.3.1976; Aytekin Musa: "Göster Bana Arkadaşını [Tell me who your friends are]." *Yenidüzen*, 12.3.1976; Tözüm İsmail: "UBP'lilerin Seçim Propagandası [The UBP members' election propaganda]." *Halkın Sesi*, 27.11.1975.

<sup>429</sup> See Fuat Veziroğlu: "Çıkamaz Sokakta Bir İktidar [A government in a dead end]." *Halkın Sesi*, 20.12.1975, and Tezel Asena: "Mahvedeceğiz [We will ruin]." *Halkın Sesi*, 23.11.1975.

president.<sup>430</sup> It was not a coincidence that the leader of the wing was his son, who was also the owner-editor of the party's mouthpiece *Zaman*. Of course, Denктаş never formally endorsed the wing. However, he did not denounce them either. The wing enjoyed his blessing if not his open support: "He enjoyed it when I was grilling his cabinet members because I was telling things he agreed but could not utter himself," recounted Erdal Andız, one of the influential reformers.<sup>431</sup>

The reformist wing initially made some inroads. They won one of their first battles when they managed to get Orhan Zihni elected by acclamation to the chairmanship of the Famagusta branch against one of the most influential cabinet ministers, İsmet Kotak.<sup>432</sup> However, they were less successful in eliminating the old guard in the primaries.<sup>433</sup> At the end, only one of the ministers, Rüstem Tatar lost the primary and this was largely because he could not campaign well as he was recovering after a medical operation. Patronage was effectively used, at least by some: banquets were thrown, and *ganimet* was distributed.<sup>434</sup> Overall, it can be said that the old guard capitalized on advantages of incumbency to defeat the new guard. But this was not a total defeat because many new faces made it to the party ticket including, Raif Denктаş, İrsen Küçük, Enver Emin, Recep Ali Gürler from Nicosia, and Derviş Eroğlu and Mehmet Bayram from Famagusta. As will be shown in Chapter Five, gradually, these members of the new guard would take the control of the delegates, and establish an unshakeable power base, which would encourage them to take on, first the old guard party leadership, and then even Denктаş. I will turn to this in the next chapter.

In the primaries, individual candidates had to team up and campaign together against other candidates. One particular way of doing this was distributing shortlists featuring only the names or numbers indicating the team members' position on the ballot paper to the branch delegates. To bolster their chances of winning the candidacy, groups started spreading news that their lists were endorsed by Denктаş, by the secretary general Konuk, or by the central executive board of the party. At some point, the secretary general felt the need to

---

<sup>430</sup> A.M. Berberoğlu: "İktidar ve Sorumluluk [Power and responsibility]." *Yenidüzen*, 12.3.1976; Aytekin Musa: "Göster Bana Arkadaşını [Tell me who your friends are]." *Yenidüzen*, 12.3.1976.

<sup>431</sup> Interviewed by author.

<sup>432</sup> Andız interviewed by author.

<sup>433</sup> "UBP'de Kazan Kaynıyor [The cauldron is simmering in the UBP]." *Yenidüzen*, 8.5.1976; "UBP Gerçeği [The UBP reality]." *Kurtuluş*, 17.5.1976.

<sup>434</sup> See for instance Aytekin Musa: "Değneğin İki Ucu da [A rock and a hard place]." *Yenidüzen*, 15.5.1976.

deny the presence of any lists endorsed by the party administration, and declared that the party leadership was at equal distance from all candidates.<sup>435</sup> The competition was so fierce that in a different statement, released on the same day, it was announced that disciplinary action was started against certain candidates whose campaign violated the relevant party bylaw and the candidates were informed that such behaviour might lead to losing of the candidate status.<sup>436</sup>

The intra-party competition did not come to an end once the candidate selection process was completed. This marked only the start of the next round. As discussed before, by allowing the voters to make preference votes among the candidates, open list electoral system played a key role in the fragmentation within the party. As a party founder put it “because of the election system, the candidates soon realized that to get elected they had to eliminate each other”.<sup>437</sup> This forced candidates to campaign individually or as small groups against fellow candidates.<sup>438</sup> Two specific examples may be of help to show the importance of the personal campaigns: First, although other parties’ ads in the newspapers featured all candidates of the party, some UBP candidates gave individual ads too to bolster their chances vis-à-vis other UBP candidates.<sup>439</sup> Second, in a UN Security Council meeting, the Turkish Cypriot side was represented by the minister of finance because the state minister responsible for foreign affairs, who was supposed to attend the meeting, did not want to leave the country as the UN meeting coincided with the last week of the election campaign.<sup>440</sup> Instead, the Turkish Cypriot side was represented by Rüstem Tatar, the minister of finance, who was the only member of the cabinet who was not running for a seat.

Furthermore, although the allegations in this direction were formally denied at the time, later many UBP members admitted how they sabotaged each other’s campaign. Konuk, for instance, recounts how he and another veteran, Erol Kazım found out that they were

---

<sup>435</sup> “UBP Basın Bildirisi Yayınlandı [The UBP issued a press statement].” *Bozkurt*, 8.5.1976.

<sup>436</sup> “UBP Aday Yoklaması [The UBP primaries].” *Zaman*, 8.5.1976.

<sup>437</sup> Andız interviewed by author.

<sup>438</sup> See for instance “Baylınsınlar Böyle Birliğe [What a unity].” *Kurtuluş*, 14.6.1976; “Denktaş Adına Listeler Dağılıyor [Lists distributed on Denktaş’s behalf].” *Kurtuluş*, 19.6.1976.

<sup>439</sup> See the individual ads of Osman Örek, Kenan Atakol, Tansel Fikri, Şemsi Kazım in *Halkın Sesi* (19.6.1976); see also “Denktaş Adına Listeler Dağılıyor [Lists distributed on Denktaş’s behalf].” *Kurtuluş*, 19.6.1976.

<sup>440</sup> The Greek Cypriot side was represented by the minister of foreign affairs. “Niye New York’a Tatar’ı Gönderdi [Why did he send Tatar to New York]?” *Halkın Sesi*, 13.6.1976.

undermined by İrsen Küçük and also admits that they reciprocated (cited in Besim 2011: 114). In the Famagusta district, competition between the groups of Orhan Zihni and İsmet Kotak was also obvious, and it was not a secret that the sides explicitly campaigned against each other.<sup>441</sup> Denктаş himself was said to be involved by covertly circulating the list of UBP candidates he favored.<sup>442</sup>

As all these suggest, by the time it finished its establishment process the UBP clearly showed major symptoms of clientelistic parties. The passive role given to the members; its non-ideological character; and the method of recruitment and electioneering are typical of machine parties. Having outlined the anatomy of the party in this chapter, in the next chapter I will analyze how these characteristics of the party affected its performance in government, and look at the development of the intra-party relations in the two-decade period until the late 1990s. I will show how choices made in the establishment process conditioned the UBP's future organizational development and made it susceptible to endless factional feuding.

---

<sup>441</sup> Ergün Tamer: "Şimdi de Başbakanlık Savaşı [And now the battle over premiership]." *Halkın Sesi*, 24.6.1976; "'Kanun Adamı' Bilgehan Seçim Günü Kanunu Çiğnedi [Bilgehan, 'the man of law,' broke the law on the ballot day]." *Yenidüzen*, 29.6.1976.

<sup>442</sup> One of Denктаş's targets was Osman Örek, one of the most respected leaders of the pre-1974 period along with Dr Küçük and Denктаş; in other words, a potential rival. See "Denктаş Adına Listeler Dağılıyor [Lists distributed on Denктаş's behalf]." *Kurtuluş*, 19.6.1976; see also "Denктаş: Artık Yabani Güvercin Demem [Denктаş: I will not say wild dove again]." *Halkın Sesi*, 15.6.1976.

## Chapter 5: A Ruling Party at Odds with Itself

The UBP won the first multi-party election by a landslide. By reaping the benefits of the electoral system, the party managed to gain thirty of the forty seats with some 53 percent of the votes. With a three-fourths majority in the parliament, now there was nothing that could stop the UBP from taking the much-delayed decisions that would bring about stability and prosperity. Nothing, it turned out, but itself. Like other clientelistic catch-all parties such as the DC, throughout its long stints in power, the UBP showed immobilism and failed to deliver public goods, not least economic development, largely due to endless power struggles within the party, which made devising and implementing a coherent program impossible. There were simply too many rivals and irreconcilable interests represented within the party.

The intra-party feuding, which had started in the establishment period did not come to an end after the election. If anything, it intensified. During the first parliament (1976-1981), many founding members resigned from the party. Those who left were not ordinary members. In the period concerned, at different points, 12 deputies including the first two prime ministers of the TFSC resigned with serious accusations, and the disaffected deputies gave countless memorandums to the party leader. Notably, from the statements of those who resigned, it is understood that the disputes did not arise from disagreement over policy but rather over the distribution of cabinet seats and petty conflicts of interest. At the end of an extremely turbulent period, by the next election in 1981, the old guard was almost completely eliminated and the new guard came to control the party. This did not mark the beginning of a period of stability, however. Ironically, towards the end of the period, a crack was opened, this time, between the new guard and Denktaş who had initially encouraged them in their quest to eliminate the old guard.

It is true that catch-all parties are riven with such infighting and factionalism. Yet, to fully explain the level of tension experienced in the UBP, the role of Denktaş should be opened to discussion. Illustrating this is one of the aims of this chapter. It will be shown that to a large extent Denktaş managed to manipulate the political agenda with backroom deals until the early 1990s. He was so successful in pulling the strings behind the scenes that the only major study in English language on the Turkish Cypriot politics in the post-1974 period concludes that he did not play a role in domestic politics at all. According to Dodd (1993:

111), Denktaş withdrew himself completely out of domestic politics. The fact that he was directly elected by people, Dodd argues, “helped distance him from everyday politics – unlike Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk) in Turkey in the aftermath of the War of Liberation when in order to retain influence he had to control the Grand National Assembly – and the Republican People’s Party” (*ibid.*). Remarkably, a more recent study in Turkish language by Egemen arrives at a diametrically opposite conclusion about the role he played in this period. According to Egemen, there was not much going on in the inter-communal negotiations, therefore, Denktaş had enough time to singlehandedly shape domestic politics, and hence emerged as the sole “patron” in the period concerned (2006: 216-20).

Neither account does accurately reflect the situation on the ground as they both overlook the inextricably intertwined nature of domestic politics and Cyprus negotiations on the one hand, and the ongoing intra-party power struggle to take over the control of the machine, on the other. By focusing on this tug of war, I aim to show that Denktaş was not above parties or politics but rather he was right in the middle of it, not as the sole patron though, but as one of the protagonists whose power ebbed and flowed over time. This was mainly due to the semi-presidential character of the system of government. It led to the strengthening of the prime minister vis-à-vis the president, and forced Denktaş to keep an eye on the developments within the UBP to avoid the rise of a potential or actual contender for power. Though in the early years of the TFSC, he had managed to fend off such a nuisance by playing different groups off each other, his tricks eventually ran out, and a crack opened within the party. After Eroğlu’s ascendance to premiership in 1985<sup>443</sup>, probably more than anything else, the power struggle between these two most prominent figures of the Turkish Cypriot political life in general, and the right-wing politics in particular, began to shape the political arena. Ironically, it was the chasm between these two leaders of the nationalist camp, which would pave the way for the collapse of the old regime in the run up to the Annan plan referendum. In this respect, the sometime open, sometime latent political struggle between these figures will be an underlying element of this and the following chapter.

---

<sup>443</sup> Eroğlu became the leader of the party in the extraordinary party congress in December 1983, and took over the premiership after the 1985 parliamentary election. In the meantime, there was a transition government in power, which took over when the last elected-parliament of the TFSC was turned into a constituent assembly with the addition of appointed deputies after the unilateral declaration of independence on 15 November 1983.

Against this backdrop, in the rest of Chapter Five, I will chart the political developments at intra and inter-party level in the late 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. Among other things, by showing the intensity of personal power struggles and the lack of discipline within the UBP<sup>444</sup>, I will illustrate that rather than ideology or programme, the party continued to be held together by clientelism or to use Schattschneider's terms, by the "cohesive power of public plunder" (cited in Sartori: 52-3). This character of the party goes a long way to account for the failure in economic development efforts as well. Additionally, I will touch upon the political competition at the inter-party level and the significant role played by Ankara in keeping the UBP in power, and hence forming a "guided democracy".

### 5.1 The Rise of the Junta

The party's internal divisions, already evident in the campaign trail, burst out once the election was won. The first civil war within the party broke out immediately after the election in the form of a succession crisis.<sup>445</sup> Who would be the prime minister and leader of the party after Denktaş who was by constitution forbidden to hold the party chairmanship? There were at least four hopefuls. Those being talked about included Osman Örek and Vedat Çelik. However, Orhan Zihni Bilgehan and Nejat Konuk were mentioned most. After consultations with various political actors for two weeks, Denktaş decided to appoint Konuk as his prime minister -though he was not his first choice.<sup>446</sup> In accordance with Denktaş's election pledge to renew his team, in the first Konuk cabinet, five of the ten seats went to the new members of the parliament: Eroğlu, Hakkı Atun, Mehmet Altınay, Ali Atun, İrsen Küçük, and the sixth seat went to a former bureaucrat from outside the parliament, Nail Asaf. Indeed, Nejat Konuk and Erol Kazım aside, none of the members of the new cabinet had ever taken part in a government before 1973.<sup>447</sup> Experienced names like Örek, Kotak, Tatar, Manyera, and Korhan were all out. Of particular importance was the

---

<sup>444</sup> As mentioned in the theoretical chapter, this is an indirect indicator of political clientelism.

<sup>445</sup> See for instance Ergün Tamer: "Şimdi de Başbakanlık Savaşı [And now the battle over premiership]." *Halkın Sesi*, 24.6.1976; "UBP'de Başbakanlık Bunalımı Var [Crisis over premiership in the UBP]." *Halkın Sesi*, 28.6.1976.

<sup>446</sup> According to Kotak, Denktaş and the Turkish ambassador Asaf İnhan's choice was Vedat Çelik ("Tekerleme ile İktidara Yeniden Adaylık Koyan Parti [The party which wants to come to power again by regurgitating the same things]." *Olay*, 26.1.1981); see also İsmet Kotak: "UBP Gitsin de Kim Gelirse Gelsin Demiyoruz [We do not say that it does not matter whoever replaces the UBP as long as it is replaced]." *Demokratik Halk Gazetesi*, 11.6.1981.

<sup>447</sup> Only two out of eleven, Erol Kazım and Nejat Konuk had ever served in a cabinet before 1973. For the cabinets see Fevzioglu 1998: 55, 62.

elimination of Kotak, probably the most influential social democrat within the party. Though the premiership was in the old guard's hands, the new round of the intra-party rivalry was obviously won by the new-guard.

The new cabinet not only failed to impress independent observers<sup>448</sup> but also sowed the first seeds of division, as some of the party members' expectations were not met. Particularly, Kotak, who found himself out in the cold, was resentful. He organized other backbenchers close to him and waged a war in the parliamentary committees against the cabinet, blocking the passing of bills, and effectively paralyzing the operation of the government.<sup>449</sup> Furthermore, even before its first year in office came to an end, two groups of deputies gave the prime minister memoranda urging him to make changes in his cabinet.<sup>450</sup> The secretary general of the party, Raif Denктаş, also talked about "a fresh start".<sup>451</sup> When their memorandum went unheeded, six of them resigned as members of the parliamentary committees in protest.<sup>452</sup> Two of them who were in the executive committee, and four of them who were also in the party assembly resigned from those posts as well.<sup>453</sup> Few months later Kotak left the party. Soon, another deputy, Özel Tahsin<sup>454</sup> who was known to be close to Kotak followed him.<sup>455</sup>

Discontent was not limited to the backbenchers. When it came to governing, it was seen that the conflict between contending interest groups was so big that working in harmony in the cabinet was impossible. In the then minister of interior, Orhan Zihni's words, "every minister had his own kingdom; all of them were more concerned with satisfying their

---

<sup>448</sup> Eşref Çetinel: "Ve Bakanlar Kurulu [And the council of ministers]." *Bozkurt*, 7.7.1976.

<sup>449</sup> Kotak interviewed by author. See also Eşref Çetinel: "UBP'de Neler Oluyor [What is going on in the UBP]?" *Bozkurt*, 21.12.1976.

<sup>450</sup> See "İsmet Kotak Ulusal Birlik Partisi'nden İstifa Etti [Kotak resigned from the UBP]." *Bozkurt*, 2.9.1977; See also "Dokuz UBP'li Milletvekili Hükümetin İstifasını İstedi [9 deputies have demanded the resignation of the government]." *Halkın Sesi*, 5.6.1977; Fuat Veziroğlu: "Parça Parça [Broken into pieces]." *Halkın Sesi*, 18.6.1977.

<sup>451</sup> "Raif Denктаş: 'Yeni Bir Başlangıç Gerecektir' [Raif Denктаş: A fresh start will be needed]." *Zaman*, 9.6.1977.

<sup>452</sup> İsmet Kotak, Özel Tahsin, Hüseyin Curcioğlu, Feridun Adahan, Hasan Murat, Mustafa Hacı Ahmet ("Altı UBP Milletvekili Meclis Komitelerinden İstifa Etti [6 UBP deputies have resigned from the parliamentary committees]." *Halkın Sesi*, 15.7.1977).

<sup>453</sup> "UBP'li Dört Milletvekili Parti Meclisinden İstifa Etti [4 UBP deputies have resigned from the party assembly]." *Halkın Sesi*, 17.7.1977; "Hasan Murat ve Özel Tahsin UBP Merkez Yönetim Kurulundan İstifa Ettiler [Murat and Tahsin have resigned from the UBP's executive committee]." *Zaman*, 16.7.1977.

<sup>454</sup> See Olay, 17.7.1978.

<sup>455</sup> Later, he returned to the party (According to İsmet Kotak, they (Özel Tahsin and Hüseyin Curcioğlu) were forced by the Türk-Sen leader, Necati Taşkın to do so, and they were promised a seat in the cabinet in return (interviewed by author).

bunch of followers than working for the common good of the society".<sup>456</sup> Given this, no wonder that three ministers resigned even before the first year of the government was over. Altınay, the minister of finance who was the first to resign showed "the lack of harmony within the party" as the cause of his resignation.<sup>457</sup> In his resignation statement he pointed out "the conflict of different philosophies and views" and "a competition to protect different interest groups" within the party.<sup>458</sup> The statement continued as follows:

While a number of urgent economic and financial problems were piling up, the factions within the party turned their attention to a battle for seats in the cabinet, and the intra-party conflict reached to a level damaging the public's interests.

He left the party as well, and after few months joined the TKP.<sup>459</sup> In the statement, he issued upon joining the TKP, he said "[i]n the UBP government, the constitution has been disregarded, and the state lost its functionality due to an administrative chaos ... internal and external problems have been addressed with arbitrary, particularistic, short-term and superficial approaches".<sup>460</sup> Although, the resignations of the ministers of education, and commerce were also mooted at the time, Konuk said this was "out of the question".<sup>461</sup> However, he was confounded few months later, when the minister of education, Eroğlu tendered his resignation. His reasons were not so different from Altınay's: "Unrest within the party due to different views, lack of discipline, and disharmony".<sup>462</sup> Unlike Altınay, he did not leave the party, but rather focused on strengthening his base in the Famagusta district.

Nail Asaf, who was the minister of commerce with no political background, quit silently.<sup>463</sup> At a time when imports were subject to controls, his position was of immense significance. He was under the pressure of commercial interest groups within the party. Tired of this, when he went to Denktaş to ask for his help, the answer he received from the president

---

<sup>456</sup> Interviewed by author.

<sup>457</sup> "Yeni Bakan Bugün Açıklanacak [The new minister to be announced today]." *Zaman*, 16.12.1976.

<sup>458</sup> "Mehmet Altınay İstifa Nedenini Açıkladı: UBP'de Toplum Çıkarlarına Zararlı Çalışmalar Var [Altınay revealed why he resigned: The UBP is working against the interests of the people]." *Bozkurt*, 18.12.1976.

<sup>459</sup> "Altınay TKP'ye Geçti [Altınay joined the TKP]." *Halkın Sesi*, 28.6.1977.

<sup>460</sup> Altınay's Statements cited in "Altınay TKP'ye Geçti [Altınay joined the TKP]." *Halkın Sesi*, 28.6.1977.

<sup>461</sup> "Konuk: Yeni Bir İstifa Soz Konusu Değil [Konuk: A new resignation is out of question]." *Bozkurt*, 18.12.1976.

<sup>462</sup> "Dr Derviş Eroğlu Bakanlıktan Ayrıldı [Dr Derviş Eroğlu resigned as minister]." *Bozkurt*, 7.5.1977.

<sup>463</sup> See "UBP İçinde Listelerin Dolıştığına İlişkin Haber Spekülasyondan İbaredir [The newspaper reports alleging that lists are circulated within the UBP ranks are speculation]." *Zaman*, 23.6.1977.

was quite telling: “You took this ministry business too seriously!” with further remarks implicitly, advising him not to bite the hand, which feeds him.<sup>464</sup> Obviously, Denктаş did not want to trouble the KTTO and sacrificed Asaf. It is remarkable that two of the ministers to resign had key policy-making portfolios.

Konuk himself lasted only a little bit more. Although he had weathered the first storm in May 1977 by making a small-scale cabinet reshuffle, in March 1978, he finally succumbed and tendered his resignation as prime minister, party leader, and party member. Though he was convinced to form the government once again by Ankara<sup>465</sup>, few days later he withdrew on the grounds of ill health.<sup>466</sup> To understand this resignation, we have to look at the balance of power within the party, as well as the broader political context, where Denктаş and Ankara were involved as protagonists.

When we look at the intra-party situation, we see that the new guard, who waged a war against the old guard before the elections, played a major role in this resignation. Unlike those in the DC, it is difficult to call this group a faction as it had a fluid structure with transient alliances and it is equally difficult to say the competition was fuelled by ideological differences though this was not completely absent. Main figures of the new guard were Raif Denктаş, İrsen Küçük and Enver Emin, the Nicosia clique, who ideologically represented the right wing of the party. Particularly, Raif Denктаş was said to have close relations with the MHP.<sup>467</sup> Those they opposed to, Kotak and Konuk, on the other hand represented the social democratic wing.<sup>468</sup> Still, in the final analysis, it should be noted that personal power struggle aspect outweighed the role of ideology as the cause of the conflict.

---

<sup>464</sup> Anonymous interviewee who was present at the meeting.

<sup>465</sup> See İsmet Kotak: “CHP ve Bürokratlar [The CHP and bureaucrats].” *Olay*, 1.5.1978; see also Konuk cited in Besim (2011: 122). Here Konuk says, he was asked by the Turkish ambassador and the foreign minister to withdraw his resignation.

<sup>466</sup> “Konuk Başbakanlık Görevinden Affını İstedi [Konuk resigned as prime minister].” *Zaman*, 12.4.1978.

<sup>467</sup> See for instance Refik Erduran: “1979 Kıbrıs’ta Dönüm Yılı [1979: The turning point in Cyprus] (7).” *Milliyet*, 14.1.1979.

<sup>468</sup> According to *Milliyet*, Konuk was under pressure from the MHP wing of the Turkish government (Akay Cemal: “Rumlar Ecevit’in Açıklamasını İhtiyatla Karşıladi [Greek Cypriots cautious about the statements of Ecevit].” *Milliyet*, 11.1.1978).

The key person of the Nicosia clique was İrsen Küçük, a wealthy landowner<sup>469</sup>. Similar to Raif Denктаş, his power largely derived from his surname. He was the nephew of the former community leader Dr Küçük, and indeed he was admitted to the party to weaken his uncle's strong opposition against the UBP: "We toured the villages together. Everyone saw that our biggest critic's nephew had joined us," Konuk recounts (cited in Besim 2011: 113-4). Unlike Raif Denктаş, however, thanks to his position in the cabinet as the minister of agriculture, he managed to build a political base of his own in a short time<sup>470</sup> (see also Egemen 2006: 229). By establishing a patronage network around the ministry and affiliated institutions, and capitalizing on his uncle's surname, İrsen Küçük soon became a heavyweight within the party, and before long set his eyes on the premiership.

What finally triggered Konuk's resignation was a demonstration organized by the Farmers Association to protest the government's decision to raise the price of diesel fuel (see also Dodd 1993: 114), and the active role played by the Nicosia clique in this demonstration.<sup>471</sup> It should be noted that, earlier, six other professional associations, including the KTTO, protested the decision, and called a strike, which brought the commercial life to a halt. The price hike was indeed part of a larger package of austerity measures, which were introduced after "consultations" with Ankara. In other words, the prime minister Konuk was between a rock and a hard place.

*Halkın Sesi* reported the Association's demonstration with a piece entitled, "The UBP members strongly protested the UBP government," commenting that such things could happen only in the TFSC.<sup>472</sup> Two UBP deputies, Civisilli and Hacıahmetođlu played a leading role in the organization of the demonstration.<sup>473</sup> Raif Denктаş, who was the deputy secretary general of the party at the time, gave his support openly by sending a telegram, which was read aloud at the demonstration. In the face of this revolt within the party,

---

<sup>469</sup> Örsan Öymen: "Kıbrıs'ta Battaniyenin Ekonomi Politiđi [The political economy of blanket in Cyprus]." *Milliyet*, 2.4.1978.

<sup>470</sup> Refik Erduran: "1979 Kıbrıs'ta Dönüm Yılı [1979: The turning point in Cyprus] (7)." *Milliyet*, 14.1.1979; "Hayvan Yetiştiricileri ve Besleyicileri Birliđi Yeksan Bakay Açıklama Yaptı [The chairman of the association of animal husbandry issued a statement]." *Yeni Devir*, 10.1.1979; "UBP'nin Partizanlıđı Büyüyor: TKP Hesap Soracak [The UBP's clientelism is growing: The TKP will hold accountable]." *Kurtuluş*, 9.1.1980.

<sup>471</sup> Enver Emin interviewed by author; for a detailed analysis see "Hükümet Buhranının Hikayesi [The story of the government crisis]." *Olay*, 17.4.1978; see also Örsan Öymen: "Girne'de Bir Buluşma [A meeting in Kyrenia]." *Milliyet*, 1.4.1978.

<sup>472</sup> 24.3.1978.

<sup>473</sup> *Ibid.*

Konuk decided to resign: "I could have started a disciplinary action and dismissed them from the party, but this would have created tension with the president who shared the same surname with the deputy secretary general," he said.<sup>474</sup>

In fact, Konuk was initially convinced to withdraw his resignation and to form a new government, when his two conditions were accepted: Raif Denktaş's resignation as the deputy secretary general, and the exclusion of İrsen Küçük from the cabinet.<sup>475</sup> "Whatever it takes, the UBP should become an internally coherent and disciplined party with members who fully believe in its program,"<sup>476</sup> he was quoted as saying after accepting to form a government upon the guarantee given by the parliamentary party to support him unconditionally. "I resigned earlier, when I came to realize that I had difficulty in implementing the program of the party due to lack of discipline and support from the party administration, and because I faced resistance in dispensing the public benefits in a socially just manner," he continued.<sup>477</sup> His intention was to form a government with the participation of technocrats.<sup>478</sup> Though Raif Denktaş accepted to resign<sup>479</sup>, İrsen Küçük responded by flexing his political muscle. In the blink of an eye, he mobilized the chairmen of 120 out of 136 party sections along with 161 *mukhtars* behind himself.<sup>480</sup> Obviously, he was firmly in control of the party's grassroots organizations thanks to his patronage power.

Having failed to elicit Denktaş's support against İrsen Küçük and realizing that he stood no chance of winning a probable race for leadership against him in the upcoming party conference, Konuk surrendered.<sup>481</sup> His statements after the second resignation shed further light on the nature of Turkish Cypriot politics: As for the intra-party power struggle,

---

<sup>474</sup> "Konuk İstifa Nedenlerini Olay'a Açıkladı [Konuk revealed the reasons behind his resignation to Olay]." *Olay*, 24.4.1978.

<sup>475</sup> "Hükümet Buhranının Hikayesi [The story of the government crisis]." *Olay*, 17.4.1978, p. 16.

<sup>476</sup> "Konuk Yeniden Görevde [Konuk in office again]." *Halkın Sesi*, 29.3.1978.

<sup>477</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>478</sup> "Konuk İstifa Nedenlerini Olay'a Açıkladı [Konuk revealed the reasons behind his resignation to Olay]." *Olay*, 24.4.1978, p. 19.

<sup>479</sup> See "Raif Denktaş UBP Genel Sekreter Yardımcılığı Görevinden İstifa Etti [Raif Denktaş resigned as deputy secretary general of the UBP]." *Zaman*, 14.4.1978.

<sup>480</sup> "161 Muhtar ve 120 UBP Örgüt Başkanı Çağrıda Bulunarak Bunalımın Sona Ermesini İstediler, ve 'Halka Hizmet Eden, Halkı Daima Yanında Bulur' dediler [161 *mukhtar* and 120 UBP section chairmen demanded an end to the crisis. 'Whoever serves the people, finds the people behind him,' they said]." *Zaman*, 4.4.1978; see also "İ. Küçük: Başbakan Karşı Eylem Yoktur. Bütünleşme İstenmektedir. [İ. Küçük: There is no action against the prime minister. Unification is desired]." *Zaman*, 7.4.1978.

<sup>481</sup> He decided to resign after meeting Denktaş. See "Başbakan Nejat Konuk Devlet Başkanı Denktaş'a Temasları Hakkında Bilgi Verdi." *Zaman*, 11.4.1978, and "Konuk Başbakanlık Görevinde Affını İstedi [Konuk has resigned as prime minister]." *Zaman*, 12.4.1978.

"I have always been against clientelism (*partizanlık*). Working only for the benefit of the party would serve nothing but to degenerating democracy," he said. According to Konuk, the developments paving the way for his resignation, particularly the efforts to keep İrsen Küçük in his place, put the party in a ludicrous position in the public opinion; "the party is no longer an institution, which commands people's respect ... it was degraded to a level where a battle could be waged for a cabinet seat; interests". Regarding the role of Denktaş within the party, "it is true that on paper I have power, but I was held under tutelage," Konuk said.<sup>482</sup> He concluded his statements as follows:

I hope the next prime minister will not be someone who works only for the benefit of the party. I hope he will not allow the others to withhold his constitutional authorities, and find ways to prevent such attempts in a definitive way because no prime minister should be held under tutelage. I hope the new prime minister will not suffer the torment I have gone through.<sup>483</sup>

What did Konuk mean when he said he was held under tutelage? To answer this question, a parenthesis should be opened and the relationship between Denktaş, the prime minister and party should be elaborated. First, it should be pointed out that in this period, the UBP leaders and prime ministers were not elected by the party but rather appointed after the selection was made behind closed doors by the so-called Coordination Council -an extra-constitutional body -which involved the president, the Turkish ambassador and the commanders of the Turkish armed forces in the island.<sup>484</sup> The party conference to elect the chairman of the party was held afterwards to rubberstamp this selection. Nor was he independent in running the daily affairs. Firstly, his power was constrained by the president. As Ahmet Atamsoy, a party member close to Konuk, put it, Konuk heard the composition of his cabinet on radio on his way to the president's office<sup>485</sup>, although the constitution vested the power to choose the ministers in the prime minister. The exclusion of Kotak from the cabinet, for instance, was Denktaş's decision, not Konuk's. It was also Denktaş who outlined the targets of the new government.<sup>486</sup> Furthermore, he maintained

---

<sup>482</sup> "Konuk İstifa Nedenlerini Olay'a Açıkladı [Konuk revealed the reasons behind his resignation to Olay]." *Olay*, 24.4.1978.

<sup>483</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>484</sup> Samioğlu interviewed by author.

<sup>485</sup> Ahmet Atamsoy: "Beş Yıllık Deneyimden Sonra UBP'ye Güven Son Bulmuştur [After the 5-year experience, the UBP is not trusted anymore]." *Demokratik Halk Gazetesi*, 22.5.1981.

<sup>486</sup> See "Bakanlar Kurulu'nun Dünkü Toplantısında Başkan Denktaş Ana Hedefleri Açıkladı [Denktaş unveiled the main targets after the Council of Ministers meeting]." *Bozkurt*, 7.7.1976.

to be a player in the executive, particularly by sending his famous personal notes written on small paper scraps (*pusula*) to the ministers concerned about the petitions of citizens, and from time to time he continued presiding over cabinet meetings.<sup>487</sup> Second constrain, (though Konuk did not refer to it) was imposed by Ankara. In a former Turkish ambassador's words "the number two in the Turkish embassy used to attend all cabinet meetings, act like a second prime minister and later in the day report to the ambassador" (İnal Batu cited in İnanç 2007: 100). In other words, the post of prime minister was highly symbolic and in practice the BEY administration was firmly in place even after 1974.

The process following the resignation of Konuk also showed that even ostensibly omnipotent Denктаş did not have a free hand in picking the prime minister. He was in an uneasy situation in the sense that he had to balance not only the demands of different groups within the party but Ankara as well. It was not a secret that Konuk's successor Osman Örek was neither Denктаş's nor the party's pick but rather imposed by Ankara.<sup>488</sup>

İrsen Küçük, by now the strongest man in the party, had to settle for the secretary generalship of the party for the moment.<sup>489</sup> However, he was not deterred. Emboldened by its victory, the Nicosia clique he led, which was now referred to as the junta, toppled Örek within less than seven months, this time triggering a larger crisis. In other words, Konuk's wishes for his successor did not come true and Örek went through a similar ordeal<sup>490</sup>, and his stint came to an abrupt end when seven of his cabinet members tendered their resignations.<sup>491</sup> He quit few days later when his attempt to secure support to form a new government failed. The foremost cause of his resignation, in his words, was "lack of discipline, disharmony and conflicts within the party".<sup>492</sup> He also highlighted that "some of his fellow party members forced him as the head of the government to take decisions that

---

<sup>487</sup> See for instance "Cumhuriyet gazetesi nasıl görüyor [How does the Cumhuriyet newspaper see it?]" *Olay*, 5.1.1981 (Originally published in *Cumhuriyet* (Istanbul)).

<sup>488</sup> Vedat Çelik interviewed by author. It was not a coincidence that the deputy secretary general of the CHP "came to Cyprus for a vacation" two days after Konuk's final resignation ("Orhan Birgit Federe Devletimizde [Orhon Birgit in our federated state]." *Zaman*, 15.4.1978.

<sup>489</sup> "İrsen Küçük UBP Genel Sekreteri Seçildi [İrsen Küçük has been elected as secretary general of the UBP]." *Zaman*, 4.4.1978.

<sup>490</sup> Few days before his resignation he was also given an "ultimatum" by the parliamentary party ("Ültimeatom [Ultimatum]." *Yeni Devir*, 22.11.1978).

<sup>491</sup> "Örek Yedi Bakanın İstifa Ettiğini Doğruladı [Örek confirmed the resignation of seven ministers]." *Bozkurt*, 28.11.1978.

<sup>492</sup> "Osman Örek Devlet Başkanına İstifasını Sundu [Osman Örek tendered his resignation to the president]." *Bozkurt*, 2.12.1978.

would violate the constitution” and that “they most of the time pushed the public interest aside and acted for political expedience”.<sup>493</sup>

The causes of Örek’s resignation were not so different from the ones expressed by Konuk earlier. Yet, his statements about the functioning of the party were even more striking and bolder. In an interview he gave to the Turkish daily *Hürriyet*, he revealed the conflict between the government and parliamentary party; particularistic demands; and how this conflict made the country ungovernable:<sup>494</sup>

The conflict fundamentally derives from the meanings we attribute to the state, government and constitutional principles. This disease emerged in the very first meeting of the Federated Assembly where we had a two-thirds majority [*sic*]. The majority of the fellow parliamentary party members had views regarding the position of the speaker of the parliament and government that would bring about a “parliamentary dictatorship”.<sup>495</sup>

Another fundamental difference: We, as the government, are bound by the government program, budget and annual plan. In the program, we have said that we were going to cut spending and increase revenue.

Today, the tax burden is on the civil servants and workers employed in the public sector. There has been a tax bill in the parliament for years. No one even talks about it ... To give an example, we wanted to update the price of hunting licenses, which had not been changed since 1936. After great difficulty, we passed it in the parliament. Imagine a citizen, who pays 10 thousand liras to buy a hunting rifle. When we ask this fellow to pay 100 liras for annual license, all hell breaks loose. Is that normal?

When asked about the disagreements within the cabinet, the former prime minister answered as follows:

The basic problem is this: Imagine a government, which the society expects to solve urgent problems with bills and decisions based on principles. And you, as the council of ministers, are made to deal with such issues as giving civil servant X a pay rise, transferring civil servant Y from one place to another, and raising the salary of a watchman in village Z by 50 lira.

Even more striking than these statements is what Örek revealed about the level of

---

<sup>493</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>494</sup> Ziya Akçapar: “Kıbrıs’ta Gizli Savaş [Secret war in Cyprus].” *Hürriyet* (Reprinted in *Kurtuluş*, 15.12.1978).

<sup>495</sup> Elsewhere Örek said that the parliamentary party had the tendency to act as a “government above government”. Particularly, they wanted to have a say on the government bills, and appointments to the high level posts in the bureaucracy (*Halkın Sesi*, 7.12.1978).

corruption within the UBP, when the interviewer reminded him that even some party members call the government “the government of smugglers”. Among other things, he conceded that he turned a blind eye to the smuggling activities of the fellow deputies’ relatives, in the name of preserving the party’s unity:

Let’s talk straight. Has smuggling started with my government? ... Strange but true; do you know who is accusing the government most about smuggling? One stands up, and goes like “smugglers are passing through the Ledra Palace checkpoint. Is the government sleeping?” You look into it, and find out that who is smuggling is the father-in-law of this fellow deputy. He did everything to cover it up. We say the party, we say the [national] cause and bite our lip. He keeps shouting. Another fellow deputy shouts. You look into it and see that he is in collaboration with another smuggler.

Örek’s resignation as prime minister, party leader, and party member triggered a domino effect. Erol Kazım, Feridun Adahan, Tansel Fikri, Orhan Zihni and Hüseyin Curcioğlu followed him.<sup>496</sup> When Mustafa Hacıahmetoğlu resigned due to different reasons, the UBP lost its majority in the parliament.<sup>497</sup> At this point, Denктаş interfered, and made the so-called Türk-Sen deputies return to the party by using his influence on the Türk-Sen president, Necati Taşkın.<sup>498</sup> After this, Orhan Zihni and Hacıahmetoğlu also returned and Tansel Fikri gave support while staying independent.

But why did not Denктаş use his clout before things got out of hand? First, it would be a mistake to see this only as a vicious intra-party power struggle. If we are to reach a more complete understanding, these developments should be put into the broader context of Cyprus problem, and Denктаş’s desire to remain at the helm should be factored in. No matter what he said, Denктаş’s actions in this period demonstrated that he did not espouse the form of government and, in the course of the 1970s, what we see is “presidential primacy” in the executive branch. Indeed, all Denктаş needed was a lightning rod to deflect

---

<sup>496</sup> İsmet Kotak: “Konular [Issues].” *Olay*, 23.1.1979.

<sup>497</sup> “Vesayet Altında Hükümet [Government under tutelage].” *Olay*, 26.2.1979, p.8.

<sup>498</sup> Özel Tahsin and Hüseyin Curcioğlu were forced by the Türk-Sen leader, Necati Taşkın to return to the party (Kotak interviewed by author; see also “Özel Tahsin ve Curcioğlu Ya UBP’ye Döner Ya da Taşkın’ı Yıpratırız [Either Özel Tahsin and Curcioğlu returns to the UBP or we will go against Taşkın].” *Yeni Devir*, 17.1.1979), and they were promised one seat among them in the cabinet (Kotak interviewed by author; İsmet Kotak: “Konular [Issues].” *Olay*, 23.1.1979; “Vesayet Altında Hükümet [Government under tutelage].” *Olay*, 26.2.1979, p.10). Çağatay appointed Tahsin as the minister of labor a year and a half later (“Özel Tahsin’in Bakanlığı [The ministerial post of Özel Tahsin].” *Olay*, 25.8.1980, pp. 22-3). For a counter argument see “Taşkın, Ö. Tahsin ve Curcioğlu’na Sendikal Hiçbir Baskı Yapılmadığını Söyledi [Taşkın said that Ö. Tahsin ve Curcioğlu were not pressured by the trade union].” *Yeni Devir*, 31.1.1979.

criticisms in domestic politics. An independent and strong prime minister, who could go beyond that would be a threat to his power. So the presence of an intra-party opposition was an effective means to keep the prime minister's power in check, and hence it was in Denktaş's favour; of course, so long as this competition did not lead to the UBP losing its majority in the parliament.

Indeed, at the time there was a wide consensus in the political circles that Konuk's resignation was the result of "collusion between the father and son Denktaş".<sup>499</sup> Some believe that Denktaş undermined him, when he came to perceive him as a threat to his monopoly of handling the relations with Ankara as well as the Cyprus negotiations.<sup>500</sup> The developments in the run up to Konuk's toppling corroborate this account. Few months before Konuk's resignation, Ecevit<sup>501</sup> who was known to have disagreements with Denktaş over the strategy to solve the Cyprus conflict, not only upgraded the status of his Turkish Cypriot counterpart, Konuk, vis-à-vis Denktaş by inviting him to Ankara<sup>502</sup>, but also welcomed the involvement, and contribution of the opposition in the negotiation process. Ahmet Tolgay, who participated in this trip as a member of the Turkish Cypriot delegation suggests that the rising prestige of Konuk was not welcomed on the island (cited in Besim 2011: 121). "I faced with jealousies and tricks of politics for the first time after this Ankara visit," he recounted decades later (*ibid.*).

After Örek's resignation, and Denktaş's refusal to give the premiership to İrsen Küçük<sup>503</sup>, the junta did not feel the need to hide the fact that "they were looking for a weak prime minister".<sup>504</sup> They found what they were looking for in Mustafa Çağatay (henceforth Çağatay). This was a curious choice because few months before, Çağatay also resigned as the minister of health because of "the disorganization within the parliamentary party" only

---

<sup>499</sup> Refik Erduran: "1979: Kıbrıs'ta Dönüm Yılı [1979: The turning point in Cyprus] (7)." *Milliyet*, 14.1.1979.

<sup>500</sup> Fuat Veziroğlu: "Temeldeki Neden [Fundamental reason]." *Olay*, 17.4.1978; see also Ahmet Tolgay cited in Besim (2011: 117-21); Kotak interviewed by author.

<sup>501</sup> Ecevit was prime minister again from 5.1.1978 to 12.11.1979.

<sup>502</sup> "Ecevit Denktaş'la Telefonla Yarım Saat Görüştü; Nejat Konuk Ankara'ya Davet Edildi [Ecevit talked with Denktaş on the phone for half an hour; Konuk invited to Ankara]." *Milliyet*, 10.1.1978. See also Ahmet Tolgay cited in Besim (2011: 117-21).

<sup>503</sup> "UBP Kurultayı: Cunta Partiye El Koydu [The UBP Congress: The junta seized control of the party]." *Olay*, 10.3.1980, pp. 18-9.

<sup>504</sup> "Vesayet Altında Hükümet [Government under tutelage]." *Olay*, 26.2.1979, p. 7.

to return a week later after assurances of his fellow deputies.<sup>505</sup> Under Çağatay, the influence of the parliamentary party, to whom he owed his premiership, grew. The influential deputies started to attend cabinet meetings “to make sure that the group held the reigns”.<sup>506</sup> In other words, “the parliamentary dictatorship,” Örek had pointed out earlier was finally established.

The party administration was under the junta’s control. İrsen Küçük was still the secretary general and the central committee was largely made up of the junta members including Raif Denктаş, Enver Emin and Recep Ali Gürler.<sup>507</sup> Even more importantly they took the complete control of the grassroots organizations. By the 1980 party conference, they placed their loyalists into the delegate lists, which would vote in the primary elections the following year. The number of delegates was again highly inflated. If the figures were to be believed, the UBP had 35 thousand members in Nicosia alone, where the total number of registered voters stood at 37 thousand; and 24,500 members in Famagusta where there were 26 thousand registered voters.<sup>508</sup>

After the establishment of the first Çağatay government, the party seemed to be stabilized for a while. This did not last long, however.

## **5.2 Split Within the Junta and Raif Denктаş’s Anti-Clientelistic Intra-Party Opposition**

By late 1980, intra-party affairs started to take a new turn, when for the first time, Raif Denктаş, a representative of the powerful junta started publicly complaining about, and exposing the party’s clientelistic structure and policies. This section will outline the process,

---

<sup>505</sup> First, the party announced that his resignation was accepted (“İstifası Kabul Edilen Çağatay’ın UBP Grubunda Derleyici Rol Alması Umuluyor [Çağatay whose resignation was accepted by the UBP group is hoped to play a role in putting the party together].” *Zaman*, 11.7.1978). A week later, the party announced that he would keep his post as minister (“Çağatay Bakanlığa Devam Edecek [Çağatay will continue as minister].” *Zaman*, 18.7.1978). According to *Olay*, Çağatay was one of the dissidents within the party until he was offered a seat in the cabinet (“Vesayet Altında Hükümet [Government under tutelage].” *Olay*, 26.2.1979, p.6).

<sup>506</sup> According to *Olay*, backbenchers like Enver Emin, Hasan Murat, Raif Denктаş and Şemsi Kazım were regulars at the cabinet meetings, while Mehmet Bayram attended occasionally (“Vesayet Altında Hükümet [Government under tutelage].” *Olay*, 26.2.1979, p. 7).

<sup>507</sup> “UBP Kurultayı: Cunta Partiye El Koydu [The UBP Congress: The junta seized control of the party].” *Olay*, 10.3.1980, pp. 18-9.

<sup>508</sup> “UBP Seçimlerinde Sahtekarlık... Girne Seçimleri İptal Edildi: UBP Kongre Delege Sayıları da Şişirildi [Fraud in the UBP Elections... The Kyrenia Elections Cancelled: The UBP delegate numbers inflated]!” *Kurtuluş*, 19.3.1980.

which started as intra-party, anti-clientelistic, renewal movement and culminated with Raif Denктаş's resignation from the party after his defeat in the primaries ahead of the 1981 parliamentary election. Essentially, what Raif Denктаş said was not so different from what other dissidents had said before. What made Raif Denктаş different was (a) his decision to stay and fight, and (b) his surname. His failure to transform the party therefore can also be seen as a major watershed in what would become the de-Denktashization of the UBP and a harbinger of more instability in the years to come.

The first sign of the approaching storm came in April 1980 when Raif Denктаş in a parliamentary speech described the UBP's four years in government as a failure to Çağatay's chagrin, who replied Raif Denктаş by reminding him of his duties to the party and saying he "should learn intra-party discipline".<sup>509</sup> The performance of the party in the municipal elections held in June, did not help Çağatay either. Particularly, Kyrenian members of the cabinet (Gürçağ, Çaydamlı and Çağatay himself) were held responsible for the electoral defeat in Kyrenia.<sup>510</sup> In November, the pressure on Çağatay piled further up when he received two consecutive memoranda from six dissident Famagusta deputies<sup>511</sup> led by Eroğlu who made his debut as a rising party star, followed by a boycott of the parliament.<sup>512</sup>

On the face of it, this was "a call for dynamism," and an attempt "to warn the government about important issues in accordance with parliamentary regime and intra-party democracy".<sup>513</sup> According to Kotak, a former UBP deputy from Famagusta and a journalist, however, this was all about grabbing a cabinet seat, which would be of immense help to get re-elected in the upcoming elections: Famagustians were demanding three ministries on the ground that Famagusta was underrepresented with only one seat (Ali Atun) while

---

<sup>509</sup> "UBP'yi Eleştirdi [He criticized the UBP]." *Olay*, 21.4.1980, p. 11.

<sup>510</sup> Editorial: "Ders Almak [To learn a lesson]." *Yeni Zaman* (Reprinted in *Kurtuluş*, 4.6.1980).

<sup>511</sup> The memoranda were signed by Eroğlu, Bayram, Civisilli, Öztürk, Curcioğlu and Bilgehan.

<sup>512</sup> "UBP'de Yeni Kavga [New dispute in the UBP]." *Olay*, 3.11.1980, p. 21; "Çağatay 'Hükümet Bunalımı Yok' dedi ['There is no government crisis' Çağatay said]." *Halkın Sesi*, 12.11.1980; "UBP'deki Kargaşa Büyüyor: UBP Milletvekilleri Dün Meclisi Boykot Etti [The chaos in the UBP growing: Yesterday, the UBP deputies boycotted the parliament]." *Kurtuluş*, 14.11.1980; "... Ve Meclis Dün Yine Toplanamadı [... And yesterday the parliament could not convene again]." *Halkın Sesi*, 16.11.1980.

<sup>513</sup> "Muhtıracı UBP Milletvekilleri Hükümetten Dinamizm İstiyor [The UBP deputies who signed the memorandum demand dynamism from the government]." *Bozkurt*, 15.11.1980; "Eroğlu Hareketin Amacını Açıkladı [Eroğlu disclosed the aim of the movement]." *Bozkurt*, 20.11.1980.

despite its small size Kyrenia was having three.<sup>514</sup> Either way, intra-party relations seemed to be far from being harmonious.

This crisis was quickly pushed off the agenda when a scandal broke out involving Cypfruvex, the SEE responsible for management of the exports of the citrus produces, by far the most important cash crop. According to the report submitted to the government and undersigned by the minister of finance as well as the top bureaucrats from various ministries, the company was “virtually bankrupt” and there was a discrepancy of USD 21 million in its books.<sup>515</sup> This was a huge figure for the cash-strapped government as it represented slightly more than half of all export earnings in 1979. Soon, it was revealed by the ministry of finance that the loss of hard currency was much higher than this as there were also some private companies, which did not bring the country the hard currency obtained from exports.<sup>516</sup> At a time when, international trade and foreign currency transactions were supposedly subject to strict government control, this affair was yet another sign showing the weakness of the government to make and enforce laws vis-à-vis not only the private sector but also its own appointees at the SEEs.<sup>517</sup>

Though the Cypfruvex scandal led to the pushing aside of the Famagustians’ revolt<sup>518</sup>, the tension within the party did not ease because contrary to the mood within the parliamentary group, Raif Denктаş was against a cover-up. In his newspaper, where he wrote with the pseudonym, Ülkü Cem, he held the government responsible for the bankruptcy and called for its resignation.<sup>519</sup> Subsequently, he voted along with the

---

<sup>514</sup> “UBP’de Yeni Kavga [New dispute in the UBP].” *Olay*, 3.11.1980, p. 21. It is worth mentioning that though Gürçağ, one of the Kyrenian ministers, tendered his resignation, it was not accepted by Çağatay (İsmet Kotak: “Bir İstifa ve Üç Bakan [A resignation and three ministers].” *Demokratik Halk Gazetesi*, 7.11.1980). Eroğlu denied allegations about their demand for cabinet seats (See “Denктаş’ın Çabası Bunalımı Yumuşattı [Denктаş’s efforts have eased the crisis].” *Halkın Sesi*, 17.11.1980).

<sup>515</sup> For the full report see *Olay*, 17.11.1980, pp. 6-8.

<sup>516</sup> See Erten Kasımoğlu: “3 Yılda Yapılan İhracatlardan KTFD’ye Getirilmeyen Döviz Tutarı: 3 Milyar TL [The amount of hard currency earnings over the three years’ exports, which has not been brought to the TFSC: 3 Billion TL].” *Halkın Sesi*, 10.12.1980; “Ekonomi ve Maliye Bakanı Hakkı Atun Ülkeye Getirilmeyen Dövizler Hakkında Açıklama Yaptı [Hakkı Atun, the minister of economy and finance issued a statement regarding the hard currency earnings that have not been brought to the country].” *Halkın Sesi*, 13.12.1980.

<sup>517</sup> For a critical analysis see two articles by Dr Fazıl Küçük: “Daha Neyi Bekliyorlar [What are they waiting for]?” and “Suç Kimde [Whose fault is it]?” published in *Halkın Sesi* on 2.12.1980 and 11.12.1980 respectively.

<sup>518</sup> It was quickly swept under the carpet thanks to the efforts of Denктаş (“Denктаş’ın Çabası Bunalımı Yumuşattı [Denктаş’s efforts have eased the crisis].” *Halkın Sesi*, 17.11.1980).

<sup>519</sup> Ülkü Cem: “Hükümete [To the government].” *Zaman* (Reprinted in *Kurtuluş*, 7.11.1980); see also the minutes of his speech at the parliament (“Raif Denктаş UBPyi Sarstı [Raif Denктаş shook the UBP].” *Olay*, 24.11.1980, pp. 13-4).

opposition in favour of a motion to open a general debate in the parliament on the agricultural policy of the government.<sup>520</sup> The motion was defeated by a slim margin: 17-16. However, Raif Denktaş's offensive against the government did not subside but rather intensified; now he was targeting the party as a whole. Though his resignation was speculated<sup>521</sup>, he was determined to stay and fight.<sup>522</sup> Accordingly, few weeks later, with a letter addressed to Çağatay, he announced the setting up of the revolutionary Kemalist opposition group within the UBP. He expressed the views and aims of the group with various press conferences, press releases and paid ads.

When these statements are studied, they give the impression that Raif Denktaş was basically trying to form what Shefter calls a "constituency for universalism" or a "constituency for bureaucratic autonomy" within the party against the already entrenched "constituency for patronage". To quote Shefter, these are "the groups that oppose the patronage system, that insist that public benefits and burdens be allocated according to a set of general, universalistic rules and procedures, and that seek to defend the autonomy of the bureaucracy from politicians who seek to intervene before it on a case-by case basis" (1994: 28). In this respect, Raif Denktaş's movement was probably the last chance to reinvent the UBP as a program-oriented party. To show this, below, I will highlight few excerpts from the group's statements, where the analysis of the UBP's stint in government is made.

To start with, according to the group, the government was "spiritless," "directionless," "visionless" and "inept"; "there was no difference between having this government and no government at all". It was basically not doing anything other than "addressing particularistic demands"; it was just "muddling through". In the group's view, the government was incapable of setting up a state mechanism that would solve problems on time and on spot in a universalistic manner. As a result, citizens were forced to look for

---

<sup>520</sup> "Cypfruvex'deki Suistimaller ve Tarım Politikası ile İlgili TKP'nin Genel Görüşme Önerisine, Raif Denktaş Muhalefetle Birlikte Olumlu Oy Verdi [Raif Denktaş voted together with the opposition in favor of the TKP motion to hold a general debate about the abuses in Cypfruvex and the agricultural policy]." *Halkın Sesi*, 5.12.1980; *Olay*, 8.12.1980, p. 20.

<sup>521</sup> "Raif Denktaş UBP'den İstifa Ettiğini Yalanladı [Raif Denktaş denied the allegations that he resigned from the UBP]." *Bozkurt*, 21.11.1980.

<sup>522</sup> "Raif Denktaş: Kesinlikle İstifa Etmem ... 'Hükümet Kaybolan Yılları Geri Getiremedi' [Raif Denktaş: I'm definitely not going to resign ... 'The government fails to make up for lost years']." *Halkın Sesi*, 30.12.1980. For an overall analysis of the developments within the UBP until the late January see *Olay*, 26.1.1981.

particularistic remedies, which in turn led to the taking root of a perception in the public mind that there was an absolute need to find a patron if one is to obtain his rights. In a similar vein, referring to the widespread unemployment problem, they said, “solving the problems of individuals but not addressing the collective causes of them is neither talent nor politics”.<sup>523</sup>

In an op-ed published in *Halkın Sesi*, Raif Denктаş describes the relationship between the business circles, high-level bureaucracy and government as follows:

Bureaucracy has been contaminated by bourgeoisie while bribery and favoritism have been institutionalized. Those who have come to power with the votes of villagers and workers have completely lost their contact with this base and have become conflated with the corrupt high-level bureaucracy. The contact with the base has been reduced to providing benefits to or solving problems of those who can bring votes. In other words, the UBP, which has come to power with the votes of artisans and laborers, in practice have become the government of corrupt bureaucracy-bourgeoisie due to its choices of cabinet members.<sup>524</sup>

This catastrophic state of affairs was the result of the candidate selection in the 1976 primaries, according to the group: “The UBP may come to power by nominating whoever that can bring votes. However, a group, who come together on the basis of this philosophy, as the experience has showed, does not deliver”.<sup>525</sup> As the party was not in a position to ask for votes in the upcoming elections based on their performance in the government, the only way out for the party would be to come up with cadres that would put the UBP’s program into practice. Accordingly, the first target of the group was announced as “coming up with a coherent and reliable list of candidates, and wiping off the useless and parasitic names” in the primary elections. Çağatay was warned not to allow the members of his cabinet to exploit their positions as ministers to retain their seats. To secure this, a technocratic government was proposed to conduct daily affairs until the election.<sup>526</sup> Not surprisingly, this was not put into practice, and as it was revealed in a later statement, “the exhausted

---

<sup>523</sup> UBP Kemalist Devrimci Muhalefet Grubu Duyuru No. 1 [The UBP Kemalist Revolutionary Opposition Group Announcement No. 1]. *Halkın Sesi*, 21.1.1981.

<sup>524</sup> Raif Denктаş: “Niçin Kemalist Devrim [Why Kemalist revolution]?” Op-Ed, *Halkın Sesi*, 19.1.1981.

<sup>525</sup> “Raif Denктаş’ın Yeni Açıklaması [Raif Denктаş’s new statement].” *Halkın Sesi*, 10.2.1981.

<sup>526</sup> Cited in “Raif Denктаş Neler Söyledi [What did Raif Denктаş say]?” *Halkın Sesi*, 26.4.1981.

party administration” started “using public sources to hunt voters and party delegates as it did in 1976”.<sup>527</sup>

No wonder these statements attracted the wrath of the party administration. For the first time in the party history, a disciplinary action was initiated. Although, this led to Raif Denktaş’s resignation from the party, he was quickly convinced to stay by Emin, another extremely influential backbencher, and the disciplinary action was shelved. Apparently, Emin promised him to work together in the primary elections to eliminate those they held responsible for the dismal performance of the party.<sup>528</sup> Accordingly, before the Nicosia primary, where there were 55 candidates for 18 spots in the party ticket, Raif Denktaş, İrsen Küçük and Emin secretly agreed on 18 names of whom 15 were neophytes.<sup>529</sup> In other words, four ministers (Atakol, Atun, Gürler and Tahsin) from the serving cabinet and Şemsi Kazım, a veteran deputy, were all excluded with a view to “injecting new blood to the party”.

This was a rather curious pact. It is true that İrsen Küçük, Emin and Raif Denktaş, the famous junta, had worked together for the most of the previous five years. However, İrsen Küçük and to a lesser extent Emin were the embodiment of everything Raif Denktaş had challenged with his Kemalist group in the previous months. It was them who represented the “constituency for patronage” within the party. This became obvious once again in the run up to the primaries.

When the primary season came, İrsen Küçük was clearly the strongest man in the party.<sup>530</sup> His strength largely derived from two factors. Firstly, his role as the secretary general of the party put him into an extremely advantageous position in the selection of party delegates who would vote in the primaries. This power was used extensively in the branch

---

<sup>527</sup> UBP Kemalist Devrimci Muhalefet Grubu Duyuru No. 1 [The UBP Kemalist Revolutionary Opposition Group’s Announcement No. 1]. *Halkın Sesi*, 21.1.1981.

<sup>528</sup> See for instance “Atakol ve Atun Liste Dışı Bırakılmak İsteniyor [There are efforts to exclude Atakol and Atun from the party ticket].” *Kurtuluş*, 20.3.1981; “Perde Aralığından [Through the curtain].” *Kurtuluş*, 24.4.1981.

<sup>529</sup> See Raif Denktaş’s statements cited in *Olay*, 11.5.1981.

<sup>530</sup> According to Turkish daily *Cumhuriyet*, for instance, İrsen Küçük could easily take the control of the party should Denktaş remain neutral, see *Olay*, 5.1.1981, p. 7 (originally published in *Cumhuriyet*, 31.12.1980). For İrsen Küçük’s strength in the party in the eve of the primaries see *Olay*, 23.3.1981, p. 17.

conferences in the run up to the 1980 party conference.<sup>531</sup> Considering the fact that over two thousand and four hundred delegates eventually voted in the primary elections, and that each delegate represented 25 members, the number of delegates was obviously inflated<sup>532</sup>, and no one could manipulate the number of delegates better than the secretary general.<sup>533</sup> As it would be revealed later, in the run up to the primaries, İrsen Küçük had signed up 200 bogus delegates<sup>534</sup>, and in an arbitrary manner, replaced many existing delegates with his supporters.<sup>535</sup>

Secondly, as the minister of agriculture, he was in control of the biggest source of patronage; a position he had secured allegedly “by blackmailing Denктаş”<sup>536</sup> in 1976 and managed to keep at the expense of dividing the party. Indeed, it was this position, which brought him the secretary generalship in the wake of the crisis, which culminated with the resignation of Konuk. There were reports in the press that in certain villages, agricultural credit was distributed to the party delegates; tractors were given at giveaway prices; banquets were thrown at the expense of the Coop Bank.<sup>537</sup> “Hundreds of farm animals from the state farms (*Devlet Üretim Çiftlikleri*) were given away to the delegates”.<sup>538</sup> In Tatlısu

---

<sup>531</sup> “UBP Kurultayı: Cunta Partiye El Koydu [The UBP Congress: The junta seized control of the party].” *Olay*, 10.3.1980, p. 18-9; for a specific example showing how the junta exercised power in the branch conferences see “Güzelyurt’ta ‘Gelmezseniz Mal Verilmeyecek’ Denerek Göçmenler Zorla UBP Kongresine Götürüldü [The displaced in Güzelyurt were told ‘if you do not come, you will not be given property’ and forced to attend the UBP Congress].” *Kurtuluş*, 27.2.1980.

<sup>532</sup> Reportedly, in some villages the number of delegates was equal to the number of inhabitants (*Olay*, 23.3.1981, p. 20); see also *Olay*, 27.4.1981, p. 7.

<sup>533</sup> For more on the role of delegates in the UBP primaries see for instance *Olay*, 23.3.1981, pp. 16-17 and İsmet Kotak: “Bu ülkeden partizanlık kaldırılmalıdır, partiler değil [In this country clientelism should be abolished, not the parties].” *Olay*, 23.3.1981.

<sup>534</sup> See also Raif Denктаş’s statements on the “bogus delegates” signed up in the villages of Gönyeli, Gaziköy and Değirmenlik, in *Olay*, 4.5.1981, p. 5.

<sup>535</sup> *Olay*, 27.4.1981, p. 7.

<sup>536</sup> “I joined the UBP to become the minister of agriculture. If I don’t become the minister of agriculture I’ll go to the TKP,” he said, when he was offered the ministry of education (See Ahmet Y. Atamsoy: “Beş Yıllık Deneyimden Sonra UBP’ye Güven Son Bulmuştur [After experiencing five years of UBP government, trust in the UBP has collapsed].” *Demokratik Halk Gazetesi*, 22.5.1981).

<sup>537</sup> “Kooperatif Merkez Bankası UBP’lilerin Vurgun Kaynağı Haline Getirildi [Cooperative Central Bank has been turned into a source of loot for UBP members].” *Kurtuluş*, 6.3.1981; see also Gözlemci: “Kapan Kapana [Finders Keepers].” *Kurtuluş*, 27.3.1981; “Marifetli Tarım Bakanı İyi Traktörleri Hurda Diyerek Taraftarlarına Dağıtıyor [The ‘talented’ minister of agriculture is distributing perfectly good tractors to his supporters by classifying them as scrap].” *Demokratik Halk Gazetesi*, 9.4.1981; “İrsen Küçük Devlete Ait Araçları UBP’lilere Dağıtıyor [İrsen Küçük is distributing vehicles that belong to the state to the UBP members].” *Yenidüzen*, 6.3.1981; see also “Koop-Sen de Greve Gidiyor [Koop-Sen is going to strike too].” *Halkın Sesi*, 30.4.1981; “Kooperatif Merkez Bankası UBP’nin Çiftliği midir [Is the Cooperative Central Bank the UBP’s private candy store]?” *Kurtuluş*, 21.8.1981.

<sup>538</sup> “UBP Delegatesinin Değil Toplu Kalkınmanın Gereği Vurgulandı [The economic development of all – not the UBP delegates- is required].” *Demokratik Halk Gazetesi*, 7.5.1981.

village, for instance, 13 party delegates were given credits from the fund for the rehabilitation of displaced (*Göçmen Rehabilitasyon Fonu*).<sup>539</sup> According to *Olay*, “the ministry was filled with personnel up to the corridors”.<sup>540</sup> Even the resources provided by the UN were channelled towards clientelistic activities.<sup>541</sup>

Certainly, the ministry of agriculture was not the sole source of patronage. Other ministries played an important role in the distribution of jobs and favors as well. In spite of the warnings issued by the Court of Audit, for instance, sons and daughters of the UBP delegates were employed in the public sector<sup>542</sup> with the consent of the ministry of finance. Another method, which would come to play an important role in the elections to come was introduced in this period. This was granting of the so called Z and T car plate permits to the delegates and the party’s backers by the ministry of interior, which were exclusively given to rent-a-car and taxi owners to import cars with substantially reduced customs duties.<sup>543</sup>

As in the 1976 primaries, there was a cutthroat competition between the candidates. When the showdown came and the results were announced, there was a tremor within the party: Raif Denктаş, who ran on an anti-clientelistic platform<sup>544</sup> was out while everybody he fought against was in. He resigned, blaming İrsen Küçük and Emin of betrayal. “In the name of topping the list and sending puppets to the parliament, they [İrsen Küçük and Emin] made concession to corruptedness in districts, [and resorted] to magic delegate tricks, and

---

<sup>539</sup> “UBP’nin Ön Seçiminde Sadece G. Mağusa’da 10 Milyon Lira Dağıtıldı [In Famagusta alone, 10 million TL distributed during the UBP’s primaries].” *Olay*, 1.6.1981, p. 11.

<sup>540</sup> “Başsavcılık-Sayıştay Başkanına Aldıran Yok [Nobody heeds the Attorney General and the chairman of the Court of Audit].” *Olay*, 5.1.1981, p. 11; Nazif Borman, his successor at the ministry of agriculture confirms that he found hundreds of people illegally employed in the ministry when he took over (interviewed by author).

<sup>541</sup> The TKP leader, Alpay Durduran’s statement (*Olay*, 2.2.1981, pp. 14-15).

<sup>542</sup> Relevant reports of the Court of Audit are cited in Mehmet Altınay: “Denetim [Auditing].” *Kurtuluş*, 20.3.1981; “UBP İktidarı Seçim Uğruna Devleti Batırıyor [For the sake of election, the UBP government is driving the state to bankruptcy].” *Kurtuluş*, 27.3.1981; see also “UBP’nin Ön Seçiminde Sadece G. Mağusa’da 10 Milyon Lira Dağıtıldı [In Famagusta alone, 10 million TL distributed during the UBP’s primaries].” *Olay*, 1.6.1981, p. 11; see also Raif Denктаş: “Bir ‘Gazel’ Daha [Another ‘fairy tale’].” *Olay*, 21.6.1982, p. 40; parliamentary speech of İsmet Kotak (DHP, Famagusta) cited in *Olay*, 23.2.1981, p. 15.

<sup>543</sup> “T ve Z Plakalı Araba Yöntemiyle Milyonluk Vurgunlar Devam Ediyor [Millions continue to be looted through granting of the T and Z car plate permits].” *Demokratik Halk Gazetesi*, 9.4.1981; see also İsmet Kotak: “Sorun Hükümet Sorunudur [The problem is the government].” *Olay*, 1.6.1981.

<sup>544</sup> Once, he addressed the delegates as follows: “Don’t forget that those who offer you the state’s resources or banquets on their personal account to get elected, may try to compensate their expenses (and much more on top of that) out of the public sources, once they get elected” (Raif Denктаş cited in *Olay* 27.4.1981, p. 8).

in doing so tainted the primaries,” he said.<sup>545</sup> More importantly, he announced that he was going to set up a new party.

What was really wondered was Denктаş’s reaction to all this. Would he support his son’s new party? According to one account, Raif Denктаş’s Kemalist movement was indeed orchestrated by Denктаş behind the scenes.<sup>546</sup> He had realized that party would not be able to win the election unless it changed course and nominated new faces. Furthermore, İrsen Küçük would soon become too strong to contain. In other words, this was a repetition of the 1976 election, and the Kemalist group was just a copy of the Reformist group. It is true that Denктаş did not publicly support his son’s manoeuvres, and even continued touring villages with Çağatay and other ministers. It is equally true however that he, for the first time, publicly complained about the corruption at the SEEs.<sup>547</sup> Furthermore, from what Raif Denктаş at one point disclosed, it is understood that he let Denктаş know before challenging Çağatay, and his father did not try to stop him either.<sup>548</sup> For those who know him well, this was not surprising. This was one of the tactics Denктаş frequently employed. That is to say, not taking sides openly in a power struggle so that he could continue to work together with whoever prevails at the end. After all, this was his position vis-à-vis the Reformists in 1976 too.

There are some press reports supporting this argument. In an article entitled “Denктаş lost thrice,” Selim Selçuk argued that Denктаş actively campaigned in the primaries without much success.<sup>549</sup> According to *Olay*, when İrsen Küçük’s clique found out that their names were not on the lists distributed by Denктаş, they reciprocated and eliminated Raif Denктаş.<sup>550</sup> Whether these allegations are true or not remains to be a moot point. However,

---

<sup>545</sup> “Oğul Denктаş Yeni Partiyi Kurmaktan Vazgeçti [Denктаş junior abandoned the idea of setting up a new party].” *Halkın Sesi*, 28.4.1981.

<sup>546</sup> See İsmet Kotak: “Tekerleme ile İktidara Yeniden Adaylık Koyan Parti [The party which wants to come to power again by regurgitating the same things].” *Olay*, 26.1.1981.

<sup>547</sup> “Denктаş BRT’de Yaptığı Konuşmada Narenciye İhracatında Suistimali Kabul Etti [Denктаş admitted the abuse in the citrus fruit exports in his speech on BRT].” *Olay*, 10.11.1980, pp. 11-13; *Cumhuriyet*, 31.12.1980 (Reprinted in *Olay*, 5.1.1981, p. 7); also see Çeşitleme: “Geçmişi Unutanlar [Those who forgot the past].” *Söz*, 24.6.1981.

<sup>548</sup> See Raif Denктаş’s statements cited in *Olay*, 26.1.1981, p. 11.

<sup>549</sup> According to Selim Selçuk, Denктаş campaigned for his favorite candidates in the primaries by summoning the heads of village and neighborhood organizations, and by circulating the list of his favored candidates’ names (“Denктаş Üç Kere Mağlup [Denктаş defeated thrice].” *Söz*, 22.4.1981); See also “Partilerde Çalkantı Sürüyor [Parties still in turmoil].” *Olay*, 11.5.1981, p. 6.

<sup>550</sup> *Olay*, 27.4.1981, pp. 7-8.

it is a fact that Denктаş held particularly İrsen Küçük responsible for his son's exclusion as well as the erosion of the party's support in the 1981 elections. To this I will turn in Section 5.3. It is also worth mentioning in this juncture that in this whole process, one clear winner stood out. This was Erođlu, who came in first in the Famagusta district, garnering 180 votes more than his nearest contender. Such was his influence on the delegates that some delegates were seen to hang placards on trees, which read "God first, then Erođlu" (*önce Allah, sonra Erođlu*).<sup>551</sup> He was said to be in league with İrsen Küçük and Emin. However, probably because he was away from the main battlefield, Nicosia, it was İrsen Küçük and Emin who attracted the wrath of Denктаş, and Erođlu managed to escape the whole process unscathed. In a similar vein, the details regarding the intra-party struggle cannot be fully corroborated. However, it can be argued in certainty that there was a bitter feud within the party, which had nothing to do with the program or ideology of the party. This was strictly a personal power struggle.

### 5.3 Denктаş's Reclaiming of the Party

Against this backdrop, after pondering for almost a week, Denктаş announced his candidacy from the UBP. He said "the candidates promised me not to undermine each other in the campaign and work selflessly for the party"<sup>552</sup>; "I decided to run for the UBP based on the word of honour they [the UBP candidates] gave me".<sup>553</sup> His move effectively killed Raif Denктаş's plans to set up a new party. As he put it in the press conference where he announced this decision, those "who were involved in the setting up of the party withdrew after the president's decision to *reclaim* the UBP".<sup>554</sup>

Once again, Denктаş was in the driving seat: He took the reigns of the party<sup>555</sup> or to put it in his own words, he "seized the party's administration," and announced that he would be

---

<sup>551</sup> "Koltuk Kavgası UBP'deki Çöküntüyü Hızlandırdı [Power struggle has expedited the collapse of the UBP]." *Yenidüzen*, 24.4.1981.

<sup>552</sup> "Rauf Denктаş UBP'nin Liderliğini Üstlendi [Rauf Denктаş has assumed the leadership of the UBP]." *Halkın Sesi*, 26.4.1981.

<sup>553</sup> "Denктаş: UBP İçin Hedef En Az 30 Mebus Olmalı [Denктаş: The target for the UBP must be minimum 30 deputies]." *Halkın Sesi*, 29.4.1981.

<sup>554</sup> "Ođul Denктаş Yeni Partiyi Kurmaktan Vazgeçti [Denктаş junior abandoned the idea of setting up a new party]." *Halkın Sesi*, 28.4.1981.

<sup>555</sup> Editorial: "Alçaklara Kar Yağıyor [There will be a price to pay]." *Söz*, 29.4.1981.

personally conducting the election campaign along with Çağatay<sup>556</sup>; practically the secretary general's authorities were suspended.<sup>557</sup> This was interpreted as his reaction to İrsen Küçük, whom he held responsible for eliminating his son. Though they resented Denktaş's *fait accompli*, and though Emin even resigned at some point<sup>558</sup>, eventually, İrsen Küçük and Emin stepped back and pledged their loyalty to Denktaş.<sup>559</sup> A truce seemed to be made. However, a settling of scores was seen inevitable after the elections.<sup>560</sup>

"Nobody should take it for granted that the current ministers will retain their positions in the new cabinet," Denktaş declared.<sup>561</sup> This single line, which he frequently used in the campaign trail is of significance as it shows (a) he was aware that the dismal performance of the party in government jeopardized his chance of winning and wanted to distance himself from the party; (b) who really was at the helm: He was even quoted saying "none of the current ministers will take part in the government after the election"<sup>562</sup>, which also supports the argument that Denktaş was the one behind the botched attempt by the Kemalist movement to reform the party.

Eventually, after a highly contested election, Denktaş won the presidency by a whisker in the first round with 51.77 percent of the votes –down from 76.6 percent he had garnered in 1976. This was a huge blow to his legitimacy not only at the domestic level but also internationally. The sharp decline in his votes led the Greek Cypriot press to conclude that, this was an indication that he lost the confidence of Turkish Cypriots, and it was the

---

<sup>556</sup> "Devlet Başkanı Denktaş Şefliğini İlan Etti [President Denktaş has declared his chieftainship]." *Yenidüzen*, 1.5.1981; see also İsmet Kotak: "Ekonomiyi Perişan Eden UBP Bugün Kendi de Perişandır [The UBP, which has ruined the economy, is itself ruined too]." *Demokratik Halk Gazetesi*, 7.5.1981; Fuat Veziroğlu: "Parti Darbesi [Coup within the party]." *Kurtuluş*, 8.5.1981; "Kan Davası [Blood feud]." *Birlik*, 18.12.1993.

<sup>557</sup> See for instance "Devlet Başkanı Denktaş Şefliğini İlan Etti [President Denktaş has declared his chieftainship]" and Editorial: "Denktaş Kabinesi: On Denktaş [Denktaş's cabinet: Ten Denktashes]." *Yenidüzen*, 1.5.1981; see also Editorial: "Alçaklara Kar Yağıyor [There will be a price to pay]." *Söz*, 29.4.1981.

<sup>558</sup> "E. Emin'in İstifasının Kabul Edilip Edilmediği Henüz Açıklanmadı [Whether Emin's resignation has been accepted or not, has not yet been disclosed]." *Halkın Sesi*, 3.5.1981.

<sup>559</sup> "Enver Emin'in Açıklaması [Emin's statement]." *Halkın Sesi*, 7.5.1981; see also "İrsen Küçük'le Birlikte Denktaş'a Başkaldıran Enver Emin Tövbekar Oldu [Emin who along with İrsen Küçük had earlier revolted against Denktaş has repented]." *Yenidüzen*, 8.1.1981.

<sup>560</sup> Refik Erduran: "Kampanyanın Mihveri: Denktaş [The axis of the campaign: Denktaş]." *Milliyet*, 24.6.1981.

<sup>561</sup> "Denktaş Mühürde İsrar Ediyor [Denktaş presses for the electorate not to split their votes]." *Halkın Sesi*, 5.5.1981; also cited in Kerim Ozanbaşı: "Bakan Olmaya Layık Görünmeyen UBP Adayları [The UBP candidates who were not seen to be deserving a ministerial portfolio]." *Demokratik Halk Gazetesi*, 11.6.1981.

<sup>562</sup> *Olay*, 25.5.1981, p. 7.

Turkish settlers' votes, which kept him in power.<sup>563</sup> It is difficult to verify this statement because there is no public opinion or exit poll available showing the preferences of the settlers in this election. The most extensive research on the voting behavior of the settlers is Hatay's study (2005), where he compares voting patterns of settlers and native Cypriots living in certain villages in the parliamentary elections. What I have found out when I applied Hatay's method to the presidential election reveals that the Greek Cypriot press' conclusion was an exaggerated statement. Having said that, it would not be wrong to say that Denktaş was relatively more popular among the settler voters, which according to Hatay's account made up about sixteen to twenty two percent of the electorate (see Hatay 2005: 21-2)<sup>564</sup>, and that the settlers' support helped him to avoid a run-off.<sup>565</sup>

The UBP's defeat in the parliamentary election was even more humiliating. It lost its majority in the parliament, and won only 18 seats –12 less compared to 1976. Still, given its dismal performance in government, and splintering, this was a success. The overall macroeconomic performance was miserable. In 1980, GNP grew less than one percent, while it shrank 7.5 percent in 1981.<sup>566</sup> The public sector employees, biggest social group, were squeezed. Because of its failure to collect direct taxes, the government relied on indirect taxes (Hakkı Atun cited in Kasımoğlu 1980: 23 and 46), which skewed income distribution to the detriment of the salaried. They saw their real income decline during this period due to rampant inflation –something unprecedented before the adoption of Turkish lira. According to one account, the purchasing power of the salaried in 1980 was a staggering 80 percent lower when compared to the 1974 figures.<sup>567</sup> Moreover, as the

---

<sup>563</sup> Phileleftheros and Eleftherotypia cited in "Rumlar ve KTFD Seçimleri [Greek Cypriots and the TFSC Elections]." *Olay*, 13.7.1981, p. 10.

<sup>564</sup> Based on 2003 figures.

<sup>565</sup> Hatay identifies "26 'settler villages' exclusively inhabited by the 'settlers'," and "53 villages inhabited exclusively (up to 90 percent) by 'native Turkish Cypriots'" (which together represented 21 percent of the electorate in 1981) based on the place of birth identified in the electoral roll, and compare their voting patterns in the parliamentary elections. I used his methodology to compare their voting patterns in the presidential election of 1981. I found out that in the settler villages, Denktaş garnered 60.27 percent of the votes, while his support fell to 51.36 percent in the native villages. Two points should be borne in mind regarding this method: (a) Hatay's study does not say anything about the voting patterns of urban voters, and (b) "The place of birth" details of the ID cards given to at least some of the settlers had been admittedly tampered with by the Turkish Cypriot authorities (Kotak interviewed by author).

<sup>566</sup> State Planning Organization: Economic and Social Indicators, available at <http://www.devplan.org/Frame-eng.html> (accessed on 16.5.2013).

<sup>567</sup> The calculation was made by the KTAMS, the union of public servants ("KTAMS Başkanı Süreç Acı Gerçeği Ortaya Koydu: Maaşlar %80 Düştü [The KTAMS chairman Süreç revealed the bitter truth: Salaries fell by 80%]." *Kurtuluş*, 5.12.1980).

resettlement and land issue could not be resolved, rents skyrocketed.<sup>568</sup> This was because the Greek Cypriot immovable properties could not be sold and bought. Therefore, the prices of very limited amount of Turkish Cypriot land, especially in the Nicosia district went drastically up further depressing the disposable incomes of the working class. The government was not capable of meeting the public expenditures with local revenues and had to go regularly to Ankara cap in hand.

Furthermore, corruption allegations were widespread, yet impunity was the norm. Even in the Turkish press, this was highlighted. One of the articles published on this issue was entitled “Cyprus has become the smugglers’ paradise,” for instance.<sup>569</sup> The following excerpt from the article of a Turkish columnist -based in Cyprus- captures the politico-economic state of the Turkish Cypriot community at this point very well:

[After 1974, Denктаş] found himself presiding over a community, which was almost ungovernable.

The authorities of the Federated State simultaneously possess and lack authority to rule the region. From the outset, our bureaucrats have limited their options by introducing red tape, and putting the economy, which by its nature needed to rely on free market mechanism to thrive, into a quagmire of semi-statism.

In a setting, turned into a paradise for smuggling and theft, while a handful of profiteers have been sprouting in a mind-boggling manner, those with low-income increasingly fell victim to inflation and suffered. The party in power, on the other hand, could not free itself from the role of defender and protector of undeserved wealth, and because of its internal conflicts failed in the economic field.<sup>570</sup>

Given this catastrophic outlook in the domestic front, it was Ankara’s intervention, which avoided an even heavier defeat for the UBP. As the Turkish ambassador of the time İnal Batu revealed later, the opposition in this period “was excluded”: “[i]n the elections all institutions openly sided with the incumbent government and Denктаş, and in this way the

---

<sup>568</sup> The ITEM was passed in August 1977. However, it was not implemented for a while as Denктаş shelved it on the grounds of its incompatibility with international law (see “Denктаş Vaad Dağıtıp Mühür İstiyor [Denктаş is distributing promises left right and center, and asking for votes].” *Yenidüzen*, 8.5.1981; see also Hasan Erçakıca: “Dilin Kemiği Yok [Talk is cheap].” *Yenidüzen*, 29.1.1981.

<sup>569</sup> Ziya Akçapar: “Kıbrıs Kaçakçılarının Cenneti Oldu [Cyprus has become the smugglers’ paradise].” *Hürriyet*, 19.12.1980. A similar comment was made by another columnist in *Hürriyet*, Hasan Pulur on 21.12.1980. Both of them were cited in “TKP Şemsi Kazım’ı Protesto Etti [The TKP protested Şemsi Kazım].” *Halkın Sesi*, 26.12.1980. See also “Cumhuriyet Gazetesi Nasıl Görüyor [How does the Cumhuriyet newspaper see]?” *Olay*, 5.1.1981, p. 7 (originally published in *Cumhuriyet*, 31.12. 1980); “Kıbrıs’ta Bir KİT [A state economic enterprise in Cyprus].” *Olay*, 22.6.1981, p. 17 (originally published in *Hürriyet*).

<sup>570</sup> Refik Erduran: “Denктаş’ın Dramı [Denктаş’s tragedy].” *Milliyet* (Reprinted in *Olay*, 20.7.1981).

left opposition was countered” (cited in İnanç 2007: 99). The implementation of this exclusion strategy can be seen at different levels.

First, it should be borne in mind that at the time there was a military junta in power in Ankara, which crushed the Turkish left and was ready to do the same thing in Cyprus. The junta summoned all party leaders and secretary-generals to Ankara in early April in the eve of the June 28 elections. When the invitation was made public, rumour mill started turning. The rumours were spread by the UBP and revolved around three points: (1) Ankara was against the opposition; (2) the elections would be postponed; (3) the constitution would be amended to introduce a presidential system.<sup>571</sup> On their arrival back in Cyprus, the opposition leaders denied the allegations.<sup>572</sup> However, later it was revealed that among other things, they were reminded by the generals that the Turkish army’s mandate to protect the “Turkish nation’s interests” extended to the island, and they were told that the current political situation on the island resembled the one prevailing in Turkey before the coup d’état, implying that they could suspend democracy in northern Cyprus too.<sup>573</sup> It was not a coincidence that the Turkish daily *Hürriyet* on the day the Turkish Cypriot party leaders arrived in Ankara<sup>574</sup>, declared whoever put up his candidacy against Denktaş would indeed serve the Greeks and Armenians.<sup>575</sup> The Turkish media continued their disinformation campaign against the opposition throughout the election campaign.<sup>576</sup> As if this was not enough, Dr Küçük and *Halkın Sesi* switched sides and launched an attack against the TKP few days before the election.

As part of this effort, top-level Turkish officials visited the island one after another. Zeyyat Baykara, the deputy prime minister and the chairman of the Cyprus Coordination

---

<sup>571</sup> See the TKP’s party assembly report (*Olay*, 21.6.1982); see also “Üst Düzeyde Türkiye Ziyareti [High level visit to Turkey].” *Olay*, 30.3.1981, pp. 19-20.

<sup>572</sup> “Ankara Kişi veya Parti Empoze Etmedi [Ankara did not impose a person or a party].” *Olay*, 13.4.1981, p. 5.

<sup>573</sup> Naci Talat, secretary general of the CTP, cited in *Olay*, 23.8.1982, p. 6.

<sup>574</sup> See *Olay*, 13.4.1981, p. 6.

<sup>575</sup> The piece, which was published on 4.4.1981, was entitled “Makarios’un Ruhü ve Denktaş [Makarios’ spectre and Denktaş].” It was reprinted in the UBP’s mouthpiece *Birlik* too. Needless to say it attracted strong criticism from the Turkish Cypriot opposition (see *Yenidüzen*, 10.4.1981; see also *Olay*, 13.4.1981, p. 6 and 34).

<sup>576</sup> See Refik Erduran: “Denktaş’ın Dramı [Denktaş’s tragedy]” and Ali Sirmen: “Kıbrıs, Denktaş ve Çok Seslilik [Cyprus, Denktaş and Pluralism]” both reprinted in *Olay*, 20.7.1981, pp. 11-12; see also “Ormandan Geliyorum [I am coming from the jungle].” Alpay Durduran singles out *Günaydın* and *Hürriyet*’s stories as particularly damaging for his party (interviewed by Ayer Y. Delideniz, *Olay*, 6.7.1981, p. 19).

Committee, for instance, spent a week in Cyprus.<sup>577</sup> In a similar vein, Nurettin Ersin, the chief of the armed forces, and a member of the ruling junta visited the island in the eve of the elections and stayed until two days before the polls.<sup>578</sup> The Turkish involvement was not limited to these high-level visits. To give an example, an official from the Turkish ministry of finance did not mind showing up with Hakkı Atun, the minister of finance, attracting the criticism of the opposition.<sup>579</sup>

There were many others actively involved particularly in the villages and neighbourhoods resided by the Turkish settlers. In an article entitled "I'm coming from the jungle," Kotak, who was on the field as the secretary general of the DHP, talks at length about this issue. According to Kotak voters were intimidated and forced to vote for either the UBP or the Turkish Unity Party (*Türk Birliği Partisi*, TBP), a party established by the settlers.<sup>580</sup> Armed groups surrounded villages populated mainly by the settlers such as Kaplıca, Ardahan, Kalecik, Ziyamet, Gelincik, Derince, Dipkarpaz, and Güvercinlik.<sup>581</sup> The settler neighbourhoods of Famagusta became "out of bounds to not only the political party representatives but even to the residents" in the last 48 hours before the polling day, Kotak added.<sup>582</sup> Furthermore, on the day of election, "the voters were not allowed to go out; they were picked up from their houses and driven to the polling stations and then back to their houses".<sup>583</sup>

Crucially, the expenditures made by *Yardım Heyeti* went drastically up in the election month and 200 million lira, out of 600 million transferred between March and June,

---

<sup>577</sup> "Baykara Temaslarını Tamamlayarak Ankara'ya Döndü [Baykara completed his meetings and returned to Ankara]." *Olay*, 27.4.1981, p. 13.

<sup>578</sup> See *Olay*, 22.6.1981, p. 19 and 27.6.1981, p. 21; "Koalisyon Dönemine Giriliyor [Entering the era of coalitions]." *Yankı* (Turkey) (Reprinted in *Olay*, 20.7.1981, pp. 10-11); see also the TKP's party assembly report (*Olay*, 21.6.1982). It is interesting to note that the opposition was blamed for not attending the reception given on the occasion of the general's visit. It turned out later that nobody from the opposition was invited! (See the statements of Nejat Konuk, the DHP leader, cited in Akay Cemal, "KTFD'de Bugün 83 Bin Seçmen Oy Kullanıyor [83 thousand voters casting their votes today in the TFSC]." *Milliyet*, 28.6.1981; Refik Erduran: "Denktaş'ın Dramı [Denktaş's tragedy]." *Milliyet* (Reprinted in *Olay*, 20.7.1981).

<sup>579</sup> "T.C. Maliye Müşaviri Sadullah Aygün Hakkı Atun ile Seçim Gezisi Yapıyor [Sadullah Aygün, an advisor from the Turkish ministry of finance canvassing for votes with Hakkı Atun]." *Demokratik Halk Gazetesi*, 22.5.1981.

<sup>580</sup> İsmet Kotak: "Ormandan Geliyorum [I'm coming from the jungle]." *Olay*, 6.7.1981, p. 9 and 22; see also his statements as the secretary general of the DHP in *Olay*, 6.7.1981, p. 21.

<sup>581</sup> *Ibid.*; *Olay*, Editorial. 6.7.1981, p. 4.

<sup>582</sup> "DHP Genel Sekreteri İsmet Kotak'ın Açıklaması [The DHP secretary general Kotak's statement]." *Olay*, 6.7.1981, p. 21.

<sup>583</sup> *Ibid.*

remained unaccounted, which was according to the sources unidentified by *Kurtuluş*, went to the salaries of the temporary personnel illegally employed in the period concerned.<sup>584</sup> The details about public employment in the election periods will be discussed in the next chapter. Suffice it here to note that the fact that the number of temporary personnel employed in this particular case was in the vicinity of 3500, lends credibility to this allegation.

In short, Ankara did everything to bolster the UBP's chances of success before the elections. When this fell short of securing a UBP majority in the parliament, this time, it blocked the forming of a coalition by the three opposition parties, TKP, CTP and DHP, which among themselves had 21 seats and agreed on forming a coalition. The pretext was the CTP's anti-NATO stance.<sup>585</sup> When Çağatay as the leader of the biggest party failed to form the government, Denktaş did not give the mandate to the leader of the second biggest party, TKP. Rather, the UBP formed a minority government, and upon Ankara's "request," the DHP leadership accepted not to support a motion of censure for a certain period of time. When, the minority government was eventually brought down, the DHP, under duress, switched sides and took part in an UBP-led coalition.

As a TKP deputy put it at the time, after "the 28 June 1981 election democracy has been seriously wounded;" of course this did not mean "that there was a fully functioning liberal democracy before 28 June. While they used to try to conceal the restrictions on liberties before, today they are exposed".<sup>586</sup> This is to say, obviously similar to the post World War II regimes in Italy and Greece, a *democrazia bloccata* to use the Italian term or a "guided democracy," in Mouzelis words, was prevailing in the northern part of Cyprus in this period. In the Greek case, "the throne and the victorious anti-communist army played the dominant political role –setting, in a clearly unconstitutional manner, strict limits to what was and what was not allowed to happen on the level of parliamentary politics" (Mouzelis cited in Mouzelis and Pagoulatos 2002: 3). In Tsoukalas' words this was "the deeply

---

<sup>584</sup> Bulletin of the Ministry of Finance cited in "Seçim Ayında Yardımlar Dört Kat Arttı [Financial assistance quadrupled in the election month]." *Kurtuluş*, 7.8.1981; the TKP's party assembly report (*Olay*, 21.6.1982); Alpay Durduran interviewed by author.

<sup>585</sup> Özker Özgür cited in Erten Kasımoğlu: "Villa Fırtına'da Söylenenler [What was said at Villa Fırtına [the Turkish ambassador's summer residence]]." *Olay*, 17.5.1982.

<sup>586</sup> Hasan Özbaflı cited in Erten Kasımoğlu: "Sınırlı Demokrasimizin Sırtına Vurulan Her Hançerin Adı 'Arzu' veya 'Rica' Oluyor [Every stab to the back of our imperfect democracy comes under the cloak of an 'entreaty' or 'intercession']". *Olay*, 28.12.1981.

original phenomenon of an authoritarian regime... built under the auspices of a democratically organized parliamentary state” (cited in Mouzelis and Pagoulatos 2002: 3). In a similar vein in both cases, the Cold War considerations played an important role in justifying the crippling of democracy. The threat of a communist takeover was used as a pretext to exclude from power the parties they labeled “anti-system”. There was a slight difference in the Turkish Cypriot case, though. The communist witch-hunt seen in these countries was coupled with a *Rumcu* (pro-Greek Cypriot) one.

As a result, the community had been condemned to the UBP-dominated governments for years. According to Della Porta, due to the lack of alternation in power in Italy, “the party system lost its legitimacy among the general public; the state became identified with the government; and the political elite's sense of responsibility and accountability declined or vanished” (2006: 188). As it will be shown in the rest of the study, the consequences of *democrazia bloccata* was not different in this case too. I will turn to the specific adverse effects of the lack of alternation in power in the politico-economic development in Chapter Six.

At the intra-party level, living up to his reputation as a grandmaster of political chess, Denктаş eliminated the junta gradually. First, as mentioned earlier, he pacified İrsen Küçük in the election campaign as much as possible. There were even rumours that the Denктаş family was mobilized to avoid İrsen Küçük’s election, albeit to no avail.<sup>587</sup> After the election, İrsen Küçük’s resignation was speculated two times in three weeks clearly showing that the battle was not over.<sup>588</sup> As a further indication of the tension, İrsen Küçük did not attend the reception held in the presidential palace after the swearing in ceremony.<sup>589</sup> Furthermore, he was excluded from the committee, which would negotiate the conditions of a possible coalition with the DHP, although he still held the number two position in the party hierarchy.<sup>590</sup> Given the party’s weak showing in the election, and with only 18 seats in the parliament, however, Denктаş was not in a position to eliminate him altogether.

---

<sup>587</sup> “UBP Adayları Şimdi de Birbirlerini Yemeye Başladı [And now the UBP candidates have started to cannibalize each other].” *Yenidüzen*, 19.6.1981; see also “Denктаş İrsen’e Karşı [Denктаş against İrsen].” *Kurtuluş*, 3.7.1981; “Denктаş Üzgün [Denктаş is sad].” *Kurtuluş*, 3.7.1981, p. 4.

<sup>588</sup> “İrsen Küçük UBP’den İstifa Ettiği Söylentilerini Yalanladı [İrsen Küçük denied the rumours that he had resigned from the UBP].” *Bozkurt*, 7.7.1981; “İrsen Küçük’ün İstifa Ettiği Haberi Yayıldı [İrsen Küçük’s resignation has been rumored].” *Bozkurt*, 28.7.1981.

<sup>589</sup> *Olay*, 20.7.1981, p. 16.

<sup>590</sup> *Olay*, 27.7.1981, pp. 7-8.

Therefore, he kept him in the cabinet of the minority government but gave him a less important portfolio: ministry of health, social affairs and labor.

In the coalition government, which was formed after the minority government had been brought down, İrsen Küçük was reinstated as the minister of agriculture.<sup>591</sup> But this did not mean that the two rivals buried their hatchets. It only showed how high İrsen Küçük's bargaining power was. His hand was strengthened by the fact that the new government had a majority of only one seat. But this came at a cost. Denktaş, this time, managed to weaken him by depriving him of the second leg of his power base: his position in the party. He was replaced by Hakkı Atun as the secretary general of the party in 1982.<sup>592</sup>

What made İrsen Küçük completely expendable for Denktaş was the proclamation of the TRNC in 1983. This unilateral declaration of independence was an undisguised challenge to the international community and a major watershed in the inter-communal affairs, and therefore it is taken up most of the time in this context in the literature. Domestic repercussions however, are largely overlooked. Looking from the perspective of Denktaş, the advantages of the declaration are not limited to the foreign policy domain. It provided Denktaş with a pretext to address challenges against his power at the domestic front too. By coming up with the idea of drafting a new constitution with a new constituent assembly, Denktaş indeed killed not two but four birds with one stone.

Dodd suggests Denktaş "did not advance proposals for a presidential type of constitution, to which he was always sympathetic" as "[h]e could not be seen to be gaining something for the presidency out of the declaration" (1993: 130). Though not completely wrong, this is only half of the truth. That he did not push for the presidential system may be true but as Soysal argued at the time, the amendments required by the declaration could have been easily done by the current parliament.<sup>593</sup> It would not be difficult to convince the opposition, which had been arm-twisted to vote unanimously in favour of the declaration, to support these cosmetic changes to reach a two-thirds majority required for amendment.

---

<sup>591</sup> This was a four way coalition: UBP, DHP, TBP and Konuk as an independent.

<sup>592</sup> "I was asked by Çağatay and Denktaş to stay out of the cabinet and assume the number two position in the party as they thought İrsen Küçük had been neglecting his responsibility as the secretary general," Atun recounted in our interview. "Until 1985, Denktaş used to be close to the party, and he used to intervene from time to time," he added (interviewed by author).

<sup>593</sup> Mümtaz Soysal: "Ada İnsanları [The island people]." *Kıbrıs Postası*, 19.12.1983 (Originally published in *Milliyet*).

However, this was not the real intention. In fact, the whole fuss/farce about the new constitution and constituent assembly served one purpose: to secure the political survival of Denктаş. The article 79 (2) of the 1975 constitution limited the president's time in office to two consecutive five-year terms, and opposition would never vote for its abolition. If this parliament would not, then, one that would do had to come! Hence, a constituent assembly was called. In the TKP leader Bozkurt's words, "this was a coup d'etat".<sup>594</sup> Though, the TKP took the case to the constitutional court, the constitutional court upheld the constituent assembly. Obviously, the decision was made under duress.<sup>595</sup>

Contrary to what Dodd suggests, therefore, it is safe to say that Denктаş gained a lot out of the declaration<sup>596</sup>, and his gain was not limited to this obvious benefit. Soon it turned out that he intended a broader shake up of domestic politics. In this context, we can talk about at least three more "gains" that he obtained with this move.

First, by setting up a new constituent assembly, he parachuted 30 new deputies –of whom 10 were directly appointed by the president<sup>597</sup>, and in doing so tilted the balance in favour of himself both in the UBP and parliament.<sup>598</sup> He was no longer dependent on the wafer-thin majority provided by an unruly coalition. Furthermore, he got rid of Çağatay with whom his relations had turned sour lately.<sup>599</sup> He asked Çağatay in a meeting of the Coordination Council to tender his cabinet's resignation to give way to the establishment of a neutral transition government.<sup>600</sup> In other words, he sent his third victim to the graveyard of prime ministers. Finally, he appointed İrsen Küçük's archrival Konuk as the prime minister of the transition government, and in doing so made sure that İrsen Küçük did not take part in the cabinet. Being deprived of his power bases, first the secretary

---

<sup>594</sup> İsmail Bozkurt interviewed by Mete Tümerkan. ([http://www.haberkibris.com/n.php?n=8dbd6f06-2011\\_12\\_07](http://www.haberkibris.com/n.php?n=8dbd6f06-2011_12_07)) accessed on 20.7.2012.

<sup>595</sup> "If only you knew how we made that decision," confided one of the judges later to Bozkurt (*ibid.*).

<sup>596</sup> İlder Türkmen, who was the Turkish minister of foreign affairs at the time, goes as far as saying "one of the aims of the establishment of TRNC was to maintain Denктаş's presidency," a quarter of a century later (İlder Türkmen: "Tarih Aydınlanıyor [History uncovered]." *Hürriyet*, 26.7.2008).

<sup>597</sup> Most of the other organizations, which were given a quota, were traditional allies of Denктаş such as Türk-Sen (3 members), three veteran associations (5 members), Chamber of Commerce (1 member), Chamber of Industry (1 member), and Farmers Union (1 member). For the complete list see for instance *Kıbrıs Postası*, 3.12.1983.

<sup>598</sup> See for instance "Kurucu Üyeler And İçiyor [Constituent members to swear in]." *Kıbrıs Postası*, 6.12.1983.

<sup>599</sup> According to Çağatay's undersecretary Samioğlu, they had been at odds (Samioğlu interviewed by author); Borman, who served in the same cabinet with Çağatay, also confirms that Çağatay repeatedly complained that Denктаş had been constantly undermining him (Borman interviewed by author).

<sup>600</sup> Aydın Samioğlu and İsmet Kotak interviewed by author.

generalship and now the ministry of agriculture, İrsen Küçük's clout in the party entered a phase of rapid decline, which culminated with his resignation from the UBP few months later.

#### **5.4 Fall of the Junta and the Unlikely Rise of Eroğlu – Revenge is a dish best served cold!**

Denktaş was not the only one who wanted to see Çağatay's back. The Nicosia clique was also eager to get one of its own elected as the party chairman. The opportunity they had been looking for arose when Çağatay resigned not only from the premiership but also from the leadership of the UBP.<sup>601</sup>

When the party chairmanship became vacant, one candidate stood out as the favourite. This was Eroğlu, the chief of the Famagusta branch, who had an extremely strong base in his constituency. When the junta had made its first move to replace Çağatay a year earlier, at the 1982 party conference, their candidate was Eroğlu. This was just to test the water. What they wondered was the reaction of Ankara. The reaction was negative: "They summoned us to the embassy. They told us that the TMFA wanted Çağatay to continue. We did not accept. Then they told us that the Joint Chief of Staff wanted him. We asked for time to evaluate the situation. Eroğlu succumbed and withdrew his candidacy," recounts Emin.<sup>602</sup> Hakkı Atun, the secretary general of the party, who had announced his candidacy, was also vetoed by Ankara.<sup>603</sup> As a result, in the first multi-candidate contest held in 1982, only a relatively weak figure, Ramiz Manyera, the former president of the KTTO was allowed to run as a candidate against Çağatay.<sup>604</sup> He was not a strong contender because he was at odds with the junta. With the Nicosia clique's active support, Çağatay defeated

---

<sup>601</sup> "Çağatay UBP Genel Başkanlığından da Çekildi [Çağatay withdrew from the chairmanship of the UBP]." *Bozkurt*, 1.12.1983.

<sup>602</sup> Enver Emin interviewed by author; see also "Derviş Eroğlu: Anavatandan Gelen Telkinler Işığında Adaylığımı Erteleme Kararı Aldık [Eroğlu: Based on the advice from the motherland, we decided to postpone my candidacy]." *Yenidüzen*, 2.11.1982.

<sup>603</sup> "UBP Kurultayı Arifesinde Etkili Çevreler Yine Devrede [The influential circles in action again in the run up to the UBP congress]." *Yenidüzen*, 19.10.1982; "Etkili Çevreler Baskın Çıktı Eroğlu ve Atun UBP Genel Başkanlığına Aday Olmaktan Vazgeçirildi [The influential circles prevailed: Eroğlu and Atun dissuaded from running for the chairmanship of the UBP]." *Yenidüzen*, 26.10.1982.

<sup>604</sup> "Manyera: Bana Bir Telkin Yapılmadı. Adaylığımın Anavatan Tarafından Tasvip Edildiği Anlaşıyor [Manyera: I have not been told anything. Apparently, my candidacy has been approved by the motherland]." *Yenidüzen*, 2.11.1982.

Manyera easily by garnering 222 of the 303 votes cast.<sup>605</sup> Basically, Ankara told the clique not to change horses in the middle of the stream. That it was Ankara calling the shots over who would form the government, had been seen in 1981. Now, it was clearly revealed that even who would run the UBP was up to Ankara.

Indeed, as in 1982, in the 1983 party conference too, Erođlu was proposed as a stopgap solution. It was clear that Denктаş would never accept the chairmanship of the clique strongman İrsen Küçük. The clique, on the other hand, would never let Denктаş impose them someone against their will once again. Erođlu was considered to be the right candidate because he was perceived as someone “unambitious,” who could be dealt with later, once Denктаş’s hegemony was broken. This perception, to a certain extent, derived from his resignation as the education minister although he was encouraged to stay by the clique.<sup>606</sup> The same reasons made him acceptable to Denктаş too, who had always been in favour of working with a “weak” primer minister<sup>607</sup> (see also Egemen 2006: 244-5).

Eventually, he ran unopposed and became the first UBP chairman, who was elected by the party before being appointed by Denктаş as the prime minister.<sup>608</sup> He had to wait for another 18 months before he took over the premiership because the transition period lasted a year longer than it had been originally envisaged.<sup>609</sup> It is also important to note that the clique recaptured the secretary generalship in the 1983 party conference. Although İrsen Küçük’s name was “widely rumoured” for this position<sup>610</sup>, he did not run and Emin became the new secretary general.<sup>611</sup>

In the mean time, having drawn a lesson from the 1981 election, which almost cost him the presidency, in 1985 presidential election, Denктаş ran for the first time as an independent, “above-parties” candidate and easily won with 70 per cent of the votes. He dissociated the

---

<sup>605</sup> “Raundu Çağatay Kazandı [The round won by Çağatay].” *Olay*, 8.11.1982, pp. 6-7.

<sup>606</sup> Emin interviewed by author.

<sup>607</sup> Mustafa Erbilen interviewed by author.

<sup>608</sup> “Erođlu UBP Genel Başkanı [Erođlu, the UBP’s chairman].” *Bozkurt*, 18.12.1983.

<sup>609</sup> According to Nejat Konuk, his government was scheduled to stay in office until May 1984 (“Hükümet Takvimi Mayıs 1984’e Göre Ayarlandı [The government’s schedule set until May 1984].” *Kıbrıs Postası*, 25.12.1983.

<sup>610</sup> “UBP Parti Meclisi Bugün Yetkili Organları Belirleyecek [The UBP party assembly to determine the executive board members today].” *Bozkurt*, 21.12.1983.

<sup>611</sup> “UBP Genel Sekreteri Yeniden Emin [Emin elected as the secretary general of the UBP].” *Bozkurt*, 23.12.1983.

presidential and parliamentary elections from each other by setting different dates. In his words, “from the past experience it was seen that having both elections on the same day created problems; candidates were shown very close to certain parties and against others. The presidential election will be held earlier to allow the candidates to campaign their programs freely”.<sup>612</sup> This did not prevent the UBP from throwing its full support behind Denktaş.

Here, a parenthesis should be opened. The close relationship between the UBP and Denktaş is taken for granted most of the time. In practice, however, given the rivalry outlined here, it would not be wrong to say that this was not the case. The decision to support Denktaş in this particular presidential election was a “strategic” one made after long deliberations. “We have asked two questions to ourselves,” Emin recounted in our interview; “first ‘what do we have to gain from fielding a candidate against Denktaş?’ and second ‘in the campaign trail, do we want him cursing us or praising us?’ My view was that we would not gain anything from nominating someone against Denktaş. At the end my view prevailed”.<sup>613</sup> The main proponent of the contending view, İrsen Küçük, who wanted to be the presidential candidate of the UBP against Denktaş<sup>614</sup>, resigned in June 1984<sup>615</sup>, and set up his own party.

This meant a reshuffling of the cards within the UBP. İrsen Küçük’s resignation was a critical blow to the Nicosia wing, which had controlled the party since its establishment. Yet, this blow could have been less effective, if it was not followed by the elimination of other heavyweights like Emin and Olgun Paşalar in the run up to the 1990 election. After allegations about his business dealings, Emin decided to retire from politics on the grounds of family matters.<sup>616</sup> Paşalar, who had joined the clique in the 1981 elections and became the successor of Emin as the secretary general found himself “vetoed” by the candidate selection committee of the party, where he was a member!<sup>617</sup> This was widely interpreted as a plot orchestrated by Denktaş to punish those whom he held responsible for the exclusion of Raif Denktaş from the party back in 1981. The rage against the clique was so

---

<sup>612</sup> Denktaş cited in “KKTC Cumhurbaşkanı Denktaş Resmen Açıkladı: Seçimlere Bağımsız Katılacağım [Denktaş: I will run as an independent].” *Kıbrıs Postası*, 22.12.1983.

<sup>613</sup> Emin interviewed by author.

<sup>614</sup> Eroğlu cited in Nur Batur: “Kıbrıs Girdabı [The Cyprus Whirlpool] (4).” *Milliyet*, 4.3.1993.

<sup>615</sup> “UBP Güçlü Bir Kanadını Yitirdi [The UBP lost a strong wing].” *Halkın Sesi*, 1.6.1984.

<sup>616</sup> “Politik Yaşamını Noktalıyor [He is finishing his political career].” *Birlik*, 16.3.1990.

<sup>617</sup> “Olgun Paşalar ve 7 Milletvekili Liste Dışı Kaldı [Paşalar and 7 other deputies out of the party ticket].” *Kıbrıs*, 24.3.1990.

fierce that Emin was even asked by the Denктаş family not to attend the funeral of Raif Denктаş when he passed away in a tragic accident.<sup>618</sup> What Denктаş did not realize then, however, was that by cutting all the aces of the Nicosia wing out, he was indeed elevating Erođlu to a position where he would become invincible. He was obviously underestimating the talents of his new prime minister.

Given the circumstances preparing his ascendance to the party leadership outlined above, it would not be wrong to say his fortune served Erođlu well. However, he has to be given credit for being ready when the luck struck. Erođlu, who had not been in the inner circle of Denктаş administration before 1974, has joined the party in its establishment period. He played a major role in the setting up of the Famagusta branch and helped turning it into a UBP stronghold. Coming from a modest background, he has always been a leader with a common touch. His talent to recall names<sup>619</sup>, and “being a dealer of hope” -someone excelled in pandering and overpromising<sup>620</sup>- proved to be of immense help in cultivating close ties with the rank and file party members and sympathizers. Along with these personal characteristics, his popularity –as a medical doctor and the president of the most popular football club in Famagusta helped him to come in on top of the party list<sup>621</sup> in the first election<sup>622</sup>, and this, helped him to become the minister of education in the first cabinet. Although his term in office did not last long<sup>623</sup>, he began gaining ground in the party by joining forces with the Nicosia clique – a move, which turned out to be what eventually elevated him to the leadership of the party.

Unlike his rival Denктаş, who had proven himself a capable politician and a charismatic leader long before the party’s establishment, it should be noted that Erođlu’s success has depended entirely on his mastery of intra-party politicking. He showed that he knew what exactly he was supposed to do if he was to retain his leadership: controlling the party delegates. He is known to be constantly in touch with the local party chiefs; “he is always

---

<sup>618</sup> Emin interviewed by author.

<sup>619</sup> A talent, which served the former American president Bill Clinton well in his successful political career (Cicero and Carville 2012).

<sup>620</sup> A personal feature Napoleon considered vital in a leader (Cited in Cicero and Carville 2012).

<sup>621</sup> The electoral system allows voting for individual candidates within the party list (preference votes) as well as splitting the votes across different parties. For more on the electoral system and elections see Warner (1993: 193-217).

<sup>622</sup> Indeed, except for 1985, when he came in second, he has always come in first.

<sup>623</sup> He resigned before completing his first year in office.

on the phone, checking on what's going on even in the remotest villages," I was told by one of my interviewees. When I asked the former UBP ministers, deputies and other party operatives I interviewed, what made Eroğlu so strong, the answer I received was unanimous: "he had secured an absolute control over the party delegates by distributing favours".<sup>624</sup> When I elaborated on this in the research process, two crucial steps he had made, stood out.

First, in as early as his second year in office, he issued a circular regarding the procedure of employment in the public sector, which made appointments and promotions subject to his approval.<sup>625</sup> In the words of Nazif Borman who worked under Eroğlu in various cabinets:

Here the intention was to send a message that it was the prime minister who had the authority. In practice, he would not veto the candidates recommended by the ministers as long as the person to be employed was close to the party. Final decision was always made after relevant local party chief was consulted and the candidate's affiliation with the party was confirmed. The real problem used to arise when contending candidates were all affiliated with the UBP.<sup>626</sup>

Second, he attached the Coop Bank directly to the prime minister's office.<sup>627</sup> The bank has been the main institution, which organized rural life by offering credits and agricultural inputs to producers.<sup>628</sup> Furthermore, as the bank commanded vast resources, controlling the bank meant control over credits for other sectors too. In other words, the bank was not only a shortcut to the delegates in the villages but also had huge influence over other business interests.

Relying on these two key sources of patronage, Eroğlu replaced those chiefs of the sections whose loyalty he could not count upon, with people whom he could trust to use their votes to sustain his leadership. He strengthened the lower level party chiefs vis-à-vis the chiefs at the branch level<sup>629</sup> and in doing so broadened his base. In this way, the role of patron became accessible to anyone, as it was no longer necessary to have a social or economic status to act as a patron or a mediator (see Piattoni 2001b: 203). Affinity to the party and

---

<sup>624</sup> Serdar Denктаş; Hasan Hasipoğlu; Erdinç Gürçağ; Mustafa Erbilen; Enver Emin; Hasan Taçoу.

<sup>625</sup> KKTC Başbakanlığı, Genelge No.: 1, Sayı: BB/276/76/8, 8.1.1987 [The TRNC Prime Minister's Office, Circular No.1, Issue: BB/276/76/8, 8.1.1987].

<sup>626</sup> Borman interviewed by author.

<sup>627</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>628</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>629</sup> Serdar Denктаş and an anonymous interviewee interviewed by author.

access to a pool of votes was enough. In a way, this was the final stage of what Tarrow calls the transition from the “clientelismo of the notable” to “clientelismo of the bureaucracy” (1967: 340-1). In short, with these shrewd moves, Erođlu developed the political machine to perfection, which had been established earlier by the junta.

As pointed out in the previous sections, de-Denktaşization of the party organization did not start with Erođlu. However, it can be said that it gained momentum in this period. Denktaş’s famous notes were no longer heeded. In Denktaş’s words, Erođlu “turned against me. He did not want me to interfere and said ‘the era of acting with Denktaş’s personal instructions written on small paper scraps (*pusulalar*) came to an end’”.<sup>630</sup> Under Erođlu, another important step in the direction of institutionalizing the prime minister’s office was taken and a new office building was built. Until then, the prime ministers had to share the same building with the president, which was located in the yard of the presidential palace.

By 1990, the power struggle between Denktaş and Erođlu did not yet reach a level that would avoid cooperation in the campaign trail. Though he did not run on a UBP ticket, Denktaş resigned and pushed the presidential election forward<sup>631</sup>, with a view to bolstering the UBP’s chances of success, and actively campaigned for the UBP in the 1990 election<sup>632</sup>.

The 1990 parliamentary election was quite different from the previous ones as it was a two party race. This was so because three main opposition parties, the TKP, CTP and YDP, decided to join forces and formed the Democratic Struggle Party (*Demokratik Mücadele Partisi*, DMP) to fight the elections.<sup>633</sup> The reason behind this unlikely partnership was the electoral system introduced by the UBP in the eve of the election, which would favour the biggest party (see Warner 1993: 200 and Dodd 1993: 148-152). The DMP’s electoral

---

<sup>630</sup> Interviewed by author.

<sup>631</sup> See İsmet Kotak: “Yangından Mal Kaçırır Gibi Seçim [Snap election].” *Kıbrıs Postası*, 15.3.1990; and İsmet Kotak: “Cumhurbaşkanlığı Seçimi [The presidential election].” *Kıbrıs Postası*, 24.3.1990; Serdar Denktaş interviewed by author.

<sup>632</sup> See his statements about the Group of 9 made in the press conference held on 9.7.1992 (The copy of the transcript of the press conference from the personal archive of Hakkı Atun).

<sup>633</sup> “Muhalefetin Tarihi Kararı [The opposition’s historical decision].” *Kıbrıs Postası*, 4.3.1990.

pledge was limited to changing the electoral law and renewing the election within three months.<sup>634</sup>

In its first election under the leadership of Eroğlu back in 1985, the UBP had won 24 of 50 seats. But this success was thanks to the eight percent threshold introduced after the declaration of the TRNC because the party garnered only 36.7 percent of the votes -5.8 percentage points below the 1981 result. After two coalition experiences, first with the TKP and then with the YDP, which lasted 13 and 20 months respectively, the UBP formed a single party government by transferring deputies from the YDP. Apparently, Eroğlu did not want to go back to a coalition government after the election, and disregarding the protests of the opposition, he pushed the new electoral law through. The opposition's reaction was strong: "The harbinger of fascism," was the headline of daily *Kıbrıs Postası*.<sup>635</sup> The tension was high.

This polarization led to the conducting of probably the most tainted election campaign in the Turkish Cypriot history. The opposition's allegations were numerous (see Warner 1993: 200-1), and as the report of the parliamentary committee of enquiry, which was set up later to look into the electoral offences committed during the 1990 elections showed, they were largely true. Though, the report produced is not comprehensive -only two and a half pages- and at times vague in wording, its findings clearly showed that the elections were neither free nor fair. In the report, *inter alia*, it was stated that the public employees were paid an extra salary one week before the election, without even completing the legal procedure; that the local and Turkish media repeatedly violated the electoral law influencing the results; that even on the day of election (which was a Sunday), the ministry of interior was opened to grant citizenship to the foreigners (read as Turkish citizens) so that they could vote for the UBP; that Turkish officials toured the villages and influenced voters. The report also concluded that appointments and promotions in the public sector, as well as granting of the T car plate permits and citizenship, and allocation of land should

---

<sup>634</sup> See Mithat Sirmen: "KKTC'de Seçim Sancısı [Election pangs in the TRNC]." *Kıbrıs Postası*, 5.3.1990 (Originally published in *Güneş* (İstanbul)).

<sup>635</sup> See "UBP Seçim Yasa Tasarısını Bugün Meclise Sunuyor: KKTC'de Demokrasi Hançerlendi [The UBP to submit the draft electoral law to the parliament today: A blow to democracy in the TRNC]." *Kıbrıs Postası*, 9.1.1990; "Faşizmin Ayak Sesleri [The harbinger of fascism]." *Kıbrıs Postası*, 10.1.1990; "Avanta Yasası Kabul Edildi [The electoral spoils law approved]." *Kıbrıs Postası*, 17.2.1990.

be stopped in the run up to the elections if more democratic and sound elections would be held in the future.<sup>636</sup>

In the financing of the election campaigns, the public sources had always been reinforced by private funds provided by businessmen close to the party. “In the eve of the elections businessmen were ‘taxed’ in line with the extent of their business dealings with the state: If they were recently given a lucrative public contract or a preferential loan, for instance, the amount of ‘tax’ went up”.<sup>637</sup> In this particular case, the famous businessman Asil Nadir played an exceptional role (see Altan 2003: 22; Egemen 2006: 250-1). “In the 1990 election, more than distribution of public jobs and the bonus salary, it was the cash provided by Asil Nadir, which tipped the balance in favour of the UBP. Money carried in suitcases was given to the ministers who distributed them via the party sections,” recalls a former high-level bureaucrat<sup>638</sup>; and adds that he was personally involved in buying votes in his neighbourhood: “We summoned the family leaders and paid them on a per vote basis”. When I asked him about the details of the campaigning process in the 1980s and 1990s when he was active in the party, he told me the following:

When the election period comes, first, we hold a meeting at the party neighbourhood section. We have the list of voters registered in the neighbourhood in front of us. We know the UBP loyalists; they don’t need to be bribed. So we cross them out. We also know the opposition loyalists; there is nothing to be done about them as well. So, we focus on independents. If the family has a grown up kid who needs a job, we offer a job. If they need land, we offer land. You name it... Even such things like a permit to drill a well can be offered in exchange of votes. ... To support the party sections at the village level, we used public funds allocated for supporting the local football clubs or for the maintenance of the mosques.

## **5.5 The Emergence of the Rift between Denктаş and Erođlu**

In the 1990 elections, the party and Denктаş acted in harmony. Yet, given Denктаş’s tendency to hold the reigns of the party and Erođlu’s determination to protect his turf, a clash between the two leaders was inevitable. The first major disagreement arose in the run up to the by-election scheduled for October 1991 to fill the seats in the parliament,

---

<sup>636</sup> For the full report see KKTC Cumhuriyet Meclisi Tutanak Dergisi [Minutes of the TRNC Parliament], 10.10.1997, pp. 195-8.

<sup>637</sup> Borman interviewed by author.

<sup>638</sup> Anonymous interviewee; see also the statements of Şinasi Başaran, a journalist who used to work at Asil Nadir’s *Kıbrıs* at the time (“Erođlu’na İki Bavul Parayı Ben Götürdüm [I took the two suitcases of money to Erođlu].” *Havadis*, 19.10.2012).

which became vacant when the opposition decided to boycott the parliament.<sup>639</sup> The boycott started when the TKP and CTP deputies had refused to swear in after the 1990 election to protest the undemocratic electoral system and Turkish meddling in the elections (see also Dodd 1993: 151).<sup>640</sup> In Denктаş's opinion, the UBP should not field candidates in the upcoming by-election as a parliament without opposition would put him and the TRNC in an awkward position in the eyes of the international community.<sup>641</sup> Erođlu decided otherwise<sup>642</sup>, and by winning eleven of the twelve seats at stake, the UBP came to control 45 of the 50 seats.

In the meantime, some deputies including Denктаş's younger son Serdar Denктаş who had made a strong debut in politics with the 1990 election by coming first in Nicosia list, started intra-party opposition against Erođlu. Indeed, the first clash between Serdar Denктаş and Erođlu came, when Serdar Denктаş put his nomination for secretary generalship. Erođlu responded by abolishing the position saying, "only communist parties have secretary generals".<sup>643</sup> Serdar Denктаş responded by organizing an opposition movement within the party:

I used to go to my father and tell him about our group. After listening to me, 'how many deputies do you have in the group?' he used to ask. He gave me the nod when I told him we had reached eight.

Upon Denктаş's green light the so-called Group of 9 gave a memorandum to the party leader Erođlu, and resigned from their posts in the party organization in protest in May 1992. After 1976 and 1981, now for the third time a group within the party was coming forward with an agenda to reform the UBP; looking from a different perspective, however, this can be seen just another attempt by Denктаş to retake the control of the party he had established. The memorandum is a succinct summary of the transformation that the Turkish Cypriot community has gone through in the post-1974 era. Of particular importance is what the rebel deputies said about the public administration:

---

<sup>639</sup> "Kaçınıcı Raunt [Which round]." *Milliyet*, 17.4.1995.

<sup>640</sup> A parliamentary investigation committee concluded that the opposition parties were basically right (see the Report of the Parliamentary Investigation Committee, which was set up to investigate the electoral offences committed in the 1990 presidential and parliamentary elections). The committee was established on 1.1.1994 and completed the investigation on 4.6.1997.

<sup>641</sup> "UBP Kaynıyor [The UBP in chaos]." *Kıbrıs Postası*, 5.6.1991; see also his statements dated 9.7.1992.

<sup>642</sup> "Erođlu'ndan Denктаş'a Yanıt: UBP'nin Seçime Girmesiyle Meclisin Yüzü Kararmaz [From Erođlu to Denктаş: The UBP's participation in the elections will not bring shame on the parliament]." *Vatan*, 23.8.1991.

<sup>643</sup> Serdar Denктаş interviewed by author.

... public service personnel, particularly the high level bureaucrats are being held under pressure by a narrow, monopolist cadre of the party and government; those who are trying to protect the rights of the state and the public are being excluded; the civil servants are tried to be modelled as yes men. Merit, experience and objective evaluation are pushed aside ... A circle of fear is built upon the citizens ... Citizens do not benefit from the resources of the state based on legal criteria. Rather, a narrow cadre who holds the political power is arbitrarily monopolizing the distribution of these resources.<sup>644</sup>

Different from the previous rounds, where he acted by pulling the strings behind the scenes, this time Denктаş publicly embraced the intra-party opposition movement<sup>645</sup>, and took active part in the anti-Erođlu campaign.<sup>646</sup> Erođlu showed that he could play as tough as Denктаş by starting disciplinary probe against the rebel deputies, and suspending all nine's membership; something his predecessors could not dare.<sup>647</sup> Eventually, when, the rebels resigned from the party upon the suspension decision<sup>648</sup> to set up the Democratic Party, and brought away a considerable chunk of the members of grassroots organizations with them, particularly in Nicosia and Kyrenia, Erođlu shrewdly filled all vacant posts with his loyalists without election.<sup>649</sup> This is to say, though the party was weakened in general, Erođlu's hold on the party was strengthened after the splintering.

This came in handy particularly when Erođlu lost the premiership after the 1993 election. It is important to note that Denктаş did his best to defeat Erođlu in the polls. To force Erođlu to call early elections, he resigned as the negotiator in the Cyprus talks blaming Erođlu and the UBP of undermining him by making anti-federation statements that cannot be reconciled with his negotiating position.<sup>650</sup> He even explicitly called on Ankara to bring Erođlu into line by using its financial influence, to no avail: "Turkey holds the biggest

---

<sup>644</sup> The copy of the memorandum from the personal archive of Hakkı Atun. The memorandum was dated 4.5.1992. See also "Kriz Dorukta [Crisis peaked]." *Kıbrıs*, 5.5.1992 and "Ve ipler koptu [And the ties are severed]." *Kıbrıs*, 6.5.1992.

<sup>645</sup> "UBP'li Olmadığını Belirten Denктаş 'Erken seçim mutlaka olacak' dedi [Denктаş who stated that he was no longer with the UBP said 'an early election will definitely be called']." *Kıbrıs*, 11.7.1992.

<sup>646</sup> To make Ankara exert pressure on Erođlu, he even resigned as the negotiator blaming Erođlu and the UBP of undermining him by making anti-federation statements that cannot be reconciled with his negotiating position ("Denктаş: Federasyona İnanmayan Bir Hükümetin Görüşmecisi Olmam [I cannot be the negotiator of a government, which does not believe in federation]." *Halkın Sesi*, 7.7.1993; see also Sami Kohen: "Sonuç Çözümü Nasıl Etkiler [How will the result affect the solution]?" *Milliyet*, 10.11.1993).

<sup>647</sup> "Altı Ay UBP'den Uzak Kalacaklar [They will stay away from the UBP for six months]." *Kıbrıs*, 7.7.1992.

<sup>648</sup> "Ve Dokuzlar İstifa Etti [And the group of nine have resigned]." *Kıbrıs*, 10.7.1992.

<sup>649</sup> Anonymous interviewee.

<sup>650</sup> "Denктаş: Federasyona İnanmayan Bir Hükümetin Görüşmecisi Olmam [I cannot be the negotiator of a government, which does not believe in federation]." *Halkın Sesi*, 7.7.1993; see also Sami Kohen: "Sonuç Çözümü Nasıl Etkiler [How will the result affect the solution]?" *Milliyet*, 10.11.1993.

sanction in its hands. It cuts money and says ‘pal, you cannot do that’.”<sup>651</sup> Yet, he could not secure the support of Ankara and eventually, the UBP came in first in the election held in December 1993. From Denktaş’s statements it is understood that the DYP wing of the ruling coalition in Ankara, and particularly Orhan Kilercioğlu, the state minister responsible for Cyprus affairs protected Eroğlu.<sup>652</sup> However, Denktaş refused to give the mandate to form the government to Eroğlu, and after blaming him of bribing the voters, expressed his hope that “the intra-party movement against Eroğlu ... succeeds and makes his job easier”.<sup>653</sup> So strong was Denktaş’s hostility against Eroğlu that the process brought about the Cypriot version of *compromesso storico* –historic compromise: The DP-CTP coalition.

Having fallen from power, Eroğlu found himself in a struggle for his political survival. Emin, whom he earlier had called back from retirement and appointed as the deputy chairman to pull the party together<sup>654</sup>, turned against him and tried to force him to resign. Indeed, he announced that he would resign<sup>655</sup> only to change his mind a day later “upon the pressure from the party base”.<sup>656</sup> This led to Emin’s nomination for the party chairmanship in the upcoming party conference in October 1994. Though Eroğlu easily won the election<sup>657</sup>, the UBP suffered yet another blow, when defeated Emin resigned from the party to set up a new one. To encourage the party organization to vote out Eroğlu, Denktaş repeatedly stated that he was not going to give the mandate to form the government to Eroğlu. The message was clear: only obstacle between the UBP and government is its chairman. Specifically, just before the UBP conference, he said should the DP-CTP coalition fall, he was not going to ask Eroğlu to form the government, “as in his eight years in office as the prime minister, he misused power, and ordered committing of [electoral] offences, which required imprisonment”.<sup>658</sup> Accordingly, when the coalition eventually resigned few

---

<sup>651</sup> Özcan Ercan: "Kıbrıs Dosyası [The Cyprus dossier] (3)." *Milliyet*, 8.10.1993.

<sup>652</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>653</sup> Akay Cemal: "Eroğlu'na Görev Yok [No mandate to Eroğlu]." *Milliyet*, 14.12.1993.

<sup>654</sup> Emin interviewed by author.

<sup>655</sup> "Eroğlu İstifa Ediyor [Eroğlu is going to resign]." *Kıbrıs*, 7.4.1994.

<sup>656</sup> "Eroğlu Tabanın Baskısı Üzerine İstifa Etmekten Vazgeçti [Upon the base's pressure Eroğlu decided not to resign]." *Kıbrıs*, 9.4.1994.

<sup>657</sup> Eroğlu received 521 of the 757 votes cast ("UBP, 'Eroğlu' dedi [The UBP said 'Eroğlu']." *Kıbrıs*, 17.10.1994).

<sup>658</sup> "Denktaş: 'Sayın Eroğlu, ekme su ister gibi başbakanlık istememeli' [Denktaş: 'Mr Eroğlu should not ask for the premiership as if he were asking for bread or water']." *Kıbrıs*, 3.9.1994.

months later, he asked a UBP deputy, Paşalar to form the government.<sup>659</sup> He said in doing so, he intended “to help to reunite the base, which has been divided needlessly”.<sup>660</sup> “I used my constitutional authority to reconcile the base,” he added. When he was asked what he thought about allegations that he appointed Paşalar “to further divide the UBP,” he put the blame for division on Eroğlu once again:

The DP’s birth has been attributed to me for known reasons. But nobody is saying that if 9 deputies had not been needlessly expelled from the party with a vengeful dictatorial decision, the base would not have been divided. The one who took that decision and kicked them out is to be blamed.

The DP leadership stated that Denктаş’s decision to give the mandate to Paşalar was “a step on the way to reunifying the right,” and expressed its willingness to take part in a UBP-DP coalition under Paşalar’s premiership.<sup>661</sup> However, the UBP’s party assembly unanimously decided to return the mandate next day.<sup>662</sup> Denктаş blamed Eroğlu and UBP of squandering an historic opportunity. What is more, he seemed to be surprised by the unanimity of the decision, and said, more than six deputies who had pledged their support for Paşalar “obviously went back on their pledges,”<sup>663</sup> admitting that he was in league with certain UBP deputies to depose Eroğlu.

The feud took a different turn in the 1995 presidential election, when Eroğlu ran as the first UBP candidate to contest against Denктаş and managed to force a run-off by garnering 24.1 percent of the votes. Remarkably, there was a perception that this time, at least in the first round, Denктаş was not actively supported by Ankara.<sup>664</sup> When he was asked about this in a press conference, Denктаş said, certain politicians from Turkey, particularly Orhan Kilercioğlu, now only a DYP backbencher, had undermined him.<sup>665</sup> Yet, he managed to win the second round easily by getting 62 percent of the votes.

---

<sup>659</sup> “Görev Paşalar’ın [Mandate given to Paşalar].” *Kıbrıs*, 16.3.1995.

<sup>660</sup> “Amaç Sağı Birleştirmek [The aim is to unite the right].” *Kıbrıs*, 16.3.1995.

<sup>661</sup> “Görev Paşalar’ın [Mandate given to Paşalar].” *Kıbrıs*, 16.3.1995.

<sup>662</sup> “UBP’den Ret [Refusal from the UBP].” *Kıbrıs*, 17.3.1995.

<sup>663</sup> “Denктаş: Çare Buluruz [Denктаş: We will find a solution].” *Kıbrıs*, 17.3.1995.

<sup>664</sup> This was the conclusion derived by a journalist from the fact that Denктаş could not win in the first round (see “Denктаş: ‘MAP destek için benden 3 milyar istedi [Denктаş: ‘MAP asked for 3 billion in exchange for support’].” *Kıbrıs*, 18.4.1996).

<sup>665</sup> *Ibid.*

After the presidential election, Denктаş maintained his anti-Erođlu stance, and gave the mandate to form the government, once again to the DP leader Atun. Accordingly, the second DP-CTP coalition was formed, which would last less than six months. This was followed by the third DP-CTP coalition, which resigned a little more than six months later. The collapse of three DP-CTP governments in only 30 months is remarkable and the reasons behind this merits further attention.

How can we explain the failure of historic compromise? Why did Denктаş eventually back down and hand the premiership to Erođlu<sup>666</sup>, whom he detested so much? The 1994 Turkish economic crisis is the obvious answer. As a result of this crisis, in Celasun’s words, “in the first quarter of 1994, the Turkish Lira (TL) was devalued more than 50 percent against the USD, the [Turkish] Central Bank lost half of its reserves, interest rates skyrocketed, and the inflation rate reached three digit levels” (1998, 2). Given the dependence of the Turkish Cypriot economy on the Turkish one, it is not difficult to conclude that the same effects were felt in the island too. As in Turkey, the crisis also led to a small-scale banking crisis.<sup>667</sup> More significantly, a sharp decline in the Turkish financial assistance can be observed in the 1994-5 period. While the amount of money transferred from Ankara stood at USD 82.6 million in 1993, it fell to USD 50.6 million in 1994, and then to USD 44.3 million in 1995.<sup>668</sup> In the absence of Ankara’s support, the government failed to pay the salaries on time in May<sup>669</sup>, June<sup>670</sup>, and July 1996<sup>671</sup>. The shortage of money inevitably turned into a social turmoil, and this led to the resignation of the government.

No matter how plausible this explanation is, it only partly accounts for the failure of the DP-CTP coalition. A deeper analysis reveals that the reason behind this crisis was not purely economic. The fact that the Turkish economy was going through a rough patch at the time cannot be denied. Yet, the real reason behind the Turkish government’s parsimony was the CTP’s participation in the government, and not its own economic woes. It is not hard to see

---

<sup>666</sup> “Yeşil Işık [Green Light].” *Kıbrıs*, 2.7.1996.

<sup>667</sup> “Akdeniz Garanti ve Everest Devlet Kontrolünde [Akdeniz Garanti and Everest Bank under state control].” *Kıbrıs*, 2.5.1994.

<sup>668</sup> TC Yardım Heyeti (2004: 25). See also the table in Annex.

<sup>669</sup> “Maaş Yok [No salary].” *Kıbrıs*, 3.5.1996; “Coşar: ‘Maaşlar Türkiye’den Bulunuyor [Coşar: Salaries got from Turkey].” *Kıbrıs*, 11.5.1996.

<sup>670</sup> “Memur Çekleri Dağıtıldı, Para Bugün [The civil servant paychecks distributed; cash today].” *Kıbrıs*, 4.6.1996.

<sup>671</sup> “Maaşlar Bugün veya Yarın [Salaries will be paid today or tomorrow].” *Kıbrıs*, 2.7.1996.

that the CTP's stance towards the solution of the Cyprus problem, civilianization of the police department or its willingness to place the relations between Turkey and the TRNC to a state-to-state basis did not win it many friends in Ankara. Serdar Denktaş also confirms that Ankara never approved their coalition with the CTP.<sup>672</sup> To say the least, this was the perception in the nationalist circles<sup>673</sup>, which was also shared by the CTP.<sup>674</sup> The more than doubling of Turkish aid to USD 91.9 million in 1996<sup>675</sup> after the forming of the UBP-DP government shows that this perception was right. Indeed, the Turkish premier Erbakan did not hide that he preferred a right-wing government.<sup>676</sup> He played an active role in the formation of the UBP-DP coalition by bringing the two parties' leaders together in a hotel room when he visited Cyprus.<sup>677</sup>

It is important to note that the Turkish establishment did not air its discontent about the involvement of the CTP in government by only playing the financial assistance card. There was a parallel campaign, which culminated with the explosion of a bomb in the Nicosia branch of the CTP on May Day.<sup>678</sup> The CTP called upon the solidarity and support of international actors by releasing a public statement entitled "Escalation of Terrorist Activities in Northern Cyprus" via its London Solidarity Association.<sup>679</sup> The following excerpt from this release does not only reflect the situation on the ground very well but also sheds light on the role of the Turkish "deep state" in Cyprus before the existence of this organization began to be discussed in the Turkish public opinion. I will briefly touch upon this in the next chapter.

---

<sup>672</sup> Interviewed by author.

<sup>673</sup> See for instance Eşref Çetinel: "İktidar Hakkı Ankara'dan Para Sağlayanındır [The right to govern belongs to the one who secures money from Ankara]." *Halkın Sesi*, 9.3.1996; see also İsmet Kotak: "Anavatan-Yavruvatan' İlişkisi İstemediklerinden Halkı Mahkum Ediyorlar [People suffer because they do not want to have an infant-mother type of relationship with Turkey]." *Halkın Sesi*, 25.3.1996; Artun Çağa's interview with Serdar Denktaş, *Kıbrıs*, 3.5.1996; Eşref Çetinel: "Bu Hükümetle Bu Memleket Kurtulmaz [This government cannot rescue this country]." *Halkın Sesi*, 30.3.1996.

<sup>674</sup> See Talat's statements ("UBP-DP Uzun Ömürlü Olmaz [The UBP-DP will not last long]." *Kıbrıs*, 21.8.1996) and Soyer's statements cited in Dilek Çetereisi: "Soyer Rekor Kıramadı [Soyer could not break the record]." *Kıbrıs*, 27.8.1996.

<sup>675</sup> TC Yardım Heyeti (2004: 25).

<sup>676</sup> See Eroğlu cited in "Erbakan'dan İç Politikamıza Müdahale [Erbakan meddling in our domestic politics]." *Yenidüzen*, 24.7.1996.

<sup>677</sup> After calling for the formation of a broad-based coalition, Erbakan said, "motherland is strong and rich. It can provide the resources required for the economic development of the northern Cyprus". Later, he met with Serdar and Eroğlu, in Talat's words "to broker a coalition between the DP and UBP" (see "Geniş Tabanlı Hükümet Çağrısı [Call for a broad-based coalition]" *Kıbrıs*, 21.7.1996); see also Ülker Fahri: "Şeffaf Müdahale [Transparent intervention]." *Yenidüzen*, 26.7.1996.

<sup>678</sup> "CTP'ye Bomba [The CTP building bombed]." *Kıbrıs*, 3.5.1996.

<sup>679</sup> For the full public statement see *Kıbrıs*, 28.5.1996.

Secret distribution of unsigned pamphlets, posting anonymous letters of threat to individuals, chauvinistic propaganda by newly revitalized members of old underground organizations<sup>680</sup>, warmongering by generals, importation of groups of reactionaries, ultranationalists and religious fanatics, vandalism of island's cultural heritage and planting of explosives at private houses and cars, offices, night clubs, banks and political centers have been the norm of terrorist activities in northern Cyprus over the past two years.

In spite of the fact that these terrorist activities are on constant increase no one has yet assumed responsibility, no suspect has yet been identified and no arrest has been made. There is no plan of action and no measure has been taken either to deter or search for those responsible.

The democratic forces in northern Cyprus are seriously concerned because it is hard to believe that terrorism can run loose and undetected under the nose of the prevailing martial rule at the rate of one 'security personnel' for every four civilians

...

All the indications are that what is being witnessed today is just the tip of an iceberg of much wider campaign by the reactionaries, ultranationalists and fundamentalists in Turkey and in Cyprus to silence the opposition and pave the way to the solution leading to territorial integration of northern Cyprus to Turkey and extinction of a Turkish Cypriot community on the island.

Not surprisingly, the CTP's statement attracted the reaction of the nationalist circles<sup>681</sup>, and probably hastened the dissolution of the coalition. Yet, it did not deter further attacks. The explosion of a bomb at the DP headquarters right after the release of the statement, the assassination of Kutlu Adalı<sup>682</sup>, a pro-federation journalist, and the border incidents that led to the killing of two Greek Cypriot demonstrators in the following two months proved the concerns raised in the statement right.

The fact that the formal negotiations for the UBP-DP coalition lasted more than two months<sup>683</sup>, and that the talks collapsed more than once, in a way, show that the UBP-DP

---

<sup>680</sup> The group called itself Libertarian Turkish Brigade (Özgürlükçü Türk Tugayı), see *Halkın Sesi*, 17.4.1996.

<sup>681</sup> The UBP leader, for instance, identified it as "scandalous" ("Eroğlu: 'Koalisyonu Tartışırız' [We can discuss a coalition]." *Kıbrıs*, 28.5.1996); see also "CTP'nin Türkiye'ye Yönelik Beyanları Kabul Edilemez [The CTP's statements regarding Turkey are unacceptable]." *Kıbrıs*, 29.5.1996; "Kotak: 'CTP Örgütleri KKTC'yi Arkadan Vurdu' [The CTP subsidiaries backstabbed the TRNC]," and "MAP: 'DP-CTP Görüşmeleri Halka Saygısızlık' [The DP-CTP meetings are disrespect to people]." *Kıbrıs*, 29.5.1996; "Etkin'den CTP'ye Sert Eleştiri: 'Hükümette İşiniz Ne [Harsh criticism against the CTP from Etkin: 'what are you doing in the government]?" *Kıbrıs*, 1.6.1996.

<sup>682</sup> "Siyasi Cinayet [Political murder]." *Kıbrıs*, 7.7.1996; a day later, the Turkish Revenge Brigade claimed responsibility for the assassination ("T.İ.T. Üstlendi [T.İ.T. claimed]." *Kıbrıs*, 8.7.1996).

<sup>683</sup> The DP party assembly authorized their leader to start coalition negotiations with the UBP in the early hours of June 11th (see "DP-UBP Gündemde [DP-CTP on agenda]." *Kıbrıs*, 11.6.1996). The DP-CTP coalition

coalition was an arranged -or to be more precise, a shotgun- marriage, at least looking from the DP side.

As a commentator put it, the whole process can be interpreted as a preparation for a post-Denktaş era; “certain circles in Turkey” were trying to initiate a rapprochement between the two right wing parties with a view to creating “a new leader,” and this new leader was obviously Eroğlu.<sup>684</sup> The fact that Denktaş had a heart attack in early March and stayed out of office for almost two months certainly gives credit to this kind of comments.<sup>685</sup> Still, no matter how much sense this made for those in Ankara, this was not something that Denktaş could easily stomach. Yet, on the face of growing pressure, he had no option but to yield.

Only looking from this broader perspective, one can understand Denktaş’s green light to the formation of an Eroğlu-led government after all he has done to get rid of him. “The party has embraced its leader. His party refused the reasons I had raised before. People have also forgotten. Being stubborn does not make sense,” Denktaş said, before adding that he did not see any reason for not giving the mandate to Eroğlu.<sup>686</sup> Having said that, this did not mean that Denktaş accepted the defeat and settled for a peaceful *cohabitation* with Eroğlu. It would turn out that this was just a tactical retreat. When a more favourable government came to power in Ankara, he struck back. This and its implications, I will discuss in Chapter Six.

---

formally came to an end on July 4th (“DP-CTP Bitti [DP-CTP over].” *Kıbrıs*, 5.7.1996), and the DP and UBP reached an agreement to form a coalition government on August 14th (“UBP-DP Nihayet Tamam [UBP-DP finally OK].” *Kıbrıs*, 15.8.1996).

<sup>684</sup> Başaran Düzgün: “Denktaş Sonrası Dönem [The post-Denktaş period].” *Yenidüzen*, 29.5.1996.

<sup>685</sup> Ses for instance “Denktaş’ın Durumu İyi [Denktaş’s condition is good].” *Kıbrıs*, 4 March 1996.

<sup>686</sup> “Yeşil Işık [Green Light].” *Kıbrıs*, 2.7.1996.

## **Chapter 6: The Left's Perfect Storm: A Politico-Economic Analysis of the End of the Monopoly of Nationalism in Turkish Cypriot Politics**

This concluding chapter focuses on the transformation process, which has culminated with the Turkish Cypriot community's approval of the UN's reunification plan in April 2004. It aims to explain how, against all odds, politico-economic dynamics, which have sustained the pro-*taksim* consensus until the early 2000s, have drastically changed, and turned the EU into a strong overarching element to mobilize masses, prompting the sudden end of the half a century old monopoly of Turkish nationalism in Turkish Cypriot politics.

Only few years ago, such a thing was inconceivable. As Diez suggests, when the EU membership came to agenda in the 1990s, it was portrayed "as an existential threat to the Turkish-Cypriot community's identity," and used as a pretext to deepen integration with Turkey (2002: 146). The electorate did not seem to be bothered by this. To the contrary, in the 2000 presidential election, the combined votes of the two nationalist rivals, Denktaş and Eroğlu reached almost 74 percent. However, despite the alarmist discourse of the nationalist establishment, instead of solidification of the Turkish identity, paradoxically, what we see in the period to come was the rise of a more inclusive vision of a political community envisaging coexistence with the long-mistrusted "other". Cypriotism was on the rise at an unlikely time and in an unprecedented manner.

In what follows, I analyze the politico-economic dynamics underlying this paradoxical transformation process. At the center of this turnaround lies the drying up of the financial resources under the government's disposal, at a time when the need for fresh funds tended to go up by the day. Particularly, the appeal of the clientelistic system began to decline when two consecutive economic crises struck a blow on the finances of the government and severely curbed its distributive capacity. The Annan plan with its prospect of immediate membership to the EU was introduced when the social unrest triggered by the economic crises was at its peak. After Ankara's blocking of their coming to power in 1981, the two vanguards of federal settlement to the Cyprus problem and Cypriotism, the TKP and CTP had been effectively pushed to the sidelines, though as mentioned in the previous chapter, both took part in short-lived coalitions as junior partners. Now, with the increasingly impoverishing effects of the crises on the masses, and the EU membership around the corner, the left was resuscitated back to life, and particularly the CTP assumed

the leadership of the pro-reunification movement. For the first time, the pro-reunification opposition was able to offer a tangible alternative political project to replace the defunct politico-economic structure.

These developments were taken up in the literature by Lacher and Kaymak (2005), and Kızılyürek (2002 and 2005), who analyzed the identity transformation within the Turkish Cypriot community in a broader historical context. This chapter complements these studies by elaborating on the politico-economic dynamics preparing this transformation in the 1990s and early 2000s. The emphasis is on the “catalyst effect” of the EU; the banking crisis; and infighting within the nationalist camp whose roots were taken up in the previous chapter. What is completely new here is, particularly, the analysis of the latent role of the schism within the nationalist camp in this process. I argue that what really escalated the banking crisis into a full-scale social turmoil was Denktaş’s attempt to politicize and instrumentalize it during and aftermath of the 2000 presidential election campaign to eliminate his archrival Eroğlu once and for all, and his rival’s determination not to yield. Without this self-inflicted wound the banking and subsequent financial crisis could have been weathered without much damage on the integrity of the post-1974 establishment. Indeed, this schism was not new, and as briefly touched upon in the previous chapter, the negative effects of a similar -albeit slightly smaller- combination of banking and currency crises were aggravated by political manipulation in the mid-1990s, without causing the fraction of the anti-establishment backlash experienced in the early 2000s. Yet, of course one should remember that at that time, the prospect of EU membership was not imminent enough to make it a real game-changer.

Before focusing on the details of the dissolution process in the last section of this chapter, in the first three sections, I will show the macro-economic and social consequences of some two decades of clientelism under the UBP with a view to demonstrating the fragility of the economy, and the damage inflicted on the social fabric at large. I also show (a) that the public sector was indeed even more over-bloated than it has often been assumed, and (b) that this huge public sector was the result of what Lyrintzis calls “bureaucratic clientelism,” a distinct form of clientelism.

## 6.1 Delayed Catalysis: The Agonies of the Old Regime

In the last few years following the RoC's accession to the EU, Brussels has often been criticized for admitting a divided Cyprus and leaving the Turkish Cypriots outside in the cold. Yet, those looking for a culprit should look elsewhere. After all, the intention of the EU when it had declared the RoC a candidate was to induce the Turkish Cypriot side to be more conciliatory in the inter-communal negotiations, and in that it certainly succeeded - though the wisdom of this approach at some point had been seriously questioned (Larrabee 1998; Dodd 1999; Jakobsson-Hatay 2001; Diez 2002; Yeşilada and Sözen 2002). The problem was, to the dismay of the proponents of this change, the expected "catalyst effect" kicked in too late. By the time the pro-reunification camp took over the cockpit, the crucial deadlines were already missed<sup>687</sup> due to, what David Hannay called "kamikaze approach" of the Turkish diplomacy (2005: 143).

Against this backdrop, if we are to understand the turnaround, first we need to put the EU dimension into its historical context, and explain the initial failure of the expected "catalyst effect". To start with the ruling nationalist elite, it should be noted that the EU membership had never been an incentive for a settlement for them.<sup>688</sup> Quite the opposite, it had been dismissed as a "carrot" aiming to deceive the Turkish Cypriot people in order to separate them from their "motherland" (Denktaş cited in Kızılyürek 2003: 300). It was nothing but *enosis* in disguise or "through the backdoor"<sup>689</sup> (Cem 2001: 180; see also Diez 2002), and hence should be avoided at all costs.<sup>690</sup> From their perspective, the Cyprus problem was solved back in 1974 anyway<sup>691</sup>, and "any settlement short of the legalization of the status quo" was not desirable (Lacher and Kaymak 2005: 153; see also Hannay 2005). Ankara's position was not different either. When the EU leaders declared, in Corfu in 1994, that the next phase of enlargement of the Union would include the RoC, the then Turkish foreign minister Murat Karayalçın expressed Turkey's misgivings by saying "in such an undesirable

---

<sup>687</sup> The RoC was formally admitted to the EU -long before the referendum- after signing the Treaty of Accession on 16 April 2003 when Denktaş was still at the helm.

<sup>688</sup> "Denktaş: Türkiyesiz Avrupalı Olamayız [We cannot become European without Turkey]." *Kıbrıs*, 5.4.1995.

<sup>689</sup> Denktaş used this expression in his election campaign in 1995 ("Barajı Geçtim [I cleared the threshold]." *Kıbrıs*, 13.4.1995).

<sup>690</sup> See also the DP leader and prime minister Hakkı Atun's statements cited in "Aman Türkiye Duymasını [Don't let Turkey hear that]!" *Nokta Kıbrıs*, 8.5.1994, p.10.

<sup>691</sup> See for instance the statement of Ecevit cited in Fikret Bila: "Ecevit'ten AB'ye Uyarı [Warning to the EU from Ecevit]." *Milliyet*, 23.7.2000.

eventuality, Turkey will be left with no option but to take steps towards achieving a similar integration with the TRNC” (cited in Kramer 2000: 177). Accordingly, Turkey and the TRNC signed an agreement establishing Association Council in 1997, “with the objective of achieving integration between the two countries in the economic and financial fields as well as achieving partial integration in matters of security, defense and foreign affairs”.<sup>692</sup>

The decision of the EU Luxembourg Summit to exclude Turkey from the list of candidate states, and the Greek Cypriot administration’s plan to deploy Russian-made S 300 missiles in the island worsened the already strained relations between the two sides (Yeşilada and Sözen 2002: 269). Consequently, the tone of Turkey’s reaction to the progress of relations between the EU and the RoC became even harsher after the formal opening of accession negotiations in March 1998. İsmail Cem, the then Turkish foreign minister had urged the EU “to evaluate its future steps very carefully before it is too late and before the Greek Cypriot administration paves the way towards another war on the island” (cited in Kramer 2000: 178). In August 1998, Denktaş, backed by the Turkish government, took advantage of the situation to further his *taksim* agenda and came up with preconditions for the resumption of inter-communal negotiations, including the Greek Cypriot side’s recognition of the TRNC and negotiating settlement on the basis of confederation.

When we look at the initial impact of the prospect of EU membership on the electorate, we see that it was equally negative. The December 1998 parliamentary election brought a landslide victory for the nationalist parties, whose overall share of the vote reached its historical peak with approximately 68 percent. Denktaş welcomed the result as “a victory for the national cause,” and said that the success of the majority, who had always been loyal to Turkey and determined to maintain the TRNC, was an unmistakable message to the world. He attributed the decline of the CTP’s support to its stance towards the “national cause” and dismissed its leader Talat’s earlier statement “Turkey is not my motherland,” as ridiculous.<sup>693</sup> A few months later, the electorate reaffirmed its support for the nationalist leaders in the presidential election. By 2000, the expected “catalyst effect” of EU

---

<sup>692</sup><http://www.mfa.gov.tr/agreement-between-the-government-of-the-republic-of-turkey-and-the-government-of-the-turkish-republic-of-northern-cyprus-on-the.en.mfa> (accessed on 18.3.2013).

<sup>693</sup> TAK’s news bulletin dated 7.12.1998

<http://www.emu.edu.tr/~tak/news/19981207.htm> (accessed on 19.3.2013); see also Sertaç Görgüner: “Görev Eroğlu’nun [The mandate given to Eroğlu].” *Kıbrıs*, 9.12.1998.

membership in promoting a more flexible stance was obviously lacking at both elite and mass level.

If it seems unsurprising that the elites remained committed to secessionism, it is more difficult to explain the indifference at the level of society at large. To account for this unresponsiveness, the attention should be turned, once again, to the clientelistic linkage mechanism established between voters and elites. By the early 2000s, looking from the perspective of the nationalist politicians, the clientelistic system seemed to be still, to quote Uğur, “resolute enough to survive under-performance in economic terms” (2003: 64). This was true so long as Ankara continued pumping money into the system. In fact, the Turkish Cypriot economy was nothing but a house of cards. Overall public finances were in a shambles after decades of misallocation of resources making the system extremely susceptible to external shocks; something those politicians failed to see at the time and would learn the hard way.

In what follows, I elaborate on the accumulated effects of clientelism on the economy and society to lay the ground for explaining why the whole establishment went into such a big crisis when Ankara turned off the tap. To start with, I take the Italian case as a benchmark, and very briefly look at the effects of the decades long DC dominance on the socio-economic development of this country to give a general idea about the connection between political clientelism on the one hand, and economic underperformance and corruption on the other. What render this comparison possible is three fundamental similarities between the DC and UBP: their conservatism; non-programmatic, clientelistic nature; and dominant role as the government party for a long time.

In the literature, general assumption is that political clientelism is damaging for economic growth (Lemarchand and Legg 1972; Stokes 2007; Müller 2007: 263; for a critical assessment see Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007(b)). Yet, Kitschelt and Wilkinson point out that these assumptions “are based on little empirical evidence” (2007b: 329). Having said that, they concede that, “on average, the prevalence of clientelism may foster more satisfaction of rent-seeking interests, worse governance, and weaker economic performance than polities with mostly programmatic competition” (*ibid.*: 333-4). What prevents them from talking about a stronger relationship between political clientelism and its negative consequences is their assumption that democratic competition for political

office restrains the extent of clientelism, bad governance and corruption (*ibid.*). If this is so, then in polities where such competition is seriously distorted as in the cases of north Cyprus and the Cold War era Italy due to absence of alternation in power, such restraints were obviously not in force, and one may conclude without much hesitation that political clientelism prompted high level of corruption and poor economic performance. In this regard, as the literature shows, the Italian case is particularly telling.

It is also important to note that thanks to the independence of judiciary in Italy, at least some of the worst offenders were exposed and held accountable (Müller 2007: 267). A case in point was the *tangentopoli* scandal. This is to say, the Italian case may give us a rough idea about what has been swept under the carpet in the Turkish Cypriot case where the subordination of the judiciary to the political establishment did not allow such catharsis. Besides, as it has been studied much more extensively in general, the findings of this vast literature can be extrapolated to the Turkish Cypriot case, a virgin territory, to support anecdotal evidence.

To start with, to understand why clientelism leads to relatively slow economic growth one may look, *inter alia*, at the organizational nature of clientelistic political parties. Tarrow identifies the DC as “part conservative party of business, part anticommunist bastion, part confessional party, part party of defence of the 'little man', and, most basically, the Italian version of the postwar phenomenon of the 'catch-all people's party'” (1979: 170). Replace the expressions “confessional” with “nationalist”, and the “Italian” with “Turkish Cypriot,” and the description applies perfectly well to the UBP (for the “catchall” character of the DC see also for instance Allum and Allum 2008: 343). It was exactly because of this nature that similar to the DC’s, the UBP’s extraordinary success in the election time has never been matched by its performance in governing. The presence of representatives of different interest groups within the party made it vulnerable to conflicting demands from different sources. In other words, the very factors that gave the party a big advantage when running an election campaign, paralyzed the party when it came to governing. To quote Tarrow once again, the DC’s

major defects lay in the policy area, where it developed an inability to make hard choices and dispersed resources, rather than concentrating their impact on chosen policy targets. ... Public intervention took the form of subsidies to industry, a large nationalised sector and generous public assistance to a variety of social groups.

What never developed was the capacity for concerted public activity to increase demand, to create or redirect employment, or to come to grips with the structural problems of an economy divided into modern and traditional sectors—in other words, economic planning (1979: 170 and 174).

Add this, another feature that the two cases had in common, and the picture becomes clearer. That is lack of alternation in power. In Pasquino's words:

Always present, and in a dominant role, in all the various national governmental coalitions, often leading exclusively DC cabinets (*monocolori*), the party and its leaders were able to strengthen and consolidate their ties with the bureaucracy, the public managers, the Cassa per il Mezzogiorno (Southern Development Agency), the banking system. Unfettered by any control, DC hegemony over these sectors was taken for granted by the "controlled" as well as by the party (1979: 95).

Under such circumstances, the state had come to be "perceived primarily as a vehicle for the pursuit of personal, party, and factional interests, leading to a blurring of the line between public and private and between legitimate and illegitimate forms of power and influence" (Chubb 2004: 465). In a political system, where the citizens' basic rights were transformed into "privileges" or "favours," by party bosses, "not just businessmen and politicians, but almost all citizens became complicit in some form of clientelism or corruption as a necessary lubricant to unblock an otherwise unresponsive bureaucracy" (*ibid.*) leading to the emergence of "mass socialization in the practices of illegality" (Signorelli cited in Chubb 2004: 465-6).

Though it is almost impossible to illustrate it in a decisive way, one may clearly sense the same perception and conditions outlined above in the Turkish Cypriot community too. As far as political corruption, and illegitimate forms of power and influence is concerned, though there is not much scholarly research at hand, plenty of anecdotal evidence is available as mentioned in the previous chapters, which could probably put it almost at par with southern Italy. To give just few examples from the more recent past, "today, whoever you ask in the TRNC who is not associated with the governing party...complains about corruption, clientelism and favoritism," the Turkish weekly *Nokta's* reporter observes in 1992. "The clearest manifestation of this situation is the case of Ömer Demir, a UBP deputy, who had been caught smuggling heroin via the VIP lounge at the airport," Atun, the then

speaker of the parliament, points out.<sup>694</sup> Demir was acquitted after the only witness of the case escaped from police custody in a rather dubious way leading to allegations that he was part of a much bigger and influential clandestine network.

The involvement of politicians in criminal cases aside<sup>695</sup> – or probably in conjunction with that- by the late 1990s, the TRNC made a reputation as a safe-haven for “casino and money laundering operations”<sup>696</sup> (see Gunter 1998: 133). Apparently, the Turkish “deep state,” the Turkish equivalent of *Gladio*, was in the middle of all of this. It is known that this organization was involved in many illicit activities in Turkey and abroad, including “political assassinations, drug trafficking, and political corruption at the highest levels” (*ibid.*: 119). According to Fikri Sağlar, the former Minister of Culture (Turkey) and the member of the parliamentary enquiry committee established to investigate the Susurluk scandal, which revealed “the relationship between the Turkish state and its intelligence community on the one hand, and organized international crime on the other,” (*ibid.*: 120)- northern part of Cyprus was one of the hotbeds of the deep state’s operations.<sup>697</sup>

Remarkably, the bomb attacks against opposition politicians<sup>698</sup>, the bombing of the houses of two prime-ministers, Eroğlu and Talat in 2001 and 2004 respectively, and the assassination of a dissident journalist<sup>699</sup>, which all went unaccounted for, are also attributed to the Turkish deep state, which had a long track record of politically motivated assassinations and provocations in Turkey and elsewhere (For the Turkish deep state see Söyler 2012; Polat 2011 and Gunter 1998). Given the interpenetration of crime and politics,

---

<sup>694</sup> Kadri Gürsel: “Kıbrıs’ta Çözumsuzlüğe İsyân [Revolt against non-settlement in Cyprus].” *Nokta*, 22.11.1992, p. 14.

<sup>695</sup> See also for instance Özker Özgür: “Öne Fırlatılmış [Hurled forward].” *Yenidüzen*, 5.4.1990.

<sup>696</sup> See also “Turkey and Corruption: Rotten Eggs Unbroken.” *The Economist*, 1.11.2001.

<sup>697</sup> Fikri Sağlar cited in Mehmet Altan: “Korsan Ada [Pirate island].” *Sabah*, 15.5.2004.

<sup>698</sup> For a detailed account of bombing attacks in the 1989-1993 period see Sevgül Uludağ: “Bombalı Yaşam [Life with bombs].” *Nokta Kıbrıs*, 20.3.1994, pp. 12-15; see also “Hasan Erçakıca’ya Atılan Dinamit Kontrgerilla Eylemine Benzetildi: Demokrasiye Gölge Düştü [The dynamite thrown to Hasan Erçakıca’s house likened to counter-guerilla operation: democracy overshadowed].” *Nokta Kıbrıs*, 29.5.1994; for a more recent tally see Mert Özdağ: “Ve KKTC polisi yakalar(maz) [And the TRNC police (don’t) catch]?” *Yenidüzen*, 22.6.2012.

<sup>699</sup> Later, the assassinated journalist Kutlu Adalı’s wife sued Turkey in the European Court of Human Rights, where Turkey was found guilty (see for instance Ayşe Karabat: “Visit reminds of dark files army was allegedly involved in.” *Today’s Zaman*, 5.9.2008.

no wonder that the TRNC came to be compared with Sicily in the mid-1990s<sup>700</sup> - which is yet another similarity with the Italian case (For the Italian case, see for instance Sassoon 1995).

When we look at the role of the Turkish Cypriot state in the economy, we see that again similarities with the Italian case are manifold i.e. generous subsidies, pensions and public assistance to a variety of social groups, and a large public sector. The way the state, which came to be conflated with the UBP, had manipulated the resources under its disposal, resulted in a stagnant economy. The export revenues generated in 2002, for instance, was not much different from the amount in 1980, and averaged slightly above USD 50 million in the period concerned. Few sectors, like manufacturing which had some potential for growth fell victim to the regime's secessionist policies; the sector was hit by the European Court of Justice's ruling on the Anastasiou case (1994), which effectively excluded the Turkish Cypriot products from the EU market. According to the figures released by the Turkish Cypriot Chamber of Industry, employment figures in the sector had slipped from 13 thousand in 1994 to 9 thousand in 1999 and continued to decline ever since.<sup>701</sup> Reluctance of the Turkish government to open its market to the Turkish Cypriot products further undermined the manufacturing sector.<sup>702</sup>

The end of the so-called luggage tourism<sup>703</sup> after liberalization of Turkish economy, which had been a major source of revenue until then, created another shock on the economy. Indeed, in the mid-1980s as part of a new economic strategy to overcome this bottleneck, "tourism was declared the leading sector of the economy, with the lion's share of resources - largely in the form of incentive credits from Turkey - being earmarked for assistance to tourism development" (Scott 2000: 60). Yet, the strategy's success was limited (*ibid.*), basically because the soft loans provided via the newly established development bank was used to enrich cronies; "all 16 businessmen who benefited from the scheme happened to be

---

<sup>700</sup> Cited in Sevgül Uludağ: "O Şimdi Bodyguard [He is a bodyguard now]." *Nokta Kıbrıs*, 5.6.1994, p. 12. See also Turhan Dağcı: "Sicilya'dan Beter Olduk [We became worse than Sicily]." *Vatan*, 11.12.1993. According to Bülent Şemiler, "the cost of non-settlement in Cyprus will be Sicilianization of the part of island under our control, and social collapse" ("Siyasi Çözüm [Political Settlement]..." *Nokta Kıbrıs*, 27.3.1994, p. 15).

<sup>701</sup> "İşyerlerine Kilit [Businesses closing]." *Kıbrıs*, 17.4.2001.

<sup>702</sup> İŞAD, various press releases.

<sup>703</sup> "Shopping trips of only one or two days' duration, staying in cheap and often unregistered accommodation, to take advantage of price and custom tariff differentials by buying large quantities of retail goods on commission for resale in Turkey" (Scott 2000: 60).

pro-UBP, and included the chiefs of Nicosia, Kyrenia and Morphou branches of the party as well as some party assembly members".<sup>704</sup> The tourism facilities run by the Cyprus Turkish Tourism Enterprises, on the other hand, were turned into loss-making basket cases where the government officials as well as members of military and civilian bureaucracy indulged themselves thanks to discounts up to 100 percent, in accommodation, food and drinks, and even telephone calls.<sup>705</sup>

In the absence of any large-scale productive economic activity, and especially after the bankruptcy of Nadir's Polly Peck which, at some point became the second biggest employer after the state (Egemen 2006: 205), the amount of money required to buy legitimacy for the regime gradually spun out of control. Essentially, the entire economic system came to rely on funds from Ankara, which was pumped into the rest of the economy via government spending. This amounted to a staggering USD 3.07 billion<sup>706</sup> in the thirty years to 2004.<sup>707</sup> As the future flow of Turkish financial assistance was taken for granted, there was no urge to establish a sustainable economic structure. Moreover, growing economic dependence on Turkey was not seen as a handicap but as the tightening of relations with the "motherland". As a result of this mentality, increasingly bigger portions of Turkish financial transfers disappeared into a "black hole" of public expenditures in the form of generous salaries, pensions and subsidies.<sup>708</sup> Between 1983 and 2000, transfer payments and current public expenditures grew annually by 8 percent and 6.2 percent respectively while the GDP grew only by 3.8 percent (Yılmaz 2002: 40). By 2000, when the total employment figure was less than 80 thousand, the treasury was issuing monthly 55 thousand paychecks.<sup>709</sup> The weight of salaries in this amount is discussed in the next section. As far as pensions were concerned, it can be said that the social security system

---

<sup>704</sup> See Özcan Ercan: "Kıbrıs Dosyası [The Cyprus dossier] (2)." *Milliyet*, 7.10.1993; see also Sevgül Uludağ: "Turizm Teşvikleri Mikroskop Altında [Incentives to tourism under scrutiny]." *Nokta Kıbrıs*, 29.5.1994; "Yağma [Pillage] (1)." *Yenidüzen*, 7.4.1990, and "Yağma [Pillage] (3)." *Yenidüzen*, 10.4.1990.

<sup>705</sup> "Turizm İşletmeleri Nasıl Zarara Sokuldu [How the State Tourism Enterprises have been rendered loss-making]." *Nokta Kıbrıs*, 24.4.1990, pp. 18-9.

<sup>706</sup> For a breakdown of the figure see Annex.

<sup>707</sup> According to the World Bank report, on a per capita basis, the northern part of Cyprus, received USD 1,348 as aid in 2003 compared to the average of USD 337 for small country aid recipients (2006a: 22). It should be noted that the aid figures used by the World Bank report are considerably lower than the figures revealed in the Turkish Board of Financial Assistance (*Yardım Heyeti*) report, which leads one to think that the real per capita aid figures can be even higher.

<sup>708</sup> İŞAD various press releases; "Commentary." *The Financial Weekly*, 12-18 March 2004.

<sup>709</sup> "Memurda Maaş Endişesi [Civil servants concerned about salaries]." *Kıbrıs*, 31.7.2000.

was so lax that, in 2001, 62 percent of some 11 thousand pensioners were between the ages of 35-60.<sup>710</sup> As if this was not costly enough, with a new legislation introduced in the eve of the 1990 elections, the pensions began to be calculated based on the gross and not net salaries, which amounted to planting a ticking time bomb under the budget.<sup>711</sup>

The result of this profligacy was the growth of dependence on Turkish funds. While the amount transferred from Ankara was around USD 38 million in 1989, it almost sextupled to USD 226 million in 2000.<sup>712</sup> Clearly, more than an independent state, the TRNC looked like a spoiled teenager on allowance or to borrow Chubb's term, which she used to depict the Italian south, the northern part of Cyprus was an *area assistita*; "dependent for survival on various forms of assistance from the" center (1982: 256). Looking from the perspective of Ankara, given the lack of any sign of economic development beyond increasing number of luxury cars cruising around despite hundreds of millions of dollars transferred each year, no wonder that the Turkish Cypriot politicians came to be classified into two groups as "thieves and traitors,"<sup>713</sup> where needless to say, traitors denoted the members of pro-reunification opposition, and thieves, the UBP.

When we look at the business elite, we see that by and large, they were, as Sotiropoulos said of the South European capitalist classes, "accustomed to depend on the state for their enrichment and for the reproduction of their power position in society. They relied on preferential state loans, contracts and other outlays to sustain their share of their market" (2004: 408). Furthermore, the purchasing power created by the clientelist system was used to consume goods and services they provided. Therefore, having thrived in this order, the loyalty of the majority of the business community to the ruling political elite was unshakeable. The chambers of commerce and industry represented this group.

In the meantime however, a different kind of business elite was in the making. Unlike their conservative counterparts, these sought to position themselves away from the establishment. This new, more progressive group of businesspeople was organized under

---

<sup>710</sup> Hüseyin Özgürkün (UBP, Nicosia) cited in "Meclis 'Ekonomik Bunalımı' Görüştü [The parliament discussed the economic crisis]." *Kıbrıs*, 28.4.2001.

<sup>711</sup> "Emeklilik Denen Kıyak [Unfair entitlements called a pension]." *Nokta Kıbrıs*, 10.4.1994, p. 5.

<sup>712</sup> For the Turkish financial assistance figures see Annex.

<sup>713</sup> See for instance Zülfü Livaneli: "Sonunda Akıl Galip Geliyor [Finally wisdom is winning out]." *Vatan* (İstanbul), 14.2.2004.

the TRNC Businessmen Association (*KKTC İşadamları Derneği*, İŞAD) and took a stance against the clientelist policies pursued by the governments, and in 1995, went as far as writing a letter to the Turkish prime minister Çiller calling on her to cut the financial assistance to the island (cited in Altan 2003: 52-3). The main argument of this letter was that the Turkish funds were either channeled directly to consumption or unfairly allocated to the Turkish businesspeople through Turkish cadres in the island, denying the local business community any chance for development.<sup>714</sup> The İŞAD also pointed out the ever-increasing size of the public sector as the main cause of the marginalization of the private sector (*ibid.*). Before further elaborating on the size of the public sector, it should be underlined that the İŞAD's position on the strategy to solve the Cyprus problem was also fundamentally different from the other economic interest groups.<sup>715</sup> To give a solid example, much to the chagrin of the nationalists<sup>716</sup>, the İŞAD was the first organization that embraced the confidence building measures proposed by the UN in the early 1990s.<sup>717</sup>

## 6.2. The Public Sector: How bloated is it?

That the public sector in the northern part of Cyprus is oversized is not a secret. As early as in 1975, in a minister's words "the public payroll tended to swell constantly"<sup>718</sup>, and even in 1976, there were media reports expressing the "determination" of the government not to hire new personnel in the face of rising personnel expenditures.<sup>719</sup> Yet, as the newly emerging private sector was not able to keep up with the demand for jobs, the government carried on taking the easiest way to address the growing unemployment problem by offering jobs in the public sector. In 1977, for instance, only 190 of the 2126 people placed in a job were employed in the private sector.<sup>720</sup> It didn't get any better in 1978, (217 of

---

<sup>714</sup> See also "Kıbrıs Türk İnşaat Firmaları İhaleleri Boykot Ediyor [The Turkish Cypriot construction companies to boycott the public works tenders]." *Nokta Kıbrıs*, 20.3.1994, p. 44; for a more specific case see "Ali Yıldız'a Tanınan Ayrıcalıklardan Yerli Müteahhitler Rahatsız [Local contractors uneasy about the privileges granted to Ali Yıldız]." *Nokta Kıbrıs*, 10.4.1994, p. 26.

<sup>715</sup> According to the chamber of industry, the only solution of the economic problems was integration with Turkey (see "Tek Çözüm TC ile Entegrasyon [The only way out is integration with Turkey]." *Kıbrıs*, 7.5.1994).

<sup>716</sup> See for instance Harid Fedai: "Bir Açık Oturum ki [Such a panel discussion]." *Kıbrıs*, 11.5.1994.

<sup>717</sup> "KKTC İşadamları Derneği Başkanı Kutlay Erk KKTC Özel Sektörünün Başarılı Olacağına İnanıyor [The TRNC Businessmen Association chairman Erk believes the TRNC private sector will be successful]." *Nokta Kıbrıs*, 6.3.1994, p. 38.

<sup>718</sup> Osman Örek cited in Abdulkadir Tansu: "Kadrolarda Şişkinlik ve Gereksiz Atamalar [Bloatedness in civil service and unnecessary appointments]." *Halkın Sesi*, 26.12.1975.

<sup>719</sup> "1976 Yılında Kesinlikle Yeni Memur Alınmayacak [In 1976 definitely no new civil servant will be employed]." *Zaman*, 21.4.1976.

<sup>720</sup> Devlet Planlama Örgütü (1978: 73).

3434) or in 1979 (123 of 1697).<sup>721</sup> To quote Raif Denктаş, “the only alternative to a job in the public service is working as retailer of smugglers,” in this period.<sup>722</sup>

Having said that, finding out how bloated the public sector exactly is, takes some digging up. For a long time, the only source of information about the employment figures, was the State Planning Organization’s (*Devlet Planlama Örgütü*, DPÖ) annual publications entitled the Economic and Social Indicators. Based on these statistics researchers, such as the authors of the so-called World Bank report (2006b: 14), and Noë and Watson (2005: 3), among others, concluded that the “public sector’s” share had been declining over time, and that at the time of writing, it had provided around 20 percent of total employment. This is not accurate for two reasons. First, apparently, the researchers were misled by the terminology used by the DPÖ. The problem is that data classified under “public services” do not reflect the total number of people employed in the public sector. Rather it is a narrow definition of it. Consequently, the public services figures presented under Sectoral Distribution of Working Population do not include, for instance, the public sector employees working in the public banks, who are classified under “financial institutions,” or the Turkish Cypriot Electricity Authority employees, who are classified under “electricity and water,” while covering the employees of clinics, and schools run by the private sector.

Second problem is a more fundamental one, and derives from the method used. For a long time (1977-2005), the DPÖ estimated employment figures based on “value added”. Then, in an effort to adapt to the EU methods<sup>723</sup>, the organization abandoned this, and started conducting annual household labor force surveys (HLFS), which are considered much more reliable than the previous method.<sup>724</sup> For only two years (2004 and 2005), the figures calculated using both methods are available, and this renders comparison possible.

---

<sup>721</sup> Devlet Planlama Örgütü (1979: 97) and (1980: 102).

<sup>722</sup> Raif Denктаş’s parliamentary speech cited in *Olay*, 5.5.1980, p.9.

<sup>723</sup> Devlet Planlama Örgütü (2009: 1).

<sup>724</sup> Director of the Statistics Department: Personal communication, Nicosia, March 2010.

**Table 1: Total employment figures**

	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>HLFS</b>	<b>Discrepancy</b>
<b>2004</b>	104873	86914	17959
<b>2005</b>	109090	85583	23507

Source: Prepared by author based on State Planning Organization, Follow Up and Coordination Department: 2007 Economic and Social Indicators, pp. 36-8.

As shown in Table 1, there is a considerable discrepancy in the two sets of figures. When the results of HLFS (2006) are checked against the 2006 census results (91815 and 92088 respectively), it is seen that the accuracy of HLFS are confirmed, which, by implication makes all pre-2004 figures about total employment completely unreliable -except for the years 1996 and 2006 when censuses were held. This is to say, only reliable employment statistics at hand belong to the post-2004 period, and they show that the real size of public sector fell below 30 percent only in 2010 and averaged around 31 percent.

**Table 2: HLFS basic indicators**

	<b>Total Labor Force</b>	<b>Total Employment (T.E)</b>	<b>Public Sector Employment (P.S.E)</b>	<b>P.S.E./T.E. (%)</b>
<b>2004</b>	96592	86914	27900	32,1
<b>2005</b>	93248	85583	28903	33,8
<b>2006</b>	101366	91815	29106	31,7
<b>2007</b>	99149	89787	28289	31,5
<b>2008</b>	101104	91223	27893	30,6
<b>2009</b>	104490	91550	27627	30,2
<b>2010</b>	106117	93498	27244	29,1
<b>2011</b>	107514	97103	29695	30,6

Source: Prepared by author based on HLFS results, 2004-2011 (Hane Halkı İşgücü Anketi Sonuçları [Household Labor Force Surveys] see [www.devplan.org](http://www.devplan.org)).

The problem is that HLFS figures are limited to eight sets of data covering the period between 2004 and 2011, which is beyond the scope of this dissertation. Nevertheless, this table makes a good analytical tool because (a) although it represents the period when the UBP was no longer in power, it reflects the overall result of bureaucratic clientelism practiced by this party in the preceding three decades, and (b) it provides a benchmark for comparison.

In the absence of published data, I turned to interviews with officials from the DPÖ, and the personnel department. As a result, I have gathered various unpublished data on the public sector employment. Of particular importance is a dataset, which shows a detailed breakdown of public sector employees including, public administration (comprising permanent staff, temporary staff, and workers); institutions and SEE's; and municipalities, as well as pensioners on yearly basis covering the period 1990-2008. According to my informant<sup>725</sup>, the DPÖ had formed this table by gathering data from the ministry of finance (based on the number of paychecks issued per month), and by calling the institutions, SEE's, and municipalities one by one. Although there are some discrepancies with the HLFS figures, the difference is negligible.

To render a sound assessment possible, the total employment figures were also needed, which were not available except for the years 1996 and 2006. Based on these two figures I calculated the annual average growth rate from 1996 to 2006 (2.98%), and assuming that the total employment figures are not volatile, I applied the same rate to the period 1990-1995. In the last column in Table 3, I further refined the figures by excluding the non-citizens employed in TRNC based on my estimation.<sup>726</sup>

**Table 3: Public employment as a percentage of selected indicators**

	<b>Total Employment (T.E.)</b>	<b>'TRNC' Citizens Employed (T.C.E)</b>	<b>Public Employment (P.E.)</b>	<b>P. E. / T.E. (%)</b>	<b>P.E. / T.C.E (%)</b>
<b>1990</b>	57580	42860	18619	32,3	43,4
<b>1991</b>	59295	43871	18178	30,7	41,4
<b>1992</b>	61061	44907	19067	31,2	42,5
<b>1993</b>	62879	45966	20002	31,8	43,5
<b>1994</b>	64751	47051	20444	31,6	43,5
<b>1995</b>	66680	48161	19543	29,3	40,6
<b>1996</b>	68667	49298	19761	28,8	40,1
<b>1997</b>	70712	50461	20515	29,0	40,7
<b>1998</b>	72818	51652	20870	28,7	40,4
<b>1999</b>	74987	52864	21287	28,4	40,3
<b>2000</b>	77220	54104	21437	27,8	39,6
<b>2001</b>	79520	55373	21607	27,2	39,0

<sup>725</sup> Personal Communication, December 2009.

<sup>726</sup> Following the same method, I estimated the number of TRNC citizens in employment (1990-2006), based on the official data from 1998 and 2006 to complete the data set.

<b>2002</b>	81888	56673	22104	27,0	39,0
<b>2003</b>	84327	58002	24079	28,6	41,5
<b>2004</b>	86838	59363	23879	27,5	40,2
<b>2005</b>	89425	60756	25223	28,2	41,5
<b>2006</b>	92088	62181	25964	28,2	41,8

Source: Prepared by author based on unpublished data from the SPO (for the public employment figures 1990-2006); Results of the Household Income Distribution Survey 1998 (for the number of 'TRNC' citizens employed for 1998); Results of the Census 2006 (for the total employment figure in 2006 and the number of 'TRNC' citizens employed in 2006); Census of Population Social and Economic Characteristics of Population, December 15, 1996 (for the total employment figure in 1996).

As seen in Table 3, contrary to what other studies claimed before, there is only a very gradual decline in the proportion of public sector employment. However, it continues to expand in absolute terms adding up to the burden on the budget. When we introduce the pensioners to the equation both the burden on the budget, and this group's political clout become more obvious.

**Table 4: Pensioners and public sector employees as a percentage of registered voters**

	<b>Public Sector (P.S.)</b>	<b>P.S. Pensioners</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Voters</b>	<b>Total/Voters (%)</b>
<b>1990</b>	18619	7585	26204	101306	<b>25,9</b>
<b>1991</b>	18178	7889	26067	106301	<b>24,5</b>
<b>1993</b>	20002	8545	28547	108820	<b>26,2</b>
<b>1995</b>	19543	9825	29368	113340	<b>25,9</b>
<b>1998</b>	20870	10806	31676	119019	<b>26,6</b>
<b>2000</b>	21437	11341	32778	126675	<b>25,9</b>
<b>2003</b>	24079	11817	35896	140832	<b>25,5</b>
<b>2004</b>	23879	11930	35809	143639	<b>24,9</b>
<b>2005</b>	25223	12120	37343	147249	<b>25,4</b>

Source: Prepared by author based on data from the State Planning Organization (unpublished document); High Electoral Council.

Table 4 shows that over time, consistently every one out of four voters is either a public sector employee or used to be one. At any rate, they are on the payroll of the state and their welfare is closely associated with the treasury's finances. When we factor in their

dependents as well, their influence grows even bigger, and makes this group probably the strongest interest group in Turkish Cypriot community.

The figures presented so far show how big the public sector is but a comparison may be useful to show how costly sustaining this was, even in South European standards. As it can be seen in the Table 5, as measured by the average share of wages and salaries in total public expenditure, the Turkish Cypriots have by far the costliest public sector.

**Table 5: Average share of wages and salaries in total public expenditure in Southern, Western and Northern Europe in 1981-90 and 1991-95 (As percentage of the state budget)**

	<b>1981-90</b>	<b>1991-95</b>
<b>Greece</b>	24,8	21,1
<b>Italy</b>	11,7	11,7
<b>Portugal</b>	22	28,5
<b>Spain</b>	21,6	14,9
<b>South European average</b>	20	19,1
<b>West European average</b>	12,6	11,7
<b>North European Average</b>	9,6	8,3
<b>TRNC</b>	38,9	40,2

Source: Prepared by author on the basis of Sotiropoulos (2004:414, Table 2). The TRNC figures from the DPÖ.

**6.3 Bureaucratic Clientelism**

Although such a big public sector is a symptom of clientelism, its presence per se does not necessarily mean that these jobs were distributed politically. What really makes the difference is the way the new personnel were recruited to the public sector. In this context, the method of employment can be used as an indicator to gauge to what extent the enormous size of the public sector can be attributed to what Lyrintzis calls “bureaucratic clientelism”. This is, in essence, what Mavrogordatos (1997) did for Greece. Before coming to this, however, the concept of bureaucratic clientelism, which fits into the Turkish Cypriot case very well, has to be identified. In Lyrintzis’ words:

Bureaucratic clientelism is a distinct form of clientelism and consists of systematic infiltration of the state machine by the party devotees and the allocation of favors

through it. It is characterized by an organised expansion of existing posts and departments in the public sector and the addition of new ones in an attempt to secure power and maintain a party's electoral base. ... In a system such as this the public bureaucracy is orientated less towards the effective performance of public service than towards provision of parasitic jobs for the political clientele of the ruling sectors, in exchange for their political support (1984: 103).

In his study on Greece, Mavrogordatos identified "meritocracy, implying a system whereby appointments and career patterns are determined on the basis of merit alone, according to universalistic and objective criteria," as the opposite of clientelism (1997: 4). Then he compared the number of employments made through party channels (clientelistic), and general competition (meritocratic). In what follows, I will apply the same method on the Turkish Cypriot case.

To start with, in the Turkish Cypriot context, on paper, appointment to permanent posts in the public sector requires a certain procedure, which is conducted by the Public Service Commission. This involves passing a central proficiency examination on the constitution and the civil service law, as well as other specific examinations that may be required by the particular post concerned. However, this procedure applies only to the public administration in its narrowest sense. For instance, teachers, police officers, employees of the municipalities, SEEs, and other autonomous or semi-autonomous institutions are not subject to this procedure.

Beside this, there are three other methods leading to a job in the public sector: (1) Hiring personnel on temporary basis. Although this method also stipulates a call for applications in the official gazette and competitive entrance examination, the process is not through the Civil Service Commission.<sup>727</sup> Rather it is at the discretion of the minister concerned.<sup>728</sup> (2) Hiring in the status of the so-called 03 permanent worker, which does not require any exam. Although it was originally envisaged for personnel with no university degree, there have been instances when university degree holders were hired, among other things, as road construction workers.<sup>729</sup> (3) Hiring on contractual basis.

---

<sup>727</sup> Kamu Hizmeti Yasası, 7/1979, Kısım 1, Madde 6 (2) [Public Service Law, 7/1979, Section 1, Article 6 (2)].

<sup>728</sup> Provided that the personnel department, and the ministry of finance give their approval.

<sup>729</sup> Anonymous interviewee.

**Table 6: Public sector employees recruited through the Public Service Commission**

	<b>Permanent Civil Service Employees</b>	<b>Total Number of Public Employees</b>	<b>Permanent/Total (%)</b>
<b>1990</b>	4014	18619	21,6
<b>1995</b>	4244	19543	21,7
<b>2000</b>	4526	21437	21,1
<b>2005</b>	4728	25223	18,7

Prepared by author based on unpublished DPÖ data (Total Public Employment); unpublished data from the Personnel Department (Permanent Civil Service Employees).

Table 6 shows that only some 20 percent of the public sector employees have gone through the *nominally* meritocratic procedure before taking their job in the public sector. In other words, provided that this procedure of employment was followed strictly, it could be argued that 80 percent of the placements were susceptible to political abuse, to say the least. My interviews with the employees of the Personnel Department confirmed that this nominally meritocratic system was also far from being immune to political meddling. “As far as the legal framework is concerned we are probably better than any country in terms of meritocracy; the problem is in the enforcement,” a senior civil servant at the Personnel Department told me.<sup>730</sup> Regarding the examinations of the Civil Service Commission, general perception is that most of the time they were token examinations, where in oral exams, questions asked did not go further than “who is your father?” In the written examinations, questions were often leaked to the clients in advance. Overall common belief is, as one of Navaro-Yashin’s informants put it “[t]here is no such thing as merit in the civil service. ... No one is brought to a position in the civil service because he has merits. He is promoted because he has *torpil*<sup>731</sup>, through relations between partners and friends [*es-dost iliskisi*]” (2006: 284).

Even though the Civil Service Commission’s involvement does not ensure meritocracy in the process, apparently the pre-requisite of qualifying in the central proficiency exam has been acting as a deterrent for utilization of this method in a large-scale. Furthermore, the fact that the Commission’s members are appointed by the president, and not by the government, had posed another obstacle for the UBP, especially since the emergence of the

---

<sup>730</sup> Personal Communication, April 2010.  
<sup>731</sup> In this context *torpil* means a patron.

schism between Denktaş and Eroğlu. Consequently, as seen in Table 6, the absolute number grew very gradually, although more than half of the positions have been vacant.<sup>732</sup>

Given these constraints, it turns out that most favoured two methods of employment in the public sector have been appointment in temporary and 03 permanent worker positions. Although it does require some form of examination, absence of any central exam requirement for appointments in the temporary positions, obviously, renders bypassing the examination process altogether possible. This is in effect the first leg of a process, which is known as *titularisation* – something common in the rest of Southern Europe too. It “involves hiring personnel to meet temporary shortages in the public sector and then granting to these personnel the status of civil servant or the functional equivalent (i.e. permanent job contracts)” (Sotiropoulos 2004: 411). As it is shown below, although it is clearly against the law, it has been widely used by the UBP machine to employ clients without any competition particularly in the run up to elections. To give two specific examples: referring to the laxity of the doling out of government jobs in the run up to the 2003 parliament elections, one of my informants at the personnel department said, “I could even have had my late grandmother employed”.<sup>733</sup> Regarding the election a decade earlier, “such was the panic in the party that there were cases where we have employed the same person via three different party sections,” conceded a party operative.<sup>734</sup>

Beyond its relative simplicity, this method has another advantage for the patron: “people hired under such circumstances can have a concrete interest in the government being re-elected, since they may have reasons to fear that a new government will terminate their employment” (Hylland 2004: 41). This precarious status makes them more likely to honour their part of the clientelistic transaction and vote for the patron, on the one hand, and to work actively in the campaign process, on the other. As it does not provide a permanent position, it can be terminated at the discretion of the patron. Therefore, at any rate the transaction does not come to an end, and the client’s dependence on the party continues – unless transferred to a permanent post or she quits the job herself. This was successfully exploited by the UBP in the 1993 election. When Denktaş protested that the UBP was doling out jobs in the run up to the polling day, the party responded by promising to

---

<sup>732</sup> For 2005, the number of vacant positions stood at 4552 (Personnel Department).

<sup>733</sup> Personal Communication, December 2008.

<sup>734</sup> Anonymous interviewee.

transfer all temporary staff to permanent positions after the election, and managed to mobilize them against the DP, by saying Denктаş is against this.<sup>735</sup> Ironically, the very same method was employed in the eve of the 1995 presidential election to give a boost to Denктаş's campaign: The DP-controlled ministry of finance had sent a circular to the ministries to start the process for elevating the temporary personnel to permanent positions though the issue was shelved after the election.<sup>736</sup>

As far as the political abuse of temporary employment in the public sector is concerned, there are two concrete cases where the UBP was caught red-handed, and one where its misconduct was certified by a parliamentary enquiry committee. These three cases provide solid evidence supporting the anecdotal ones, and therefore clearly show that the size of the public sector was due to bureaucratic clientelism. These are the general elections of 1990, 1993 and 2003. In the latter two elections, the UBP was voted out of government making enquiries on the irregularities during the election periods possible. As for the first one, the report produced seven years later when the UBP was in opposition, verifies allegations about irregularities regarding the employment, appointment, promotion, and transfer of the public employees during the campaign period.<sup>737</sup> Additionally, it confirms that the government's decision to pay in effect a bonus salary to the public sector employees by switching the date of payment<sup>738</sup> (see also Warner 1993: 213-4) was illegal.<sup>739</sup>

Regarding the 1993 and 2003 cases, evidence available is even more solid. In the case of 1993 elections, the council of ministers authorized the minister of finance and economy, or the director of this ministry along with the director of the personnel department to employ temporary staff to "various ministries, and directorates" just few days before the election.<sup>740</sup> In Denктаş's words, jobs were distributed "like candies".<sup>741</sup> Both the director of court of audit, and the attorney general declared the placements made according to this

---

<sup>735</sup> See "Geçicilerin Tümü de Kadrolanacak [All temporary staff will be given permanent positions]." *Birlik*, 1.12.1993, and "Denктаş Geçicilerin Kadrolanmasına da Karşı [Denктаş is also against the elevation of temporary staff to permanent positions]." *Birlik*, 2.12.1993.

<sup>736</sup> "Geçiciler Kadrolanıyor [Temporary staff to be elevated to permanent positions]." *Kıbrıs*, 8.3.1995.

<sup>737</sup> See the paragraph 5 of the suggestions section of the report.

<sup>738</sup> "Esenlik Paketi [Welfare package]." *Kıbrıs*, 30.04.1990.

<sup>739</sup> See the paragraph 5 of the findings section of the report.

<sup>740</sup> *Karar Numarası: E-1520 -93* (8 December 1993): *Muhtelif Dairelere Geçici Statüde Gündelikçi Olarak İstihdam Yapılması [Temporary employment as casual labor to various departments]*.

<sup>741</sup> Denктаş's Letter to the Editor, *Birlik*, 10.11.1994.

governmental decree unlawful<sup>742</sup> right after the election, and ironically the decree, and the consequent employments were annulled by the outgoing council of ministers with a new decree few days after the election!<sup>743</sup> According to the minister of economy and finance, employing temporary staff was something, which had been practiced since 1979, and practising it more during the election campaign was “normal”.<sup>744</sup> In an attempt to justify what they did in 1993, an unidentified former minister, was indeed confessing the party’s earlier misconduct: He said that the UBP had employed around 4 thousand new personnel before the 1981 elections; 2 thousand before the 1985 elections, and another 1800 before the 1990 elections.<sup>745</sup> Considering that in 2005, the average number of votes required to win a seat in the parliament was 2190 when 119 thousand voters turned out to vote<sup>746</sup>, and that one job brings most of the time the votes of a whole family, it can be safely said that this practice provided the UBP with a huge advantage in the elections.

The governmental decree annulling the job placements did not stop the attorney general from starting an investigation regarding the irregularities in the election period. Upon completion of the investigation, he concluded that there were serious violations of the electoral law, and asked the parliament via the prime minister<sup>747</sup> to lift the legislative immunities of all the cabinet ministers concerned (ten in total), along with another UBP deputy to render their trial possible. Accordingly, an enquiry committee was established in the parliament. Although, the committee report stated that “the facts and findings” presented in the attorney general’s dossier involved “serious allegations,” it concluded that they were not serious enough to make the lifting of the legislative immunities imperative.<sup>748</sup> It is important to note that in the “facts,” section of the report, it was clearly stated that based on the governmental decree concerned, “1175 people had been given

---

<sup>742</sup> “Geçici İstihdam Yasal Değil [Temporary employment is not legal].” *Kıbrıs*, 14.12.1993; “Geçici İstihdam Kargaşaya Dönüştü [Temporary employment turned into chaos].” *Kıbrıs*, 15.12.1993; “Geçiciler Durduruldu [Temporary employees dismissed].” *Kıbrıs*, 18.12.2003.

<sup>743</sup> *Karar Numarası: E - 1572 - 93 (16 December 1993): Muhtelif Dairelere Geçici Statüde Gündelikçi Olarak İstihdam Yapılması Hakkındaki E - 1520 - 93 Sayı ve 8.12.1993 tarihli kararın iptali [The annulment of the decree regarding the temporary employment as casual labor to various departments]; “1200 Genç Kapı Dışarı [1200 youths shown the door].” *Yenidüzen*: 18.12.1993; “Geçiciler Durduruldu [Temporary staff dismissed].” *Kıbrıs*, 18.12.1993.*

<sup>744</sup> “Coşar: Amaç İstihdamdı [The intention was employment].” *Birlik*, 18.12.1993.

<sup>745</sup> Cited in “Eski Bakanlar Sanık Sandalyesinde [Former ministers in the defendant box].” *Nokta Kıbrıs*, 10.4.1994, p. 19.

<sup>746</sup> Naci Taşeli: “Seçimler Diye Diye [Talking about the elections].” *Yenidüzen*, April 2009.

<sup>747</sup> For the letter to the Prime Minister dated 9 March 1994 see KKTC Cumhuriyet Meclisi Tutanak Dergisi [Minutes of the TRNC Parliament] 12.8.1994, pp.27-8.

<sup>748</sup> See KKTC Cumhuriyet Meclisi Tutanak Dergisi [*Minutes of the TRNC Parliament*]. 12.8.1994, p.21.

*istihdam belgesi*<sup>749</sup>,” and that some of these “documents had been distributed by the UBP members, including ministers, deputies, and candidates.”<sup>750</sup> When I asked Serdar Denktaş why the DP did not vote in favour of lifting of the immunities of the offenders in the committee, he told me that the dominant view within the party was against starting a political blood feud in the eve of the upcoming presidential election.<sup>751</sup> Once again, political expediency trumped principle although supposedly the DP’s *raison d’etre* was eradicating such practices.

In a similar vein, in the eve of the 2003 election, it turned out that the UBP government placed 1660 people in the temporary positions. The incoming council of ministers annulled the employment of these people, on the ground that they had been admitted to “the public service unlawfully”.<sup>752</sup> Probably, as a consequence of the earlier impunity or in the absence of political will, this time the attorney general did not bother to start an investigation.

Though unlike these three cases, no formal probe was conducted into the matter, the 1981 elections should also be mentioned in this context because of the extent of abuse. According to the opposition members of the parliament, over three thousand people were given jobs in the public sector without following the legal procedure despite the protests of the court of audit.<sup>753</sup> Years later, the UBP’s mouthpiece *Birlik* admitted that this was true. It was said that Denktaş had made the minister of finance hire 3 thousand new personnel in the run up to the 1981 elections, following the same procedure the UBP followed in 1993.<sup>754</sup>

As discussed earlier, although there is a perception about the widespread use of bureaucratic clientelism in the public mind, its exposure as clear as the cases elaborated above would be impossible without the party in power being voted out of government. This

---

<sup>749</sup> A document stating that the holder was employed in the public sector on a temporary basis. The typed document was signed by the directors of the ministry of economy and finance, and personnel department. Only the name section was left blank to be filled out later by hand. For a copy of the document see *Yenidüzen*, 13.12.1993, p. 5.

<sup>750</sup> *Ibid.*: 18.

<sup>751</sup> Interviewed by author.

<sup>752</sup> “Seçimlik İstihdamlara Son Veriliyor [Jobs annulled of those employed in return for their votes].” *Kıbrıs*, 30.1.2004.

<sup>753</sup> See for instance the parliamentary speech of Ergün Vehbi (CTP, Nicosia) cited in *Olay*, 25.1.1982, p.25; İsmet Kotak’s (DHP, Famagusta) parliamentary speech cited in *Olay*, 22.2.1982, p. 18.

<sup>754</sup> “Denktaş’a Mübah UBP’ye ise Günah [Permissable for Denktaş but sinful for the UBP].” *Birlik*, 18.12.1993.

does not necessarily mean that there is no other evidence, however. Although it does not show the immediate relationship between the job and vote as clearly as the instances in these three cases, another occasion revealing the extent of this practice is the situations where these temporary posts were turned en masse into permanent ones by means of legislation passed in the parliament; in other words, the second leg of the *titularisation* process. Indeed, though the precarious status of the temporary staff is a tramp card for the party to retain them as clients and hence desirable from the perspective of the patron, holding them in this status indefinitely is not possible, as the group's sheer size makes it a too big pressure group to be ignored. There are three cases where the government eventually bowed to these demands: 1984, 1997, and 2000.

The law elevating the temporary personnel to permanent positions (Geçici Personelin Kadrolanması Yasası, 22/1984) dated 1984, appointed in total 3475 temporary employees to permanent posts both as civil servants, and workers.<sup>755</sup> This, to a certain extent, also verifies the allegations regarding the 1981 elections mentioned above.<sup>756</sup> A similar draft bill to appoint 1105 temporary employees (who were employed between 1985 and 1996) to permanent posts was tabled in 1997<sup>757</sup>, but it did not come into force as the constitutional court overturned it upon Denктаş's referral. The verdict of the court contains numerous details about bureaucratic clientelism, and hence merits further elaboration. The court concluded that the draft bill was a clear infringement of the constitution (Article 8), as it violated the equal opportunity principle, by excluding the rest of the citizens not holding office (as temporary staff) from the opportunity to be admitted to the civil service, even though they may have had better qualifications than the temporary office-holders.<sup>758</sup>

Two of the five judges who opposed this verdict, justified their position by stating that the draft bill was an "interim solution," which was accepted by both the parliamentary opposition, and the trade unions.<sup>759</sup> Among other things, they argued that the law per se did not violate the constitution but rather fixed an earlier violation, which had been

---

<sup>755</sup> Geçici Personelin Kadrolanması (Özel Kurallar) Yasası [The law (special rules) elevating the temporary personnel to permanent positions], No. 22/84, see pages 13 and 16.

<sup>756</sup> In the verdict of the Constitutional Court regarding a similar legislation, it is said that temporary employment had been made since 1981 (A/M Numara: 2/1997, D. No: 3/97, p. 17).

<sup>757</sup> A/M Numara: 2/1997, D. No: 3/97, p. 4.

<sup>758</sup> *Ibid.*: 15.

<sup>759</sup> *Ibid.*: 17.

committed by employing these people in the first place.<sup>760</sup> They argued that contrary to the Article 6 (2) of the relevant law - which says the employment is completely temporary, and could not last more than one budgetary period - both the ones who employed the temporary staff, and those who had been employed temporarily themselves had never intended to keep these positions temporarily.<sup>761</sup> But rather, both sides concerned saw this as a first step to the public sector, which would eventually, somehow be turned into permanent positions.<sup>762</sup> It is interesting to note that there was no reference made to the earlier law (22/1984), although they explicitly expressed their concern regarding the prospect that this legislation could form a loophole/precedent, which could be abused by the party in power in the future, especially in the election periods.<sup>763</sup>

What 97/3 tried and failed to do was later achieved by the legislation dated 2000 (19/2000), which eventually elevated 1166 temporary employees to permanent positions.

#### **6.4 The Collapse**

For a long time, despite complaints from different segments of the society, what this illusory welfare state had been offering concretely was perceived to be outweighing the abstract and uncertain economic gains of prospective EU membership. Yet, as Roniger suggests, intrinsically clientelistic relations are limited in scope and extent, and are subject to the dynamics of political economy. Hence, *inter alia* “a decline in the supply of resources ... may in the short term contribute to the fragility of clientelistic commitments and over the long term may shatter the salience of clientelism and patronage” (1994: 11; see also Chubb 1982: 5). In a similar vein, Piattoni points out that “when the economic and political costs of clientelism become unbearable, mobilization against it may be sudden and dramatic” (2001b: 199). This was exactly what happened when the Turkish government decided to make the Eroğlu government foot the bill for the banking crisis, which broke out in 1999, and imposed an austerity program to cut budgetary deficits as a pre-condition for further financial support.

---

<sup>760</sup> *Ibid.*: 19.

<sup>761</sup> *Ibid.*: 19-20.

<sup>762</sup> *Ibid.*: 20.

<sup>763</sup> *Ibid.*: 19.

Lacher and Kaymak highlight “the Turkish financial crisis of 2001 as a cathartic element ... which reduced the ability of the incumbent elites to contain discontent and the envisioning of political alternatives through the traditional instruments of patronage and clientelism” (2005: 150). They attribute this reduced ability to Ankara’s diminishing willingness to pay the bills due to its own economic woes (*ibid.* 157). This argument needs to be refined. Firstly, in curbing the distributive capacity of the government, the 1999 banking crisis was more important than the 2001 crisis, as it substantially increased the amount of transfer payments in the budget due to compensation payments for the depositors of the liquidated banks. Secondly, and more importantly, though it is true that the Turkish government showed less willingness to foot the bill, this was not due to its economic woes. Rather, it was a deliberate policy to force Eroğlu to step down in an effort to side with Denктаş.

Ironically, therefore, one of the factors that played a decisive role in bringing the collapse of the politico-economic structure that had sustained the *taksim* project was a personal power struggle between the two leaders of the nationalist camp. Particularly, the Turkish government’s active involvement in this feud proved counterproductive. By making the flow of financial assistance subject to implementation of a rather unpopular economic austerity program, Ankara seriously weakened Eroğlu, but fell short of effecting his resignation. Eroğlu’s resistance perpetuated the crisis to the extent that not only his government’s, but the legitimacy of the post-1974 regime as a whole came under scrutiny. It is important to highlight that this is not to say that this power struggle alone led to the collapse of the regime. There was a “historical juncture” at this point; a rare alignment of the stars where external and internal factors were all favorable for a change. This is to say, without the EU membership around the corner, most probably the regime would have survived this power struggle and financial crisis as it did in the 1990s. But in a similar vein, in the absence of this power struggle/financial crisis and its consequences on the living standards of the ordinary Turkish Cypriots, the EU membership would probably not become a game-changer. In what follows, I will elaborate on this process.

The root of the crisis can be traced back to November 1999, when a banking crisis hit. The amount deposited in the failing banks was USD 163 million in 58 thousand different accounts, which corresponded to almost 18 percent of all bank deposits in the banking

system.<sup>764</sup> More than 30 thousand individuals were affected.<sup>765</sup> Still, the disruptive repercussions of the crisis were not clear at the beginning. After all, all deposits were insured by the government; therefore, depositors stood to be compensated. A deal between the government and depositors was struck as early as in March 2000, which envisaged the payment of compensations in 18 equal monthly installments.<sup>766</sup> It was naturally assumed that the operation would be financed by Ankara, as always.

Until the kick-off of the presidential election campaign in April 2000, everything seemed to be under control. However, when Denктаş turned the campaign into an opportunity to settle his old score with Erođlu, things took a different turn. From the beginning, it was clear that Ankara's favorite would be Denктаş. Allegedly, Turkey's minister of state responsible for Cyprus affairs, Őükrü Sina Gürel (henceforth Gürel) even asked Erođlu not to run, albeit to no avail.<sup>767</sup> Having failed to dissuade him from running, Denктаş predicated his election campaign on portraying Erođlu as the sole culprit for the banking crisis. As usual, Denктаş's campaign did not only target the Turkish Cypriot electorate; it also addressed the public opinion in Turkey. In the mass circulation Turkish daily *Hürriyet*, for instance, he blamed Erođlu for wasting Turkey's precious money for his political expedience:

In the last four days, I have visited 35 villages. There is an outcry in every village. The economy has sunk. When I talk about these issues, they [the government] tell me not to interfere. The president is being excluded. And now they are running against me at the election. Whose money are they using for this? They are trying to collect votes by distributing millions of dollars coming from Turkey to their partisans [and] exerting pressure.<sup>768</sup> They are trying to deceive desperate people.<sup>769</sup>

---

<sup>764</sup> The amount reached to USD 244 million and 89 thousand accounts by 2003 after failing of some other banks (TC Yardım Heyeti 2004: 3 and 30-1).

<sup>765</sup> "KKTC İsyân Havasında [TRNC in the rebellion mood]." *Radikal*, 25.7.2000.

<sup>766</sup> "Aylık Miktar 160'dan 200 Sterlin'e Çıkarıldı [The monthly amount increased from 160 to 200 British pounds]." *Avrupa*, 6.1.2001.

<sup>767</sup> Reportedly, this was refused by Erođlu in an unpleasant manner, sowing the first seeds of the tension between Turkish government and Erođlu's UBP (Muharrem Sarıkaya: "Bakan Gürel'den Erođlu'na: Benim Tabanım da 65 Milyon [From the minister Gürel to Erođlu: My base is 65 million]." *Hürriyet*, 30.7.2000).

<sup>768</sup> This was not the first time that Denктаş accused Erođlu of vote buying. He made similar statements after the parliamentary elections in 1993 and 1998 (see for instance "Denктаş: Milli Dava Kazandı [Denктаş: The national cause has won]" *Kıbrıs*, 7.12.1998). For more on vote buying in north Cyprus see Hylland 2004.

<sup>769</sup> "Denктаş'ın Sorusu, Tamam mı devam mı [Denктаş's question: should I stay or should I go?]" *Hürriyet*, 28.3.2000.

Despite Denктаş's strong negative campaign, in the first round of the election, Erođlu gained a significant share of the vote with 30 percent, six percentage points more than he had received in the first round in 1995, and once again forced Denктаş for a run-off. However, the run-off eventually would not be held as increasing pressure from Turkey led Erođlu to surrender and withdraw his candidacy.<sup>770</sup> Yet, for Denктаş, this was not enough. Immediately after he has sworn in, he aired his discontent about Erođlu once again, stating that it was no longer possible for him to work in harmony with Erođlu, and explicitly calling for his and the foreign minister Ertuđrulođlu's resignation.<sup>771</sup> Erođlu retorted that nobody but his party congress could oust him, thus further escalating the tension.<sup>772</sup>

In the meantime, the coincidence of Erođlu's withdrawal from the presidential race and the release of USD 100 million in loan by Ankara<sup>773</sup> was evaluated as a clear indication that Ankara would involve itself in this power struggle by playing the financial assistance card to bring Erođlu into line. Later, the Turkish government maintained this policy by tying the release of desperately needed funds to the implementation of an economic austerity package, which would substantially reduce the incomes of public sector employees and pensioners, the main clientele of the UBP. The Turkish government was quite convinced that their money was not used properly and squandered by the Erođlu government, and was determined to put the financial burden of the crisis on the government's shoulders.<sup>774</sup> In fact, as Ecevit and Gürel made it clear, it was not a big deal for Turkey to bail the Turkish Cypriots out of this crisis; however, the Turkish Cypriots had to clean up their act first.<sup>775</sup>

The government was between a rock and a hard place. Not only the opposition parties and trade unions –usual suspects- but this time the business community too was opposed to the proposed package. The trade unions and the opposition criticized the package for depriving employees of their acquired rights, while the business community argued that

---

<sup>770</sup> Reportedly, Erođlu implied that Ankara made him withdraw (Hakan Gülseven: "KKTC'de Kötü Koku [Foul smell in the TRNC]." *Radikal*, 22.4.2000; Sedat Sertođlu: "Kıbrıs'ta Tehlikeli Tezgah [Dangerous plot in Cyprus]." *Sabah*, 27.7.2000).

<sup>771</sup> "KKTC Denктаş'a Teslim [The TRNC entrusted to Denктаş]." *Radikal*, 21.4.2000.

<sup>772</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>773</sup> Erdal Güven: "KKTC'nin Seçimi [The TRNC's choice]." *Radikal*, 21.4.2000; "Tercih de Plan da Belliydi [Both preference and plan were known in advance]." *Radikal*, 22.4.2000.

<sup>774</sup> See for instance Güneri Cıvaođlu: "Kıbrıs'ta Bugün [Today in Cyprus]." *Milliyet*, 1.8.2000.

<sup>775</sup> Uđur Ergan and Metehan Demir: "İşte Kıbrıs Raporu [Here is the Cyprus report]." *Hürriyet*, 27.7.2000; *Kıbrıs*, 29.7.2000; Fikret Bila: "Ecevit: KKTC Disiplin Olmalı [The TRNC needs to be brought under discipline]." *Milliyet*, 28.7.2000.

the package was incomplete. According to the İŞAD, the sole aim of the package was to cut public expenditures rather than giving a boost to the economy. This would curb demand and push the economy further into depression rather than fixing it. İŞAD urged the government to complement it with measures that would promote the private sector in order to secure growth.<sup>776</sup>

Having failed to implement the austerity measures on time due to massive opposition, in July 2000, the government paid the salaries of public sector employees with great difficulties and with a week's delay.<sup>777</sup> Even more importantly, the government also announced that it would stop paying the bank depositors' compensations of which three installments had so far been paid, due to lack of financial resources. To paraphrase a metaphor from Warren Buffet, when the tide of Turkish handouts had gone out it became evident that the government was swimming naked.<sup>778</sup>

As if this was not enough trouble, the commander of the Security Forces (*Güvenlik Kuvvetleri Komutanlığı*, GKK), Ali Nihat Özeyranlı, a Turkish brigadier general, opened a second front against the Eroğlu government. The issue was the junior coalition partner TKP's demand to transfer the control of the police department from military to civilian authority as it was stated in the coalition protocol. Tension between the TKP leader and deputy prime minister Akıncı, and Özeyranlı peaked when the latter, during an opening ceremony, stated that the special conditions on the island made it impossible to civilianize the police department. Akıncı left the ceremony in protest.<sup>779</sup> The next day, the general made a statement that criticized Akıncı in a humiliating manner and accused him of treason.<sup>780</sup> He also demanded that Eroğlu sack the directors of BRT, the public broadcasting corporation and TAK, the public news agency, as these two institutions

---

<sup>776</sup> "İŞAD İkinci Ekonomik Paketi Değerlendirdi [İŞAD evaluated the second economic package]." *Kıbrıs*, 26.7.2000.

<sup>777</sup> "Maaşlar Nihayet Ödendi [Salaries finally paid]." *Kıbrıs*, 8.7.2000.

<sup>778</sup> For the original metaphor, "It's only when the tide goes out that you can see who's swimming naked," see "Danger Time for America" *The Economist*, 14.1.2006.

<sup>779</sup> "Polis Genel Müdürlüğü Binası Törenle Açıldı [The General Directorate of Police Department opened with a ceremony]." *Avrupa*, 1.7.2000.

<sup>780</sup> See "Turkish Cyprus: Not a Baby." *The Economist*, 20.7.2000.

“censored his statements”. He also called on parliament to start an investigation against Eroğlu, should he not sack them.<sup>781</sup>

Tension escalated further when Şener Levent, the editor of the *Avrupa* newspaper, was arrested, along with three other journalists, on charges of espionage.<sup>782</sup> *Avrupa*, one of the champions of Cypriot identity, had been a staunch critic of the regime and heavily criticized Ankara’s proposed economic austerity package and the Turkish commander’s meddling in the internal affairs of north Cyprus before the arrests.<sup>783</sup> The general’s statements and detentions of the journalists sparked strong public criticism. In the *Economist’s* words, “a score of liberal political parties, trade unions and non-governmental organisations in northern Cyprus have formed a ‘platform against oppression,’ denounced the arrests and demanded the immediate replacement of General Ozeyranli”.<sup>784</sup> Cengiz Çandar’s words cited in the same article would later turn out to be a prescient warning to the Turkish establishment which went unheeded: “If things continue like this, Cyprus, which was lost neither on the battleground nor at the negotiating table, will be lost because of the domestic situation in northern Cyprus.”<sup>785</sup>

It was this perfect storm, which prepared the ground for the marginalized opposition to reconnect with the electorate. With a view to translating the community’s accumulated anger and frustration into political action, the opposition parties, trade unions, and other civil society organizations called on the public to demonstrate against the “imposition of the economic package of destruction” and “the intervention of the military in civilian life,” and to protest “the imprisonment of journalists on false charges”. At the same time, the organizers expressed their support for a peaceful settlement for the Cyprus problem, attributing the recent woes to the perpetuation of the conflict.<sup>786</sup> In short, this was a rally against the status quo, which was defined as an all-encompassing social, cultural, political, and economic establishment. The rally proved to be a huge success and subsequently its organizers came together to form a platform under the name “This Country is Ours;” a clear

---

<sup>781</sup> “Ne Komutan [What a commander]!” *Avrupa*, 2.7.2000.

<sup>782</sup> The evidence presented against the journalists was so flimsy that few days later the court freed them, pending trial (*The Economist*, 20.7.2000).

<sup>783</sup> “In a front-page story, the newspaper told the general: ‘Look, you are not the one to decide who is a traitor and who is a patriot. Before you were in Cyprus, we were here. When you leave, we will still be here.’ (*ibid.*)

<sup>784</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>785</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>786</sup> *Avrupa*, 15,16,17,18, July 2000.

message to Ankara. The platform was to constitute the backbone of the opposition movement that would challenge the regime in the months to come. It would prove instrumental in mobilizing what Kızılyürek calls “post-nationalist Cypriot patriotism,” as a broad-based people’s movement (2003: 298-9).

Less than a week after the opposition’s rally, the bank depositors held a demonstration to protest the government, which had ceased to pay the monthly compensation installments. The demonstration culminated in the storming of the parliament by angry demonstrators. The police used tear gas and sound bombs to disperse the furious crowd, and arrested around sixty demonstrators.<sup>787</sup> Referring to the police brutality, Şener Levent wrote that this was much worse than the reaction of the British commandoes against the Turkish Cypriot protesters during the 27-28 January 1958 demonstrations against the British colonial administration.<sup>788</sup>

In the face of overwhelming pressure, Eroğlu desperately sought to mend fences with the Turkish government. However, his requests for an appointment were repeatedly turned down by Ecevit.<sup>789</sup> This was an ironic situation for a prime minister who had come to power with promises of more money from Turkey. Referring to these promises, the editor of the influential daily *Kıbrıs*, Başaran Düzgün, wrote an article entitled “Begging for Appointment,” where in a sarcastic way he said let alone money, Eroğlu was not able to get an appointment from Ankara.<sup>790</sup> Ecevit was firm. At some point, he even proposed switching to the presidential system as a way out of the crisis.<sup>791</sup> Another idea, which was floated in the Turkish media, was forming a technocratic government.<sup>792</sup>

In the meantime, after consultations in Ankara, Denктаş decided to withdraw from the ongoing inter-communal negotiations in November 2000 on the grounds that “the negotiations were a waste of time” (Kızılyürek 2005: 269). His intention was to achieve his long-desired goal of integration with Turkey by derailing the negotiation process that could

---

<sup>787</sup> “Büyük Tutuklama [Many arrested].” *Kıbrıs*, 25.7.2000.

<sup>788</sup> “Kuzular ve Şahinler [Lambs and hawks].” *Avrupa*, 25.7.2000.

<sup>789</sup> Erdal Güven: “Nereye Kadar [Until where]?” *Radikal*, 28.7.2000.

<sup>790</sup> 29.7.2000. See also “Ankara Eroğlu’na Randevu Vermedi [Ankara did not give Eroğlu an appointment].” *Avrupa*, 31.7.2000.

<sup>791</sup> “Bülent Ecevit KKTC için Başkanlık Sistemi Önerdi [Ecevit proposed presidential system for the TRNC].” *Kıbrıs*, 29.7.2000.

<sup>792</sup> See Başaran Düzgün, “Ötenazi mi Demokrasi mi [Is it euthanasia or democracy]?” *Kıbrıs*, 31.7.2000.

have resulted in reunification and EU membership (*ibid.*). To this end, in early 2001, the Turkish council of ministers took some measures envisaging integration between Turkey and the TRNC in diverse domains. When the Turkish daily *Sabah* announced the measures with an article, entitled “Cyprus, the 82nd Province,”<sup>793</sup> the Turkish Cypriot public opinion was angered once again. Though it turned out that the measures were less dramatic than the sensational headline suggested, the decision was not welcomed on the island.<sup>794</sup> According to the CTP leader Talat this plan would lead to the “annihilation of the Turkish Cypriots”.<sup>795</sup> He withdrew the CTP’s representative from the Association Council, stating, “the CTP would not be a partner in this sin [and] that they would never accept its results”.<sup>796</sup>

The Eroğlu government, however, had no other option but to give in to Ankara’s pressure. By signing the “Economic and Financial Cooperation Protocol” with the Turkish government after months of foot-dragging, the government agreed to implement the proposed austerity program on 12 January 2001<sup>797</sup>, and secured USD 350 million, which enabled it, *inter alia*, to resume the compensation payments of bank depositors. The strongest opposition to the protocol came from the influential trade union of primary school teachers, KTÖS. KTÖS gave an advertisement to local newspapers addressing Ankara<sup>798</sup> on the day a Turkish official came to the island. “We neither want your money, nor your package, nor your civil servants,” the ad declared (Güven 2003: 73-4).

In the face of growing dissidence, the regime did not sit on its hands. It responded by employing its battle-tested tactics, nationalistic arousal with a pinch of terror, to clamp down on social unrest. As in 1996, the pro-reunification junior coalition partner was kicked out of the government, and a grand coalition between the UBP and DP was formed. Akıncı’s

---

<sup>793</sup> *Avrupa*, 1.3.2001.

<sup>794</sup> The idea of integration was not popular among the Turkish Cypriots. According to a poll, when asked about the best solution to the Cyprus problem, only 11.5 percent in 1997, 8.2 percent in December 1999 and 7.7 percent in August 2000, of the respondents said they were in favour of integration with Turkey (*Yenidüzen*, 1.4.2002).

<sup>795</sup> “KKTC ‘Kurtarılacak’ [The TRNC will be ‘rescued’].” *Radikal*, 5.1.2001.

<sup>796</sup> “CTP Ortaklık Konseyi’nden Temsilcisini Geri Çekti [The CTP withdrew its representative from the Association Council].” *Avrupa*, 5.1.2001.

<sup>797</sup> TC Yardım Heyeti (2004: 1).

<sup>798</sup> *Kıbrıs* refused to run it. Only *Yenidüzen* and independent *Avrupa* agreed to run it.

stance towards Ankara “cost him his job as deputy prime minister in the Turkish-Cypriot government”.<sup>799</sup> To quote the Economist once again,

A newspaper critical of Mr Denktash, *Avrupa*, has been hit by a bomb. Mr Denktash has accused advocates of a Greek-Turkish dialogue of being ‘spies on the payroll of foreign diplomats’ -and has recently said he has evidence to prove it. A group called the National Action Movement [*sic*], which goes around villages reminding residents of atrocities committed by Greek-Cypriots before 1974 and heaps praise on ‘our saviours from the Motherland’, is said to have been conceived by Mr Denktash and his mentors in Turkey.<sup>800</sup>

In the meantime, another economic shock struck when the Turkish government decided to drop exchange rate controls and allow the Turkish lira to float in February 2001. To quote James Arnold of BBC, this was the worst financial crisis to hit Turkey since World War II. As a result, Turkish citizens “have seen the dollar value of their savings and incomes halve, while their financial obligations - usually set in hard currency - ballooned” in the following year.<sup>801</sup> Needless to say, Turkish Cypriots, who use the Turkish lira as legal tender, were in the same sinking boat. The society as a whole was impoverished. Yet, the two groups’ situation is of particular importance as what held the rest of the economy on its feet was the consumption of these groups. These were the public sector employees and pensioners, whose incomes eroded considerably as a result of the implementation of the austerity measures: in 2001 and 2002, in average real terms, salaries and pensions were 30 percent less than their 2000 level.<sup>802</sup> One might look at the financial assistance figures and say Ankara indeed increased the amount of money transferred in the period concerned. This is true. However, it should be borne in mind that the bulk of these transfers went to the compensation payments of bank depositors<sup>803</sup>, and this severely curtailed the government’s distributive capacity.

This was a serious blow for a regime, which grew increasingly dependent on political clientelism. The first poll results after the introduction of the Annan Plan confirmed this: 83.5 percent of the military and police personnel; 78 percent of the teachers; 77 percent of other public sector employees; and 65 percent of workers said that they would vote in

---

<sup>799</sup> “Divided Cyprus: The danger of over-doggedness.” *The Economist*, 19.7.2001.

<sup>800</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>801</sup> James Arnold: “Analysis: Turkey’s year of crisis.” 21.2.2002.

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/1833730.stm> (accessed 15.3.2012).

<sup>802</sup> TC Yardım Heyeti (2004: 32-3).

<sup>803</sup> *Ibid.*

favor of the plan, should a referendum be held.<sup>804</sup> Obviously, the public sector employees were not willing to unilaterally fulfill their side of the clientelistic deal in the absence of rewards from the government side.

Certainly, the transformative process that was set in motion with these events cannot be grasped in economic terms alone. As Yücel argues, the series of developments outlined above were the manifestation of an “economic-political-social chaos” that posed an “existential threat” to the community (2003: 37). This chaos clearly demonstrated that “neither democracy, nor a sustainable economy, nor a state in a real sense could be formed,” despite thirty years that had elapsed since the division of the island (Kızılyürek 2005: 388-9). As *The Economist* commented in the wake of the dispute between the Turkish general and the government, the claim that “the Turkish north Cyprus is an independent state and recognized as such” began to ring hollow.<sup>805</sup> The *taksim* project had failed to realize most of its promises and was virtually bankrupt. As Lacher and Kaymak suggest:

the TRNC is a ‘failing state’; its legitimacy has eroded as more and more Turkish Cypriots question whether this state actually reflects their political will ... it is not just an increasing dissatisfaction with the failure to gain external recognition, but wide-ranging skepticism as to the quality of the TRNC’s internal sovereignty that prevails (2005: 155).

Crucially, this bankruptcy or “state failure” coincided with the rise of a new tide. Now, a “solution based on a common state” also meant automatic EU membership. This was an important element in mobilizing mass-support among people (Kızılyürek 2005: 389). For the first time, a concrete political project had emerged that could challenge the monopoly of Turkish nationalism. Particularly, common people came to perceive the EU as a panacea for various economic ills of the establishment.<sup>806</sup> Just as significantly, the same perception was gaining ground in the ranks of the business community as well. The EU membership represented an opportunity for normalization in economy that would allow the private sector to thrive without being held hostage by the UBP. This was indeed one of the

---

<sup>804</sup> The public opinion poll was conducted by KADEM, which is considered as one of the most reliable pollsters (“İşte Referandum [Here’s the referendum].” *Kıbrıs*, 6.1.2003).

<sup>805</sup> “Turkish Cyprus: Not a Baby”.

<sup>806</sup> For instance see the poll published in *Yenidüzen* (Muharrem Faiz: “Kıbrıslı Türkler Ne Düşünüyor [What do Turkish Cypriots think]?” *Yenidüzen*, 1.4.2002).

novelties of this movement. Especially, the election of a liberal-minded, pro-EU businessman, Ali Erel, as chairman of the KTTO gave a significant boost to the pro-reunification camp (Bahceli 2004). With this move, the chamber, which had been hitherto one of the bulwarks of the *taksim* policies, reinvented itself as the champion of “solution and EU membership”. Only few years earlier it was issuing statements against not only official but also unofficial contacts with the Greek Cypriot side.<sup>807</sup> Erel’s chairmanship can be seen as the defeat of the conservative business elite by the liberal ones, which had organized earlier under İŞAD. The pro-solution stance of İŞAD, which was fiercely attacked by the chamber few years ago, now came to dominate the chamber.

Soon, six other business associations, including the hoteliers, bankers, and building contractors, joined the pro-reunification movement, launching a public relations campaign to urge both Turkish and Turkish Cypriot officials not to miss the chance to reach a settlement before the December 2002 Copenhagen Summit.

By joining forces with the parties on the left, and trade unions, which had established “This Country is Ours Platform” earlier, the KTTO helped broadening the social base of the movement. The new umbrella organization established in August 2002 was named “Common Vision”. The Common Vision, which was comprised of 91 professional associations and civil society organizations, became the spearhead of the “Solution and EU” movement, bringing together, according to some accounts, up to 60 thousand Turkish Cypriots -almost one third of the population- in mass demonstrations (Bahceli 2004). In June 2002 local elections, this liberal-left wing coalition showed that it could translate its influence on the streets into electoral success when the CTP won the mayoralities in three big towns, Nicosia, Famagusta and Kyrenia by garnering some 34 percent of votes with its election campaign based on the slogan: “Open the door to solution and EU membership”. The chamber’s support in Nicosia was so remarkable that it led some to comment that the CTP candidate, Kutlay Erk, a former chairman of the İŞAD, was in fact the candidate of the KTTO (An 2004: 149-51).

---

<sup>807</sup> See for instance “Ticaret Odası Görüşmelere Karşı [The chamber of commerce is against the negotiations].” *Ortam*, 16.12.1998.

This is to say, when the Annan Plan was introduced in November 2002, there was already an unprecedented momentum behind the reunification movement. This was revealed by the initial polls conducted right after the introduction of the Annan Plan in December. Almost two thirds of the respondents were ready to approve the first version of the plan, indicating that the following period, which culminated with the referendum, was by no means an uphill struggle for the proponents of reunification and EU membership.<sup>808</sup>

Certainly, this is not to deny the effect of the pro-EU Justice and Development Party (*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi*, AKP) government's new Cyprus policy in the process. However, considering the fact that the AKP came to power in November 2002, it would not be wrong to suggest that the AKP's stance gave a boost to the dynamics that were already at work rather than initiating them.

---

<sup>808</sup> "İşte Referandum [Here is the referendum]." *Kıbrıs*, 6.1.2003.

## Conclusions

How can we explain the Turkish Cypriots' approval of the UN's reunification plan in 2004, given the fact that they had kept pro-partition leaders in power for almost half a century? This study aimed to answer this question within the analytical framework offered by the political clientelism literature. Basically, I argued that the yes vote, which represented a sharp departure from the *taksim* policy of the nationalist ruling elite, was triggered by a crisis of the clientelistic system, which had been the main source of legitimacy of the post-1974 order.

What do we know about the role and nature of clientelism in Turkish Cypriot politics? Not much. The review of the relevant literature showed that though the presence of patronage politics in the northern part of Cyprus has been referred to in passing in many works, a comprehensive study, which analyzes the causes of its birth and charts the development of these practices in detail with a historical approach, has yet to be done. Therefore, to fill this gap, overall the study mainly dealt with the emergence, development and crisis of political clientelism in the Turkish Cypriot political life in conjunction with its effects on the Cyprus problem and politico-economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community.

Against this backdrop, the study started with a chapter on political clientelism, which outlines the theoretical framework of the dissertation. After identifying what it is, and elaborating on the differences between the traditional and modern forms of patronage, I overviewed the *culturalist*, *developmentalist* and *institutionalist* approaches, which try to account for the emergence of political clientelism in different contexts.

Which of these theories does offer the best framework to understand the case of north Cyprus? Was political clientelism in the post-1974 period a consequence of the pre-existing patron-client ties as the *culturalist* and *developmentalist* approaches presuppose? Did it emerge after the independence of the island in 1960? Or was it a post-1974 phenomenon? To answer these questions, in the first chapter of the empirical part, the possible roots of political clientelism have been investigated with an historical approach, which extended to the beginning of the British period. Here, I showed that the prevalence of political clientelism in the post-1974 period could not be attributed to pre-existing patron-client ties because (a) the pattern of land-ownership i.e. majority of the farmers were peasant-

proprietors, was not conducive to the formation of lasting patron-client relations; (b) the British solved the problem of peasant indebtedness and hence blocked the possible rise of money-lenders as a patron group; (c) particularly after the abolition of the legislative assembly in 1931, we cannot talk about electoral politics, and (d) in the Republic period there was an authoritarian, military rule where there was no room for political competition and therefore mass clientelism.

If political clientelism was not inherited from the pre-democratic past, then how can we explain its emergence in the post-1974 period? In Chapter Three, following, to a large extent, the *institutionalist* approach, I demonstrated that the emergence of clientelistic politics was basically the consequence of a deliberate strategy adopted by the ruling nationalist elite to outmobilize the opposition in the first multi-party elections. I argued that the programmatic difference between contending political blocs i.e. polarization in the political arena, played an important role in prompting the nationalist elite to opt for a clientelistic mobilization strategy. This is to say, to create an image of mass support behind the *taksim* idea, which was at the time opposed not only by the local opposition but also by the mainstream political actors in Ankara, the nationalist leadership adopted a clientelistic strategy in the establishment process of their political party, the UBP. The absence of a constituency for bureaucratic autonomy, which could have blocked the adoption of this strategy; abundance of public resources under their disposal; and the wider socio economic context made the conditions for the adoption of this strategy more favourable.

What were the basic characteristics of the UBP at the time of its establishment? In other words, what does make the UBP a clientelistic party? In Chapter Four, I tried to answer this question by analyzing its program, social composition, constitution and organization. I showed that what brought the founders together was not program or ideology but rather clientelistic linkages by illustrating the lack of cohesion in its program, and irreconcilable conflicts of interest in its cadres, who, given their social backgrounds did not make natural allies. The leadership's puzzling decision to organize itself in the mass party format is also worth mentioning here. This was an odd choice because as an internally mobilized party, they did not need mass membership to finance the party's activities. This decision largely stemmed from the leadership's desire (a) to outdo the HP, which had adopted a similar model and reached over three thousand members in a short time; (b) to show that a big majority espoused its *taksim* policy, and (c) to renew the cadres around Denктаş. This was

a critical choice because by removing the discretion of party leaders on the selection of candidates, this model had detrimental effects on the existing cadre's prospects of maintaining their position, and paved the way for the ascendance of a different breed of politicians, the new guard, who would before long capture the party administration – something, which was discussed in detail in Chapter Five. In the last section of Chapter Four, I also illustrated how the UBP machine used public resources first to recruit members and then to mobilize voters in the run up to the first multi-party election.

How can we explain inertia in government and chaos within the UBP, two things, which have characterized the post-1974 politico-economic order? To what extent did the institutional choices made in the UBP's and TFSC's establishment process affect the functioning of the UBP in particular, and politico-economic development of the Turkish Cypriot society in general? I tried to answer these broad questions in the Chapters Five and Six. The first section of Chapter Five was devoted to the roots of the political turmoil, which would paralyze the country and the UBP in the decades to come. Here, particularly, I tried to answer two questions: How can we explain the chaos within the UBP, which brought the party to the brink of a complete disintegration in only few years? What was the role of Denktaş in all this? I showed that basically the chaos within the party was due to two parallel power struggles: one between the president, and the prime minister, who was also the UBP leader; and another between the old guard and the new guard. So, inertia of government was only a side effect of the power struggle for the control of the party. Institutional factors, like the electoral system and form of government also aggravated the situation. To be more precise, the open list electoral system led to the personalization of politics, intensified intra-party competition for getting re-elected and hence promoted disunity. The semi-presidential character of the government, on the other hand, strained the relations between the president and prime minister. While eventually one of these parallel power struggles came to an end after the election of Eroğlu to party chairmanship in 1983, which signified the victory of the new guard, this did not stabilize the country because the tension between the president and the UBP leader got even more intensified.

At the inter-party level, not surprisingly, this turmoil proved to be extremely costly for the UBP. Despite all the patronage power it mobilized and the nationalistic propaganda it spread, the party lost its majority in the parliament as early as in 1981. Yet, it remained in power as the junta in Turkey dictated so. This move exposed the role of Ankara. Obviously,

it was setting strict limits to what was and what was not allowed to happen in the northern part of Cyprus. In other words, just like in post World War II Italy and Greece, here too, a “guided democracy” was prevailing. In this respect, it is important to note that highlighting the important role of political clientelism in maintaining the pro-*taksim* policies does not mean that this is the sole problem in an otherwise democratic, autonomous state with free and fair elections. The Turkish Cypriot democracy is flawed in many respects; the biggest of them being the tutelage of Ankara, which can be seen as an integral element of the system as its roots can be traced back to the mid-1950s, as shown in Chapter Two.

Overall, in Chapter Five, I also aimed to show how it turned out that no matter how useful it was in mobilizing masses in election times, when it came to governing, and particularly delivering public goods, the system proved extremely inept in a way constantly sowing the seeds of its own destruction. This had something to do with the nature of machine parties. In the absence of a binding ideology and a too broad base that makes interest aggregation almost impossible, the UBP governments have never managed to go beyond kicking the can down the road. It should be also added that by exposing the lack of discipline within the party, an indirect indicator showing that a party is held together by clientelistic linkages, I tried to highlight that the UBP has been a machine party.

What did eventually bring about the crisis that led to the collapse of the regime? What did make the regime, paradoxically, so resilient yet at the same time so fragile? Chapter Six was devoted to the analysis of the dynamics, which have maintained and then undermined machine politics. I argued that the prospect of EU membership was part of the answer for the first question. But if this was the case, then another question had to be answered: Why did the kicking in of the much-expected catalyst effect of the prospective EU membership in shifting the Turkish Cypriot position in the inter-communal negotiations take so long? The answer had two dimensions: (a) at the ruling elite level the EU did not have much appeal anyway. Indeed, the EU’s approach even backfired and gave Denktaş a pretext to be even less cooperative; (b) at the mass level, on the other hand, the tangible benefits offered by the regime or simply patronage politics, obviously outweighed the abstract and uncertain benefits of the possible EU membership.

Yet, it should be borne in mind that the survival of patronage politics cannot be taken for granted indefinitely because it is subject to changes in the politico-economic dynamics, and

certainly some dynamics were constantly undermining it. What made the system so fragile were the accumulated ills of decades of patronage politics on the economy and society. I touched upon this in the first section of Chapter Six, where I made a comparison with the DC and Italian case, which share something in common with the Turkish Cypriot case: political clientelism and guided democracy. This is to say, in a clientelistic system where the opposition is declared unfit to come to power and alternation of power is effectively blocked, the system loses its sole mechanism to correct itself. The most obvious side effects of this deadly combination, in both cases, were an inefficient and over-bloated public sector, widespread corruption and overall failure in delivering public goods.

To elaborate on this, in the rest of Chapter Six, I showed (a) that the public sector was even more bloated than it has been widely assumed, and (b) that this was the consequence of bureaucratic clientelism. In the absence of any large-scale productive sector that could act as a locomotive for the rest of the economy, the cost of sustaining the system gradually grew, and at some point in the mid-1990s spun out of control. The result was an “assisted society,” which made the whole politico-economic structure not only susceptible to economic crisis but also, as soon it would turn out, to the political meddling of the sponsor of this clientelistic system: Ankara.

Given these weaknesses, as also pointed out by Chubb (1982: 211-6), it can be argued that the long term resilience of clientelistic systems can be accounted for in the context of a collective action problem. This is to say, no matter how bad the situation is for the society as a whole, individuals do not have much incentive to try to change the system until something major changes the calculus in their minds and makes collective action possible. In the case of Naples, for instance, it was the cholera outbreak of 1973, which provided the essential stimulus to bring an end to the DC rule in the local government (*ibid.*: 249). In the Turkish Cypriot case, the stimulus for change was a mixture of factors: a banking crisis, whose effects were worsened (a) by the involvement of Ankara in the power struggle between nationalist leaders, and (b) by a financial crisis. It was the coincidence of this multiple crisis with the immediate prospect of the EU membership, a perfect storm, I argued, which brought about the nationalists’ sudden fall from grace and “yes” in the referendum.

Is there anything peculiar about the Turkish Cypriot political clientelism? What are the specific features of the Turkish Cypriot case compared to the other cases? The peculiarity of the Turkish Cypriot case stems from the Cyprus conflict, which to a large extent has conditioned the way the system has been operating since its inception. Take the two of the favorite patronage resources, for instance. Distributing the Greek Cypriot properties to the voters, and granting TRNC citizenship en masse to the Turkish citizens in the run up to the elections seem to be peculiar to this case, which in the absence of the Cyprus conflict would not be possible. By distributing these “resources,” the UBP did not only tighten its grip on power but also undermined the prospects of reunification of the island –the party’s *raison d’être*. Furthermore, its image as the sole guardian of the status quo and the Turkish interests in the island in the eyes of the establishment in Ankara has turned the UBP into a gatekeeper, which effectively monopolized the distribution of jobs and other favours. This meant the total exclusion of the pro-reunification opposition parties; something that we cannot see in the cases of Italy or southern Cyprus for instance. In the case of the Cold War era Italy, for example, when it came to the distribution of public jobs, thanks to “the so-called *lottizzazione* [carve-up]” (Morlino et al. 2000:76), “candidates for public appointments were chosen on the basis of the strength of their party” (Edwards 2005: 227), where even the Italian Communist Party was not left out (Morlino et al. 2000: 77). The same applies to the Greek Cypriot case too (Faustmann 2010).

Does the crisis outlined in this dissertation mean that the era of political clientelism in the Turkish Cypriot political life has come to an end once and for all? Or will there be a revival? Alas, it is not possible to talk about the demise of political clientelism in Turkish Cypriot politics. Recent developments show that the crisis of political clientelism, which brought about the end of the hegemony of the UBP, was a temporary one. A revival already came, and indeed, it did strikingly. The UBP had made a comeback in the 2009 parliamentary election by garnering 44 percent of the votes –its third best performance in a general election after 1976 and 1990! Furthermore, in the presidential election in 2010, its chairman Eroğlu who came back from retirement has easily won the presidency.

Did being five years away from government change the UBP? No. The UBP’s latest stint in power was not so different from the previous ones. Indeed, what we have observed in the few years following Eroğlu’s ascendance to presidency was like watching the remake of an old movie: A succession crisis, a power struggle between the president and the prime

minister –or to put it another way, between former and current leaders of the UBP- and eventually splintering.

When he got elected to the presidency, like Denktaş, Erođlu stepped down from the leadership of the party as the constitution dictated. With a twist of fate, this gave the old master of patronage and the architect of the UBP machine, İrsen Küçük the chance to make a comeback and grab the party leadership as well as the premiership. Yet, as it was the case with Denktaş, Erođlu was not willing to give up his hegemony over the party. As his predecessor did, no wonder, he also faced with resistance from the new chairman. This new round of intra-party conflict of power led to turmoil within the party, and inertia in government. And once again, the Turkish government picked a side in this struggle and threw its full weight behind Küçük. Emboldened by Ankara's support, Küçük used the full patronage power of the state to retain his chairmanship in the 2012 party congress against Ahmet Kaşif, who was the favored candidate of Erođlu. Yet, he failed to garner enough votes to win in the first round. Only after months of controversy and a court order, Küçük accepted a run-off, which he won by a whisker: 708 to 701. As of the time of writing, another split have occurred within the UBP. Eight dissident deputies resigned from the UBP with the endorsement of Erođlu, ironically, to join an earlier splinter movement, which came into being after an intra-party revolt against Erođlu back in 1992: the DP. Subsequently, they forced Küçük to resign as prime minister by voting in favour of a motion of no confidence. The ensuing early election, which was held on 28 July 2013 led to the formation of a CTP-DP government against the will of Ankara -as if history is repeating itself.

## Annex

**Table 7: The Turkish financial assistance as percentage of the budget expenditures.**

Year	Budget Expenditure (USD)	Turkish Aid (USD)	BE/TA (%)
1977	65,170,329.7	18,259,231	28.0
1978	58,345,528.5	23,158,745	39.7
1979	65,054,347.8	19,288,386	29.6
1980	56,047,936.1	27,224,576	48.6
1981	63,892,035.4	31,321,535	49.0
1982	59,158,730.2	37,164,285	62.8
1983	70,207,937.9	44,867,325	63.9
1984	73,391,399.0	52,862,207	72.0
1985	86,671,777.4	38,051,352	43.9
1986	103,243,480.8	48,340,879	46.8
1987	121,621,903.7	44,066,301	36.2
1988	105,979,043.6	35,657,293	33.6
1989	120,187,191.5	38,353,117	31.9
1990	200,363,882.1	58,648,787	29.3
1991	212,174,575.6	76,422,671	36.0
1992	198,560,652.5	93,529,092	47.1
1993	225,468,367.2	82,623,645	36.6
1994	209,270,687.3	50,628,985	24.2
1995	293,320,522.5	44,262,629	15.1
1996	296,779,987.9	91,921,534	31.0
1997	323,841,392.8	199,385,809	61.6
1998	403,647,258.4	184,081,346	45.6
1999	455,094,061.6	162,361,566	35.7
2000	530,378,838.1	226,852,576	42.8
2001	418,220,888.7	209,590,904	50.1
2002	531,813,423.7	282,007,478	53.0
2003	691,441,329.8	356,760,133	51.6
2004	883,601,641.6	379,544,828	43.0

Source: Prepared by author based on financial assistance figures (TC Yardım Heyeti 2004: 25); budget expenditure figures (State Planning Organization: Economic and Social Indicators, available at <http://www.devplan.org/Frame-eng.html> (accessed on 16.5.2013). The average exchange rate figures to convert the budget expenditure figures, which were available in current TL prices to USD (*ibid.*).

## Bibliography

Adalı, Kutlu (1999). *Yaseminlerimi Geri Verin [Give My Jasmines Back]*. Lefkoşa: Kutlu Adalı Vakfı Yayınları.

Allum, Felia and Percy Allum (2008). "Revisiting Naples: clientelism and organized crime." *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, 13:3: 340-365.

Altan, Mehmet (2003). *Kıbrıs Diye Bir Ada [An Island Called Cyprus]*. İstanbul: Gündem Yayınları.

An, Ahmet (1996). *Kıbrıs'ta Fırtınalı Yıllar (1942-1962) [Stormy Years in Cyprus (1942-1962)]*. Lefkoşa: Galeri Kültür.

An, Ahmet (1997). *Kıbrıs Türk Liderliğinin Oluşması (1900-1942) [The Formation of Turkish Cypriot Leadership (1900-1942)]*. Lefkoşa: Galeri Kültür.

An, Ahmet (2004). *Küçük Adada Büyük Oyunlar: Kıbrıs'ta ayrılıkçılık, federal çözüm ve AB üyeliği [Big Games in a Small Island: Secessionism, Federal Settlement and the EU Membership in Cyprus]*. İstanbul: NK yayınları.

An, Ahmet (2006). *Kıbrıslı Türkler'in Siyasi Tarihi (1930-1960): Basının Aynasında Kıbrıslı Türklerin Unutturulan Siyasal Geçmişi ve Siyasal Kavgaları [The Political History of Turkish Cypriots (1930-1960): The obliterated political past and political feuds of Turkish Cypriots as reflected in the press]*. Lefkoşa.

Attalides, Michael (1977a). "Forms of Peasant Incorporation in Cyprus during the Last Century." In Ernest Gellner and John Waterbury, eds., *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. London: Duckworth.

Attalides, Michael (1977b). "The Turkish Cypriots: Their Relations to the Greek Cypriots in Perspective." In Michael Attalides, ed., *Cyprus Reviewed: The Result of a Seminar on the Cyprus Problem*. Nicosia: Jus Cypri Foundation.

Attalides, Michael (1979). *Cyprus: Nationalism and International Politics*. Edinburgh: Q Press.

Atun, Hakkı (2007). "Kıbrıs'ta Göçmenlerin İskanı [The Resettlement of Displaced in Cyprus]." Ülker Vancı Osam, ed., *Proceedings of the 6th International Congress on Cyprus Studies*. Famagusta: Eastern Mediterranean University Press.

Axt, Heinz-Jürgen and Hansjörg Brey, eds. (1997). *Cyprus and the European Union: New Chances for Solving an Old Conflict*. München: Südosteuropa Gesellschaft.

Aydoğdu, Ahmet (2005). *Tarihsel Süreçte Kıbrıs Türk Seçimleri ve Yönetimleri [The Turkish Cypriot Elections and Administrations in the Historical Process]*. Ankara.

- Bahçeli, Tözün (2004). "Saying yes to EU Accession: Explaining the Turkish Cypriot Referendum Outcome." *The Cyprus Review*, 16(2): 55-66.
- Baier-Allen, Susanne, ed. (1999). *Looking into the Future of Cyprus-EU Relations*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Balkır, Canan (2005). "The Turkish Cypriot Business Community as a Politico-Economic Actor Searching for a Solution." *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol.4, No.4.
- Banfield, Edward (1958). *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*. New York: The Free Press.
- Banfield, Edward and James Q. Wilson (1966). *City Politics*. New York: Vintage.
- Besim, Filiz (2011). *Tarihe Sözüm Var: Kıbrıslı Türkler'in Toplumsal ve Siyasal Tarihine Kısa Bir Yolculuk [I have a word to history: A short journey to the Turkish Cypriots' social and political history]*. İstanbul: Galata.
- Boissevain, Jeremy (1966). "Patronage in Sicily." *Man*, New Series, Vol. 1.: 18-33.
- Boissevain, Jeremy (1977). "When the Saints Go Marching out: Reflections on the decline of Patronage in Malta." In Ernest Gellner and John Waterbury, eds., *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. London: Duckworth.
- Borowiec, Andrew (2000). *Cyprus: A Troubled Island*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.
- Brey, Hansjörg (1999). "Cyprus as an issue of Turkish Foreign Policy." *The International Spectator*, 34(1): 111-121.
- Caciagli, Mario and Frank P. Belloni (1981). "The 'New' Clientelism in Southern Italy: The Christian Democratic Party in Catania." In S.N. Eisenstadt and Rene Lemarchand, eds., *Political Clientelism, Patronage, and Development*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Carey, John M. and Matthew Sobert Shugart (1995). "Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote: a Rank Ordering of Electoral Formulas." *Electoral Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 4: 417-439.
- Cavendish, Anne, ed. (1991). *Cyprus 1878: The Journal of Sir Garnet Wolseley*. Nicosia: Cyprus Popular Bank Cultural Centre.
- Celasun, Oya (1998). *The 1994 Currency Crisis in Turkey*. Macroeconomics and Growth Group, Development Research Department, The World Bank.
- Cem, İsmail (2001). *Turkey in the New Century*. Nicosia: Rustem.
- Choisi, Jeanette (1993). "The Turkish Cypriot Elite – Its Social Function and Legitimation." *The Cyprus Review*, 5 (2): 7-32.

Choisi, Jeanette (1993b). *Wurzeln und Strukturen des Zypernkonfliktes 1878 bis 1990: Ideologischer Nationalismus und Machtbehauptung im Kalkül konkurrierender Eliten*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Choisi, Jeanette (1997). "The Problem of the Cypriot Identity." In Heinz-Jürgen Axt and Hansjörg Brey, eds., *Cyprus and the European Union: New Chances for Solving an old Conflict?* pp. 24-35. München: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft.

Christophorou, Christophoros (2006). "The Emergence of Modern Politics in Cyprus (1940-1959)." In Hubert Faustmann and Nicos Peristianis, eds., *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism (1878-2006)*, pp. 295-314. Mannheim und Moehnesse: Bibliopolis.

Christophorou, Christophoros (2006). "Party Change and Development in Cyprus (1995-2005)." *South European Society and Politics*, 11 (3-4): 513-542.

Chubb, Judith (1981). "The Social Bases of an Urban Political Machine: The Christian Democratic Party in Palermo." In S.N. Eisenstadt and Rene Lemarchand, eds., *Political Clientelism, Patronage, and Development*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Chubb, Judith (1982). *Patronage, Power, and Poverty in Southern Italy: A Tale of Two Cities*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chubb, Judith (2004). "Comments." *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, 9(4): 464-472.

Cicero, Quintus Tullius and James Carville (2012). "Campaign Tips from Cicero." *Foreign Affairs*, May-June 2012.

Clapham, Christopher (1982). "Clientelism and the State." In Christopher Clapham, ed., *Private Patronage and Public Power*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Crawshaw, Nancy (1978). *The Cyprus Revolt: An Account of the Struggle for Union with Greece*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Çelik, Vedat (1990). "The Role of Industry in the Economic Development of the TRNC." *Proceedings of Conference on Structural Changes in the Economy of North Cyprus* organized by Turkish Cypriot – German Cultural Association. Mağusa.

Çolak, Yılmaz (2004). "Reintegration in Cyprus: Nationalism and Citizenship in the RoC and the TRNC." UNU-CRIS, e-Working Papers, W-2004/6.

Della Porta, Donatella (2006). *Social Movements, Political Violence and the State: A Comparative Analysis of Italy and Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Denktaş, Rauf (1982). *The Cyprus Triangle*. London: George Allen and Unwin Publishers.

Denktaş, Rauf (2006). "TMT'nin İlk Dönemi [The Early Period of the TMT]." In Arslan Mengüç, ed., *Anılarda Erenköy: Bir Direnişin Anılarıyla Romanı [Erenköy in Memories: The Novel of a Resistance with Memories]*, pp. 46-49. Ankara.

- Diez, Thomas (2002). "Last Exit to Paradise? The European Union, the Cyprus conflict and the problematic 'catalytic effect'." *European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict, Postmodern Union*, pp 139-162. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Dodd, Clement H. (1993a). "From Federated State to Republic: 1975-1984." In Clement Dodd, ed., *The Political Social and Economic Development of Northern Cyprus*, pp. 103-135. Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press.
- Dodd, Clement H. (1993b). "The Ascendancy of the Right: 1985-93." In Clement Dodd, ed., *The Political Social and Economic Development of Northern Cyprus*, pp. 136-166. Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press.
- Dodd, Clement H. (1993c). "Political and Administrative Structures." In Clement Dodd, ed., *The Political Social and Economic Development of Northern Cyprus*, pp. 167-192. Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press.
- Dodd, Clement H. (1999). "The Cyprus Issue: Constraints on a Solution." In: S. Baier-Allen, ed., *Looking into the Future of Cyprus-EU Relations*, pp. 23-37. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Duverger, Maurice (1978). *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd.
- Edwards, Phil (2005). "The Berlusconi Anomaly: Populism and Patrimony in Italy's Long Transition." *South European Society and Politics*, 10 (2): 225-243.
- Egemen, Salih (2006). *Kıbrıslı Türkler Arasında Siyasi Liderlik [Political Leadership Among Turkish Cypriots]*. Lefkoşa.
- Eisenstadt, Shmuel and René Lemarchand, eds. (1981). *Political Clientelism, Patronage and Development*. London: Sage.
- Eisenstadt, Shmuel N., and Luis Roniger (1984). *Patrons, clients and friends: Interpersonal relations and the structures of trust in society*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Faustmann, Hubert (1998). "Clientelism in the Greek Cypriot Community of Cyprus." *The Cyprus Review*, 10 (2): 41-77.
- Faustmann, Hubert (2010). "Rusfeti and Political Patronage in the Republic of Cyprus." *The Cyprus Review*, 22 (2): 270-289.
- Fedai, Harid, ed. (2002). *Başhakim Zeka Bey [Chief Justice Zeka Bey]*. Lefkoşa.
- Fevzioglu, Bülent (1998). *Kıraathane-i Osmani'den, Cumhuriyet Meclisi'ne (1886-1996) Olaylar ve Seçimler/Seçilenler [From Kıraathane-i Osmani to the Republican Assembly (1886-1991) Events and Elections/Elected]*. Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi – KKTC Cumhuriyet Meclisi Ortak Yayını.
- Foley, Charles (1964). *Legacy of Strife: Cyprus from Rebellion to Civil War*. Middlesex: Penguin.

Galli, Giorgio and Alfonso Prandi (1970). *Patterns of Political Participation in Italy*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Garcia, Marisol and Neovi Karakatsanis (2006). "Social Policy, Democracy, and Citizenship in Southern Europe." In Richard Gunther, Nikiforos Diamandouros and Dimitri A. Sotiropoulos, eds., *Democracy and the State in New Southern Europe*. pp. 87-137. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gazioğlu, Ahmet C. (2000). *Direnış Örgütleri, Gençlik Teşkilatı ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Durum: 1958-1960 [Resistance Organizations, the Youth Organization and Socio-Economic Situation: 1958-1960]*. Ankara: Cyrep.

Georghallides, G. S. (1979). *A Political and Administrative History of Cyprus (1918-1926)*. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.

Gilbert, Mark F. and K. Robert Nilsson (2007). *Historical Dictionary of Modern Italy*. Plymouth, UK: The Scarecrow Press.

Graziano, Luigi (1976). "A conceptual framework for the study of clientelistic behavior." *European Journal of Political Research* 4: 149-174.

Graziano, Luigi (1977). "Patron-Client Relationships in Southern Italy." In Steffen W. Schmidt, Laura Guasti, Carl H. Lande and James C. Scott, eds., *Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gumpel, W. (1997). "Economic Performance and Competitiveness in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus." In Heinz-Jürgen Axt and Hansjörg Brey, eds., *Cyprus and the European Union: New Chances for Solving an old Conflict?* pp. 63-73. München: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft.

Gunter, Michael M. (1998). "Susurluk: The connection between Turkey's intelligence community and organized crime." *International Journal of Intelligence and Counter Intelligence*, 11(2): 119-141.

Gunther, Richard (2005). "Parties and Electoral Behavior in Southern Europe." *Comparative Politics*, 37 (3): 253-275.

Gürel, Ayla (2012). *Displacement in Cyprus, Consequences of Civil and Military Strife: Turkish Cypriot Legal Framework*. Oslo: PRIO.

Gürkan, Haşmet (2001). *Cumhuriyet Düşünceleri [Thoughts about the Republic]*. Lefkoşa: Galeri Kültür.

Gürkan, Haşmet (2008). *Kıbrıs'ın Sisli Geçmişi [The Foggy Past of Cyprus]*. Lefkoşa: Galeri Kültür.

Güven, Erdal (2003). *Helsinki'den Kopenhag'a Kıbrıs [Cyprus, From Helsinki to Copenhagen]*. İstanbul: Om Yayınları.

Hall, Anthony (1977). "Patron-Client Relations: Concepts and Terms." In Steffen W. Schmidt, Laura Guasti, Carl H. Lande and James C. Scott, eds., *Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Halluma, Remzi, ed. (2007). *Ayios Sipuridon'un Çanları: Mehmet Ali Tremeşeli'nin Anıları [The Bells of Agios Spiridon: The Memoir of Mehmet Ali Tremeşeli]*. Lefkoşa: Galeri Kültür.

Hannay, David (2005). *Cyprus: The Search for a Solution*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Hatay, Mete (2005). *Beyond Numbers: An inquiry into the Political Integration of the Turkish 'Settlers' in Northern Cyprus*. Oslo: PRIO.

Hill, George (1972). *A History of Cyprus The Ottoman Province (Volume 4) The British Colony (1571-1948)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hopkin, Jonathan (2001). "A 'Southern Model' of Electoral Mobilization? Clientelism and Electoral Politics in post-Franco Spain." *West European Politics* 24 (1): 115-36.

Hopkin, Jonathan (2005). "Forza Italia after 10 Years." In Carlo Guarnieri and James L. Newell, eds., *Italian Politics: Quo Vadis?*, pp. 83-99. New York: Berghahn Books.

*In Memory of Dr. Ihsan Ali* (1995). Ihsan Ali Foundation: Nicosia.

İnanç, Gül (2007). *Büyükelçiler Anlatıyor: Türk Diplomasisinde Kıbrıs (1970-1991) [The Ambassadors Recount: Cyprus in Turkish Diplomacy (1970-1991)]*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

İnceci, Sevgi G. (2004). "KKTC Ekonomisi: Karşılaştırmalı Analiz [The TRNC Economy: Comparative Analysis]." In İrfan Kalaycı, ed., *Kıbrıs ve Geleceği: Ekonomi-Politik Bir Tartışma [Cyprus and its Future: A Politico-Economic Discussion]*, pp. 201-216. Ankara: Nobel.

Ioannides, Christos P. (1992). "Changing the Demography of Cyprus: Anatolian Settlers in the Turkish-Occupied North." In Christos P. Ioannides, ed., *Cyprus: Domestic Dynamics, External Constraints*. pp. 19-43. New York: Aristide D. Caratzas, Publisher.

Jakobsson Hatay, Ann-Sofi (2001). "The Contribution of European Integration to Ethnic Conflict Resolution: The Cases of Northern Ireland and Cyprus." *The Cyprus Review*, 13(1): 31-57.

Kadritzke, N. and W. Wagner (1977). "Limitations of Independence in the Case of Cyprus." In Peter Worsley and Paschalis Kitromilides, eds., *Small States in Modern World: The Conditions of Survival*. Stavrinides Press.

Kalaycı, İrfan (2004). "Kıbrıs'ın Makro Ekonomisi [The Macro Economics of Cyprus]." In İrfan Kalaycı, ed., *Kıbrıs ve Geleceği: Ekonomi-Politik Bir Tartışma [Cyprus and its Future: A Politico-Economic Discussion]*, pp. 181-200. Ankara: Nobel.

Kalaycıoğlu, Ersin (2002). "Elections and Governance." In Sabri Sayarı and Yılmaz Esmer, eds., *Politics, parties, and elections in Turkey*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Kalodukas, Angelos (2003). "Kıbrıs Sorunu: 2. Dünya Savaşı'ndan Annan Planı'na [The Cyprus Problem: From the Second World War to the Annan Plan]." In Masis Kürkçügil, ed., *Kıbrıs: Dün ve Bugün [Cyprus: Yesterday and Today]*. Istanbul: İthaki.

Kasımoğlu, Erten, ed. (1980). *1980 Siyasal Partiler Platformunda Bu Toplum [This Community in the Platform of Political Parties]*. Lefkoşa.

Kasımoğlu, Erten (1991). *Eski Günler Eski Defterler [Old Days Old Stories]*. Lefkoşa.

Katsiaounis, Rolandos (1996). *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Cyprus Research Centre.

Katz, Richard S. (2003). "Intraparty Preference Voting." In Bernard Grofman and Arend Lijphart, eds., *Electoral Laws and Their Political Consequences*. New York: Agathon Press.

Katz, Richard S. and Peter Mair (1995). "Changing Models of Party Organization and Party Democracy: The Emergence of the Cartel Party." *Party Politics*, 1 (1): 5-28.

Kaufman, Robert R. (1974). "The Patron-Client Concept and Macro-Politics: Prospects and Problems." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16(4): 284-308.

Kedourie, Elie (2005). "The Cyprus problem and its solution." *Middle Eastern Studies* 41 (5): 649-660.

Kettering, Sharon (1988). "The Historical Development of Political Clientelism." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18 (3): 419-447.

Kitromolides, Paschalis M. (1979). "The Dialectic of Intolerance: Ideological Dimensions of Ethnic Conflict." *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora*, Vol. 06: 5-30.

Kitromolides, Paschalis M. (1980). "An Unexplored Case of Political Change: A research note on the electoral history of Cyprus." *The Greek Review of Social Research*: 187-190.

Kitromilides, Paschalis M. and Theodore A. Couloumbis (1976). "Ethnic Conflict in a Strategic Area: The Case of Cyprus." In Abdul Aziz Said and Luiz R. S. Simmons, eds., *Ethnicity in an International Context*. Newbrunswick: Transaction Books.

Kitschelt, Herbert (2000). "Linkages Between Citizens and Politicians in Democratic Polities." *Comparative Political Studies* 33(6/7): 845-879.

Kitschelt, Herbert and Steven I. Wilkinson (2007a). "Citizen-politician linkages: an introduction." In Herbert Kitschelt and Steven I. Wilkinson, eds., *Patrons, Clients, and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kitschelt, Herbert and Steven I. Wilkinson (2007b). "A research agenda for the study of citizen-politician linkages and democratic accountability." In Herbert Kitschelt and Steven I. Wilkinson eds., *Patrons, Clients, and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kızılyürek, Niyazi (1988). *Paşalar Papazlar [Generals, Priests]*. Londra: İstanbul Graphics.

Kızılyürek, Niyazi (2003). *Milliyetçilik Kaskacında Kıbrıs [Cyprus in the Grip of Nationalism]*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Kızılyürek, Niyazi (2003 b). "Birinci Cumhuriyet'ten Yeni Kıbrıs'a [From the First Republic to New Cyprus]." In Masis Kürkçügil, ed., *Kıbrıs: Dün ve Bugün [Cyprus: Yesterday and Today]*. İstanbul: İthaki.

Kızılyürek, Niyazi (2005). *Doğmamış Bir Devletin Tarihi: Birleşik Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti [The History of an Unborn State: The United Cyprus Republic]*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Knapp, Andrew and Vincent Wright (2006). *The Government and Politics of France*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kramer, Heinz (2000). *A Changing Turkey: The Challenge to Europe and the United States*. Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Lacher, Hannes and Erol Kaymak (2005). "Transforming Identities: Beyond the Politics of Non-Settlement in North Cyprus." *Mediterranean Politics*, 10(2): 147-166.

Lande, Carl H. (1977). "Introduction: The Dyadic Basis of Clientelism." In Steffen W. Schmidt, Laura Guasti, Carl H. Lande, and James C. Scott, eds., *Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lanitis, Nicholas C. (1992). *Rural Indebtedness and Agricultural Co-operation in Cyprus*. Limassol.

Larrabee, F. Stephen (1998). "The EU Needs to Rethink its Cyprus Policy." *Survival* 40(3): 25-29.

Legg, Keith (1969). *Politics in Modern Greece*. California: Stanford University Press.

Legg, Keith (1973). "Political Change in a Clientelistic Polity: The Failure of Democracy in Greece." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, Vol. 1 (Fall): 231-246.

Lemarchand, Rene (1981). "Comparative Political Clientelism: Structure, Process and Optic." In S.N. Eisenstadt and Rene Lemarchand, eds., *Political Clientelism, Patronage, and Development*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lemarchand, René and Keith Legg (1972). "Political Clientelism and Development: A preliminary analysis." *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 4(2): 149-178.

- Leventis, Yiorghos (2002). *Cyprus: The Struggle for Self Determination in the 1940s*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Loizos, Peter (1975). *The Greek Gift, Politics in a Cypriot Village*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Loizos, Peter (1977). "Politics and Patronage in a Cypriot Village." In Ernest Gellner and John Waterbury, eds., *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. London: Duckworth.
- Lyrantzis, Chrystos (1984). "Political Parties in Post-Junta Greece: A Case of 'Bureaucratic Clientelism'?" *West European Politics*, 7 (2): 99-118.
- Lyssiotis, Marios (1990). "An Analysis of the Cyprus Legislative Council." *The Cyprus Review*, 2 (2): 55-69.
- Markides, Kyriacos C. (1977). *The Rise and Fall of the Cyprus Republic*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mavratsas, Caesar V. (2000). *Elen Milliyetçiliğinin Kıbrıs'taki Yönleri [The Hellenic Nationalism's Aspects in Cyprus]*. Lefkoşa: Galeri Kültür.
- Mavrogordatos, George Th. (1997). "From Traditional Clientelism to Machine Politics: the Impact of PASOK Populism in Greece." *South European Society & Politics*, 2 (3): 1-26.
- Mayes, Stanley (1960). *Cyprus and Makarios*. London: Putnam&Co. Ltd.
- McHenry, James A. (1987). *The Uneasy Partnership on Cyprus, 1919-1939: The Political and Diplomatic Interactions between Great Britain, Turkey, and the Turkish Cypriot Community*. New York and London: Garland Publishing.
- McLaren, Lauren M. (2008). *Constructing Democracy in Southern Europe: A comparative analysis of Italy, Spain, and Turkey*. London: Routledge.
- Medina, Luis Fernando and Susan Stokes (2002). *Clientelism as Political Monopoly*. Manuscript.
- Meyer, A.J. (1962). *The Economy of Cyprus*. Harvard University Press.
- Morlino, Leonardo (1995). "Consolidation and Party Government in Southern Europe." *International Political Science Review*, 16 (2): 145-167.
- Morlino, Leonardo, Donatella della Porta, Lisa Francovich, Serena Giusti, Fillipo Legnaioli and Pietro Milazzo (2000). *Democracy Report for Italy*. IDEA working document.
- Morvardi, Behrooz (1993). "Demographic Change, Resettlement and Resource Use." In Clement Dodd, ed., *The Political Social and Economic Development of Northern Cyprus*. Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press.
- Mouzelis, Nicos and George Pagoulatos (2002). *Civil Society and Citizens in Postwar Greece*.

Müller, Wolfgang C. (2007). "Political Institutions and Linkage Strategies." In Herbert Kitschelt and Steven I. Wilkinson, eds., *Patrons, Clients, and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Navaro-Yashin, Yael (2006). "Affect in the civil service: a study of a modern state-system." *Postcolonial Studies*, 9 (3): 281-294.

Nevzat, Altay (2005). *Nationalism Amongst the Turks of Cyprus: The First Wave*. Oulu: Oulu University Press.

Nicolet, Claude (2002). "The Turkish Cypriot Failure to Return to Cypriot Government in 1964: A View from the U.S. Archives." In John Charalambous et.al., eds., *Cyprus: 40 Years on from Independence*. Mannheim und Möhnese: Bibliopolis.

Nesim, Ali (1999). *Kıbrıs Türk Gençlik Hareketi [The Turkish Cypriot Youth Movement]*. Lefkoşa.

Noe, Willem and Max Watson (2005). "Convergence and Reunification in Cyprus: Scope for a Virtuous Circle." *ECFIN Country Focus*, 2(3): 1-7.

Olgun, Ergün M. (1993). "Economic Overview." In Clement Dodd, ed., *The Political Social and Economic Development of Northern Cyprus*. Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press.

Özuslu, Sami (2011). *Ahmet Mithat Berberoğlu: Persona Non Grata, Ankara'ya Kafa Tutan Adam [The man who defied Ankara]*. Lefkoşa: United Media.

Panteli, Stavros (1984). *A New History of Cyprus: From the Earliest Times to the Present Day*. London: East-West Publications.

Pasquino, Gianfranco (1979). "Italian Christian Democracy: A party for all seasons?" *West European Politics*, 2 (3): 88-109.

Patrick, Richard A. (1976). *Political Geography and the Cyprus Conflict: 1963-1971*. University of Waterloo.

Peristianis, Nicos (2006). "The Rise of the Left and of the Intra-Ethnic Cleavage." In Hubert Faustmann and Nicos Peristianis, eds., *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism (1878-2006)*. Mannheim und Moehnesse: Bibliopolis.

Piattoni, Simona (2001a). "Clientelism in Historical and Comparative Perspective." In Simona Piattoni, ed., *Clientelism, Interests, and Democratic Representation: The European Experience in Historical and Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Piattoni, Simona (2001b). "Clientelism, Interests, and Democratic Representation." In Simona Piattoni, ed., *Clientelism, Interests, and Democratic Representation: The European Experience in Historical and Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Polat, Necati (2011). "The Anti-Coup Trials in Turkey: What Exactly is Going On?" *Mediterranean Politics*, 16 (01): 213-219.
- Pollis, Adamantia (1977). "Colonialism and Neo-Colonialism: Determinants of Ethnic Conflict in Cyprus". In Peter Worsley and Paschalis Kitromilides, eds., *Small States in Modern World: The Conditions of Survival*. Stavrinides Press.
- Pollis, Adamantia (1979a). "Colonialism and Neo-Colonialism: Determinants of Ethnic Conflict in Cyprus." In Paschalis Kitromolides and Peter Worsley, eds., *Small States in the Modern World: The Conditions of Survival*. Nicosia: Zavallis Press.
- Pollis, Adamantia (1979b). "Cyprus: Nationalism vs. Human Rights." *Universal Human Rights*, 1(2): 89-102.
- Pollis, Adamantia (1998). "The Role of Foreign Powers in Structuring Ethnicity and Ethnic Conflict in Cyprus." In Vangelis Calotychos, ed., *Cyprus and its People: Nation, Identity and Experience in an Unimagiable Community, 1955-1997*. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Powell, John Duncan (1970). "Peasant Society and Clientelist Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64(2): 411-25.
- Protopapas, Vassilis (2006). "The Rise of a Bi-Polar Party System, Municipal Elections 1940-1955." In Hubert Faustmann and Nicos Peristianis, eds., *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism (1878-2006)*, pp. 269-293. Mannheim und Moehnesse: Bibliopolis.
- Purcell, H. D. (1969). *Cyprus*. New York: Praeger.
- Putnam, Robert D. (1993). *Making Democracy Work. Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Richter, Heinz A. (2006). "Benevolent Autocracy: 1931-1945." In Hubert Faustmann and Nicos Peristianis, eds., *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism (1878-2006)*, pp. 133-150. Mannheim und Moehnesse: Bibliopolis.
- Rhodes, Martin (1997). "Financing party politics in Italy: A case of systemic corruption." *West European Politics*, 20(1): 54-80.
- Roniger, Luis (1994). "The Comparative Study of Clientelism and the Changing Nature of Civil Society in the Contemporary World." In Luis Roniger and Ayşe Güneş-Ayata, eds., *Democracy, Clientelism and Civil Society*, pp. 1-18. Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Roniger, Luis (2004). "Political clientelism, democracy, and market economy." *Comparative Politics*, 36(3): 353-75.
- Rüstem, Kemal (1987). *North Cyprus Almanack 1987*. London: K. Rustem & Brother.
- Salih, Halil Ibrahim (1978). *Cyprus: The Impact of Diverse Nationalism on a State*. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.

Sassoon, Donald (1995). "Tangentopoli or the democratization of corruption: Considerations on the end of Italy's first republic." *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, 1 (1): 124-143.

Sayari, Sabri (1977). "Political Patronage in Turkey." In Ernest Gellner and John Waterbury, eds., *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*, pp. 103-113. London: Duckworth.

Schmidt, Steffen W. (1977). "The Transformation of Clientelism in Rural Colombia." In Steffen W. Schmidt, Laura Guasti, Carl H. Lande and James C. Scott, eds., *Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schneider Peter, Jane Schneider and Edward Hansen (1972). "Modernization and Development: the Role of Regional Elites and Noncorporate Groups in the European Mediterranean." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 14 (3): 328-350.

Scott, James C. (1969). "Corruption, Machine Politics, and Political Change." *American Political Science Review* 63(4): 1142-58.

Scott, James C. (1977a). "Patronage or exploitation?" In Ernest Gellner and John Waterbury, eds., *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. London: Duckworth.

Scott, James C. (1977b). "Patron-Client Politics and Political Change in Southeast Asia." In Steffen W. Schmidt, Laura Guasti, Carl H. Lande and James C. Scott, eds., *Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Scott, James C. (1977c). "Political Clientelism: A Bibliographical Essay." In Steffen W. Schmidt, Laura Guasti, Carl H. Lande and James C. Scott, eds., *Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Scott, Julie (2000). "Peripheries, Artificial Peripheries and Centres." In Frances Brown and Derek Hall, eds., *Tourism in Peripheral Areas: Case Studies*, pp. 58-73. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Seyidođlu, Halil (2004). "KKTC Ekonomisi: Bazı Görüş, Eleştiri ve Öneriler [The TRNC Economy: Some Opinions, Criticisms and Suggestions]." In İrfan Kalaycı, *Kıbrıs ve Geleceđi: Ekonomi Politik Bir Tartışma [Cyprus and its Future: A Politico-Economic Discussion]*, pp. 223-232. Ankara: Nobel.

Shefter, Martin (1994). *Political Parties and the State: The American Historical Experience*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Silverman, Sydel F. (1968). "Agricultural Organization, Social Structure, and Values in Italy: Amoral Familism Reconsidered." *American Anthropologist* 70 (1): 1-20.

Silverman, Sydel F. (1977). "Patronage and Community-Nation Relationship in Central Italy." In Steffen W. Schmidt, Laura Guasti, Carl H. Lande and James C. Scott, eds., *Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sotiropoulos, Dimitri A. (2004). "Southern European Public Bureaucracies in Comparative Perspective." *West European Politics* 27(3): 405-422.

Söyler, Mehtap (2012). "Informal institutions, forms of state and democracy: the Turkish deep state," *Democratization*, (ahead-of-print), 1-25.

Soysal, Mümtaz (1992). "Political Parties in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and their Vision of the Solution." In Norma Salem, ed., *Cyprus: A Regional Conflict and Its Resolution*, pp. 39-43. Ottawa: St. Martin's Press.

Spyridakis, Constantinos (1974). *A Brief History of Cyprus*. Nicosia: Zavallis Press.

Stavrinos, Zenon (1999). *The Cyprus Conflict: National Identity and Statehood*. Lefkoşa: CYREP.

Stokes, Susan C. (2007). "Political Clientelism." In Susan C. Stokes and Carles Boix, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Storrs, Ronald (1945). *Orientalisms* (Definitive Edition). London: Nicholson&Watson.

Symeonides, Nicos S. (1977). "The Unity of the Economy and the Economics of Separation." In Michael Attalides, ed., *Cyprus Reviewed: The Result of a Seminar on the Cyprus Problem*, pp. 255-271. Nicosia: Jus Cypri Association.

Şemsi, Orhan (n.d.). *Tüm Yönleriyle Rauf Denktaş [All about Rauf Denktaş]*. İstanbul.

Tarrow, Sidney (1967). *Peasant Communism in Southern Italy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Tarrow, Sidney (1979). "Italy: Crisis, crises or transition?" *West European Politics* 2(3): 166-186.

Tayfur, Fatih M. (2002). "Akdeniz'de Bir Adanın Kalın Uçlu Bir Kalemle Yazılmış Hikayesi: Kıbrıs [The Story of an Island in Mediterranean Written with a Blunt Pencil: Cyprus]." In O. Türel, ed., *Akdeniz'de Bir Ada: KKTC'nin Varoluş Öyküsü [An Island in Mediterranean: The Existence Story of the TRNC]*, pp. 13-77. Ankara: İmge.

Theophanous, Andreas (2001). "The Cyprus Problem and its Implications for Stability and Security in the Eastern Mediterranean." In D. Keridis and D. Triantaphyllou, eds., *Greek-Turkish Relations in the Era of Globalization*, pp. 180-207. Virginia: Brassey's.

Türel, Oktar (2002). "KKTC Ekonomisinin Dünü, Bugünü ve Yarını: Bir Makroekonomik Perspektif." In Oktar Türel, ed., *Akdeniz'de Bir Ada: KKTC'nin Varoluş Öyküsü [An Island in Mediterranean: The Existence Story of the TRNC]*, 79-120. Ankara: İmge.

Uğur, Mehmet (2003). "Mind the Gap: Unification, EU Membership and Regional Disparity in Cyprus." *Ekonomia* 6(1): 53-71.

Vural, Yücel and Ahmet Rüstemli (2006). "Identity fluctuations in the Turkish Cypriot community." *Mediterranean Politics* 11(3): 329-348.

Vural, Yücel and Nicos Peristianis (2008). "Beyond ethno-nationalism: emerging trends in Cypriot politics after the Annan Plan." *Nations and Nationalism* 14 (1): 39-60.

Wang, Fang (1994). "The Political Economy of Authoritarian Clientelism in Taiwan." In Luis Roniger and Ayşe Güneş-Ayata, eds., *Democracy, Clientelism and Civil Society*, pp. 181-206. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Warner, Carolyn (2001). "Mass Parties and Clientelism in France and Italy." In Simona Piattoni, ed., *Clientelism, Interests, and Democratic Representation: The European Experience in Historical and Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Warner, Jonathan (1993). "Political Choice: Parliamentary and Presidential Elections." In Clement Dodd, ed., *The Political Social and Economic Development of Northern Cyprus*, pp. 193-218. Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press.

Waterbury, John (1977). "An attempt to put patrons and clients in their place." In Ernest Gellner and John Waterbury, eds., *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. London: Duckworth.

Weingrod, Alex (1968). "Patrons, Patronage and Political Parties." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 10 (4): 377-400.

Wilson, James Q. and Edward C. Banfield (1971). "Political Ethos Revisited." *The American Political Science Review*, 65(4): 1048-1062.

Wolf, Eric R. (1977). "Kinship, Friendship, and Patron-Client Relations in Complex Societies." In Steffen W. Schmidt, Laura Guasti, Carl H. Lande and James C. Scott, eds., *Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Yavuzalp, Ercüment (1993). *Kıbrıs Yangınında Büyükelçilik [The Embassy in the Cyprus Inferno]*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.

Yaşın, Mehmet (1989). "The Question of Identity and its Socio-Historical Basis in Turkish Cypriot Literature." In Aydın Mehmet Ali, ed., *Proceedings of First Turkish Cypriot Panel of Young Intellectuals*. London: Fatal Publications.

Yeşilada, Birol A. and Ahmet Sözen (2002). "Negotiating a Resolution to the Cyprus Problem: Is Potential European Union Membership a Blessing or a Curse?" *International Negotiation* 7: 261-285.

Yılmaz, Işıl (2002). "Avrupa Birliği Sürecinde Türkiye-KKTC [Turkey-TRNC in the EU Process]." *Mülkiye*, Ocak-Şubat: 36-49.

Yücel, Hakkı (2003). "Tarih, kimlik ve siyaset üçgeninde Kıbrıslı Türkler [Turkish Cypriots in the Triangle of History, Identity and Politics]." *Birikim* 167: 31-38.

Zuckerman, Alan (1977). "Clientelistic Politics in Italy." In Ernest Gellner and John Waterbury, eds., *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*. London: Duckworth.

## **Official Publications**

Başbakanlık Basın Bürosu (1981). *KTFD'ne Bakış* [An overview of the TFSC]. Lefkoşa.

Devlet Planlama Örgütü (2009). *Hanehalkı İşgücü Anketi: Açıklamalı El Kitabı* [Household Laborforce Survey: Handbook].

Devlet Planlama Örgütü (1978). *İstatistik Yıllığı 1977* [Statistical Yearbook 1977].

Devlet Planlama Örgütü (1979). *İstatistik Yıllığı 1978* [Statistical Yearbook 1978].

Devlet Planlama Örgütü (1980). *İstatistik Yıllığı 1979* [Statistical Yearbook 1979].

Kuzey Kıbrıs Haber Ajansı (1983). *Sekizinci Kuruluş Yılında Kıbrıs Türk Federe Devleti Ekonomisinin Genel Görünümü* [The general overview of the TFSC's economy on its eighth anniversary].

KKTC Cumhuriyet Meclisi Tutanak Dergisi [Minutes of the TRNC Parliament](various).

Public Information Office (n.d.). A Biography of President Rauf Raif Denktaş.

State Planning Organization (1979). *Economy of the Turkish Federated State of Cyprus*. Lefkoşa.

State Planning Organization (1999). *15 December 1996 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics of Population*. Lefkoşa.

State Planning Organization (2004). *Economic and Social Indicators 2003*. Lefkoşa.

State Planning Organization (2000). *Results of the Household Income Distribution Survey 1998*. Lefkoşa.

TC Yardım Heyeti Başkanlığı [Republic of Turkey, Board of Financial Assistance] (2004). *Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti'nde Ekonomik Gelişme ve Altyapı Yatırımları* [The Economic Development and Infrastructure Investments in the TRNC]. Lefkoşa.

## **Reports**

European Commission of Human Rights (1976). *Cyprus against Turkey, Report of the Commission* (Adopted on 10 July 1976).

Hylland, Anund (2004). *Northern Cyprus: Parliamentary Elections December 2003*. Oslo: NORDEM.

*Crisis on Cyprus (1975)*. The Subcommittee to Investigate Problems Connected with Refugees. A Report Prepared for the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate. Washington D.C.: American Hellenic Institute.

TÜSİAD (1998). *KKTC Ekonomisi: Sorunlar ve Çözüm Önerileri [TRNC Economy: Problems and the solution suggestions]*. İstanbul.

World Bank (2006a). *Sustainability and Sources of Economic Growth in the Northern Part of Cyprus, Volume I: Economic Assessment*.

World Bank (2006b). *Sustainability and Sources of Economic Growth in the Northern Part of Cyprus, Volume II: Technical Papers*.

### **Unpublished Sources**

KKTC Kamu Kesiminde 1990-2007 Döneminde Çalışanların ve Emeklilerin Dökümü [The number of employees and pensioners in the public sector in the 1990-2007 period] (7.9.2009). Provided by the State Planning Organization.

KTFD 1976 Yılı Geçiş Programı Taslağı [The TFSC Draft Transition Program for 1976].

Maliye ve İktisadi İşler Üyeliği (1973): *Kıbrıs Türk Yönetimi 1973 Yılı Cari Bütçesi, 9 Aylık Uygulama Dönemi Gelir-Gider Cetvelleri* [1973 Current Budget of the Turkish Cypriot Administration: Income-Expenditure Breakdowns of the 9-month Period].

Memorandum given to Eroğlu by the Group of 9 (4.5.1992). From the personal archive of Hakkı Atun.

Note to file submitted to the Minister of Interior and Settlement (n.d.). From the personal archive of anonymous interviewee.

Transcript of the press conference of Denктаş about the Group of 9 (9.7.1992). From the personal archive of Hakkı Atun.

Yıllara Göre Kamuda Çalışan Sayısı [The number of personnel working in the public sector](n.d.). Provided by the Personnel Department.

### **Interviews**

Altınay, Mehmet: Member of Parliament (Elected from the UBP in 1976, then joined the TKP in the same year). Famagusta, 8.12.2010.

Andız, Erdal: UBP founder and one of the leading figures of the Reformist movement. Nicosia, 28 and 29.6.2011.

Atun, Hakkı: Undersecretary (1975-1976); Member of Parliament (UBP, 1976-1992; DP, 1992-1998); Cabinet Minister (various ministries); Speaker of Parliament; DP Founder; Prime Minister (1994-1996). Nicosia, 4.11.2010 and 8.3.2012.

Borman, Nazif: Chief Inspector of Cooperatives; Member of Parliament (UBP, 1981-1992); DP founder. Nicosia, 26.11.2010.

Bozkurt, İsmail: Member of Parliament (1970-1990); HP and TKP founder; TKP leader; Presidential Candidate (1990). Nicosia, 14.12.2011.

Bilgehan, Orhan Zihni: Member of the Executive Council (pre-1974); UBP founder; Member of Parliament (1976-1985); Cabinet Minister (1973-75 and 1976-1978). Famagusta, 12.11.2010.

Çelik, Vedat: Member of the Executive Council (pre-1974); UBP founder; Member of Parliament (1976-1981). Kyrenia, 6.6.2011.

Denktaş, Rauf: President (1973-2005); Member of the Constituent Assembly; UBP founder, Nicosia, 1.11.2010.

Denktaş, Serdar: Member of Parliament (UBP, 1990-1992; DP, 1992-to date); DP founder. Nicosia, 15 and 19.10.2010.

Durduran, Alpay: Member of Constituent Assembly as representative of the chamber of architects and engineers (1975-6); Member of the Parliament (1976-1985). Nicosia, 7 and 11.1.2011.

Emin, Enver: UBP founder; Secretary General; Member of Parliament (1976-1990). Nicosia, 17.2.2011.

Erbilen, Mustafa: Member of Parliament (elected from TKP in 1985, then joined the UBP); Cabinet Minister. Nicosia, 9.11.2010.

Feridun, Oktay: Mehmet Zeka Bey's son in law. Nicosia, 8.3.2011.

Gürçağ, Erdinç: Member of Parliament (1976-1981, UBP); Cabinet Minister. Nicosia, 24.12.2010.

Gürler, Recep Ali: Member of Parliament (1976-1981, UBP); Cabinet Minister. Vasilya, 1.7.2011.

Hasipoğlu, Hasan: Member of Parliament (1998-2003, UBP). Nicosia, November 2010 and 17.1.2011.

Kazım, Şemsi: Member of Parliament (1960-1981); CTP founder; Member of UBP. Nicosia, 21.4. 2011.

Kotak, İsmet: Member of the Executive Council (1969-1976); Member of Legislative Assembly (1970-1975); UBP founder; Member of Parliament (1976-1985); DHP founder. Nicosia, 18.1.2011.

Refik, Hilmi: High-Level Bureaucrat (State Planning Organization and Sanayi Holding). Haspolat, 4.8.2011.

Samioğlu, Aydın: Highest Ranking Turkish Cypriot Official at the *Bayraktar's* Office (from the early 1960s to 1975). Member of the Constituent Assembly – Appointed by Denktaş to represent the *Bayraktar's* office (1975-6); Undersecretary of the Prime Minister's Office (1976-1988). Nicosia, 10, 14, and 15.3.2011, and 26.5.2011.

Ural, Ekrem: Member of the Constituent Assembly as representative of civil servants (1975-6); TKP founder; Member of Parliament (1976-1985). Nicosia, 18.10.2010.

Veziroğlu, Fuat: Member of the Legislative Assembly (1970-1975); Member of the Constituent Assembly (1975-1976); TKP founder (1976); Member of the Parliament (1975-1985). Nicosia, 21 and 22.2.2011.