

FUTURE POWER RELATIONS AND CYPRUS

Asst.Prof. Sait YILMAZ

Abstract:

The first quarter of the 21st century marks a period of developing parameters which will cause crucial changes in the years to come in the field of international relations and security. Global security environment is profoundly complicated in the midst of general chaos and instability. Following the end of the Cold War in 1989, the world has entered in a period of rapid change accelerated by globalization. As the scope of the international power competition changes, the world is presently in a period of transformation manipulated by the US, a unique hegemonic power. This status quo is also maintained by the EU and other Western partners. The argument of this paper is to detect the Cyprus' role in future power systematic by disclosing mechanisms of contemporary power relations in relation to theory as well as practice. In this way, it is aimed to conclude some remarkable results on that the Cyprus may play roles in shaping security environment around it and possible scenarios for Cyprus within the future power relations.

Key Words: Cyprus, Power Relations, US, EU, Turkey.

INTRODUCTION

In various eras of history either a unique hegemony has shaped the security environment in line with the events engendered by its projection of power or a number of similar power centers has appeared, and the competition and rivalry among them have determined the direction of historical developments. In the 21st century, the U.S. represents unique hegemonic power keeping the top position in the asymmetric power balance pyramid. However, frontiers of European Union, namely England, France and Germany, are also in cooperation to U.S. in hegemonic implications within the Western conceptual basis and practices. While recently Cyprus matter is turning out to be rather hopeless, we have to evaluate our options under the highlight of current strategic trends and power struggles' outcome.

Our main target is to forecast and evaluate the future conditions where Cyprus is being drawn and then presenting the clues for the road map with his already casted roles. That study successively consists of two main parts: future power relations; and Cyprus' roles and future scenarios within power games. At the first part, this paper aims to disclose the conceptual basis of hegemony and its instruments. To do so, we will start by analyzing the abstract direction of giants' dominance, hegemony and power struggles, and their in-between political relations. At the second part, we will try to reveal the probable scenarios about Cyprus' strategic importance, over anticipated trends and relationships of future times. Accordingly with these scenarios, the coming of Cyprus, the casted roles for him, and their impacts on Cyprus people, will tried to be exposed in this work.

CONCEPTUAL BASIS

To analyze any international phenomenon such as power relations we first have to be aware of the conceptual basis which includes theories, concepts and models behind the complex of international relations (IR) discipline. Most feasible theories in international relations discipline are Realism, Liberalism, Pluralism, Social Constructivism and Marxism (Baylis, Smith: 2005, 5). Key pillars of those theories are power, structure and hegemony to explain the international environment and power relations. Realism and Liberalism are primary theories of international relations to explain the hegemonic concept behind the Western thinking. However, modernism, post-modernism, and also globalization represent other essential conceptual components of contemporary hegemonic ambitions.

Realism, which emerged in the 1940s, is still the dominant paradigm in IR. According to Realism, main actors of IR are (sovereign) states and IR represents a struggle for power between states to maximize their national interest (Arı, 1997: 256). Finally, IR works with a mechanism called as "balance of power". Another important paradigm, Liberalism, focuses on democracy and development. According to Liberalism, security also has economic, technological & environmental

dimensions, and to solve the security problems; international cooperation comes first prior to military options. Liberalism adds new actors such as MNCs, NGOs, IOs, and Transnational Organisations into the international arena and taking account interdependency and interaction in security environment. It stresses the role of international law and regimes with agreed norms in international problem solving.

According to Cox, theories like Realism and Neo-realism were coined to preserve the status quo serving the interests of rich dominant Western countries and their elite (Cox, 1981: 16-155). Those theories aimed to make the international order seemingly natural and unchangeable. Hegemony enabled the dominant state to spread its moral, political, and cultural values around the society and sub-communities. This was done through civilian society institutions. Civilian society consists of the net of institutions and practices that are partly autonomous from the state. Hegemony is to produce social and political systems that are to be applied on the nations targeted.

Another conceptual group which enables us to understand international power relations is related to the modern, modernization and modernism. Presently, modernism overlaps with Realism as a conceptual basis of hegemonic intervention and it underlies the conceptual basis of Western culture for the Third World Countries to penetrate (Alexander, 1995: 69-70). Hegemony and modernism together brings about democracy, development, and cultural projects for transformation. On the other hand, the envisaged political, economical and socio-cultural transformation from the traditional to the modern for the non-western countries gives rise to current well-known missions in the security environment such as; nation-building, state-building, institution-building, and regime restoration (Kesselman, 1973: 139-154).

Post-modernism forms the basis of the European Union idea. EU represents a unique sample of post-modern structure. According to post-modernists, the modern state represents traditional nation-state, sovereign, aggressive and the use traditional power for national interest. EU represents a unique sample of post-modern structure (Cooper, 2005: 179). Post-modernists deny the supremacy of the nation-state, nationalism, sovereignty and national boundaries. They defend the individual basis, and question identity and power. According to the post-modernist point of view, the state should share its authority with the private sector and civil community organizations (Gaudin, 2005: 22). Post-modernist approach has been the conceptual framework of EU mechanism in executing security and defense policies with hegemonic aspirations.

We must touch upon the globalization to complete the conceptual part by summarizing the effects of globalization on national security. Globalization causes the limitation of national sovereignty and power policies by introducing new actors in the policy area (Yılmaz, 2006: 97-98). In weak states, it may also stimulate social and religious separatist activities and elicit questions of national unity and identity. Transparency of boundaries and information is another security problem. And nations should transform their structure and determine the new roles of the state in order to effectively to counter the negative effects of globalization.

HEGEMONY AND POWER BALANCE

The concept of hegemony greatly contributes to a better understanding of current international relations and power relations. Hegemony is defined as dominant position having power capacity to change international rules and norms according to own motivations and desires. In another definition, hegemony is the position of having the capability and power to change the rules and norms of international systems based on one's own motivation and desire (Volgy, 2005: 1-2). As for imperialism, it is known as forceful extension of a nation's authority by territorial conquest, establishing economic and political domination. In contradiction to imperialism, hegemony manipulates others with various mechanisms instead of a superior political structure (Heywood, 2007: 392).

Table 1: Hegemony and Power Balance since the 19 th Century

Periods	Superpowers	Major Powers
19 th Century	England (H), France, Russia	Japan, Germany, USA
Post I st WW	England (H), USA, USSR	Japan, Germany, France
Cold War	USA (H), USSR	Japan, Germany, China
Post Cold War	USA (H) H: Hegemony	China, Japan, Russia, EU (Germ.-Eng.-Fr.)

Source: Table prepared in accordance with the data provided by Çetin ÖNGÜN (An Historical Approach to US Power; Amerikan Gücüne Tarihsel Bir Yaklaşım, 2007) and Barry BUZAN, Ole WAEVER (Regions and Powers, The Structure of International Security, 2003).

The history of hegemony goes hundred years back. England was the first hegemonic country beginning from 15th century. U.S. has taken over the hegemonic position in 1945. Having a look at the current power balance pyramid in the world (Table 1); U.S. is the only super power and also represents hegemony with global influence capacity in all dimensions (Brzezinski, 2004: 279). Major Powers are listed as China, Russia Federation, EU frontiers, and Japan. The existing studies show that the current 1+4 balance may replace either 0+5, or 2+3 till 2030s. Studies show that China is expected to catch US power in declining process by 2030 (Figure 1).




Figure 1: Power Trend of U.S., Japan and China (Öngün, 2007:133)

Susan Strange envisages that hegemony requires two kinds of strength; relational and structural based (Strange, 1989: 165). Relation based power is the strength to persuade and force the other actors one by one or in groups. Structural power is the essential capacity to realize the desired rules, norms, and operations in the international system. A hegemon creates or maintains critical regimes to cooperate in the future, and reduces uncertainty while other states are in pursuit of their own interests. A hegemonic power should have the best position in three dimensions; political, economic, and socio-cultural. Hegemony ensures global influence and control mechanisms with conceptual basis and practical actors and instruments. Hegemony also requires necessarily military power with a global reach and power projection. There are many studies about the various sources of power as seen at the Table 2. Some argue that the following as possible sources of hegemonic power (Uzgel, 2003: 31);

- * Money unit effective internationally
- * Bases and allies in all regions of the world

- * Leadership in regional crisis and conflicts
- * Nuclear capability
- * Persuasion power over the others
- * Spreading its life-style and values to the whole world to legitimate own position.

POWER CATEGORIZATION

Power is the influence applied by one nation or nations' group to others in order to force the opponent to do something, normally refused. There are two sources of authority; power and legitimation. Conceptual basis provides the necessary framework to legitimate power use. Joseph S. Nye. Nye defines power in three categories; hard, economic, and soft power (Nye, 2003: 30). Soft power is the ability of a political body, such as a state, to indirectly influence the behavior or interests of other political bodies through cultural or ideological means. The basic concept of soft power is the ability to influence others to get them to do what you want. There are three major forms to use soft power: to threaten them with sticks; to pay them with carrots; to attract them or co-opt them, so that they want what you want. If you can get others to be attracted to wanting what you want, it costs you much less in carrots and sticks. According to Nye, the following are the sources of soft power (Nye, 2004: 256): (1) Global norms (liberalism, plurality, democracy, and modern) to dominate other cultures and ideas; (2) Global communication channels to influence agenda; (3) Ensuring global prestige with internal and international performance.

Table 2: Sources of Major Powers

Source of Power	U.S.A.	Russia	E.U.	Japan	China
Natural Sources	S	S	S	M	S
Military	S	M	M	W	M
Economy	S	M	S	S	M
Science&Technology	S	W	S	S	W
Unity	S	M	W	S	S
Universal Culture	S	M	S	M	M
International Organizations	S	M	S	M	M

S. Strong, M: Middle, W: Weak

Kaynak: Joseph Nye (1990, 174) Robert Jackson, George Sorensen: Introduction to International Relations, Theories and Approaches", Oxford University Press, (New York, 2003), 200.

We may categorize the power actors under five sections; Super power, Major (great) power, Regional power, Sub-regional power, and Powerless power (Figure 2). A super power has broad-spectrum capabilities (political, economic, cultural, and military) with a global reach and is an active player in the securitization and de-securitization of all regions whether as threats, guarantors, allies or interveners in the international system and defends own values as universal. A great power does not have large capabilities in all sectors and is not actively present in the securitization process of some regions (Buzan, Waever, 2003: 394). It is responded to by others on the basis of system level calculations. A regional power normally has large capabilities in various regions but not in broad-spectrum. It is influenced by higher-level powers and excluded from the higher-level calculations.




Figure 2: Power Pyramide in the 21 st Century (Yılmaz, 2007: 16-17)

POWER POLICY AND SECURITIZATION IN THE 21 ST CENTURY

We define policy as the common course of actions with desired targets. And strategy is ways or concepts achieving desired targets determined by policy. In international relations, nations or alliances may follow one of the following policies; the status quo policy, revisionist policies, imperialist policy, prestige policy, isolationism, neutral, or nonaligned, coalitions or alliances. Very classic and currently feasible power policy is “Divide and Rule” (Yılmaz, 2008: 82-92). Other power policies are territorial acquisition, armament, and setting alliances. We may list the national security strategies as; deterrence, shaping the security environment, crisis management and out of war ops, limited power use, and total or decisive (conventional/nuclear) war. An authority may choose some of these instruments to implement its security strategy. These instruments may be in diplomatic, economic, cultural or military category. They represent a la carte menu to select.

Security in the 21st century traces following trends;

- * Interventions change its scope,
- * Soft power use by new actors
- * Ineffective UN and international regulating institutions
- * Informal wars based on intelligence functions
 - Special and proxy wars
 - Covert operations & propaganda war
 - State sponsored terrorism
 - Low intensity wars.

Power use brings intervention. One may classify interventions as humanitarian, preventive, reactive or non forcible, and classic military intervention. Intervention requires legitimation means such as persuasion and advocating values like modern, democracy, human rights, development or rule of law. Those are some other ideas to ensure legitimacy technically (Faber, 2004: 4-6);

- * The UN should be preferred “lead” in scenarios,
- * Majority of international actors believe it is correct and acceptable,

- * Instead of own interests, general good of international community must be pursued,
- * Right authority, just cause, right intention, proportionality, last resort.

Intervention in the 21st century aims at ensuring influence and control over the nations states and its power use by Web (Net) strategy using internal and external webs. Internal web creates a parallel sovereignty layer between the people and government using connecting actors such as media, civil community organizations. External web forms an external pressure layer using transnational institutions like IMF, WB, UN, EU etc. On the other hand, methods and actors of foreign policy have changed to penetrate into nations with web strategy.

The reconstruction process of the Post-Cold War period is still in progress. The trend is toward to a multipolar world system and the international environment is becoming more chaotic. Reasons behind this trend may be listed as the following (Öztürk, 2007: 30); (1) No influential and inadequate supervising and regulating powers, (2) Transformation of strategic resources like water, oil, and natural gas have become political and security issues as the environmental issues like global warming make other agenda matters with the disaster risks. (3) Energy competition will clarify the winners of the super and major power race. (4) Ethnic and religious issues are getting more exploited within the concepts of democracy, human rights, and the war on terror. (5) Globalization feeds the imbalance among the regions and nations.

We may summarize the features of current security environment as; unipolar, supremacy of capitalism, greater regional autonomy, and national identity as high politics. On the other hand, the military and non military scopes of security have changed drastically, we have many issues to tackle in order to overcome security problems and the military is unable to work out all security issues. NPT (Non Proliferation Treaty) does not work properly to deter the countries from having nuclear arms and the very limited energy reserves have reached an alarming point. Energy sources and lines represent the possible conflict and transformation areas in the near future. We have to keep in mind that most of the great power struggles emanate from the security of energy sources and lines. We may assess the global trends shaping 21st century; Globalism, US Hegemony, Russian Future, China: as Rising Power, EU Integration, NATO Expansion, Decreasing Energy Sources, Clash of Civilizations. We see the forecasted power trends showing US as declining and China rising (Figure 2).

To sum up, power policy “Divide and Rule” is being applied with new formulation in 21st century; Transform – divide - annexation, and – rule. The present world is in a process of transformation in pursuit of modernization and democratization with regime restorations, nation buildings, state sponsored terrorism, and self-determination provocations. We may conclude that part with the following results;

- Hard power is not the only the asset in crisis management interactions,
- Global security environment is being shaped with new methods, actors and technological instruments instead of pure and overt crisis management techniques,
- The world is in a period of transformation in course of modernization and democratization aiming at national power by influencing state sovereignty and identity.

WESTERN HEGEMONY AND ITS MECHANISM

Now we can examine the US and EU power use mechanisms. But we have to reconsider first the modern and post-modern geopolitics guiding those countries’ policies. United States applies modern geopolitics with the following features; state based, hard power first, national interest driven, utilization of globalization, classify the countries as Rouge or Failed States and Goods or Bads, focus on democracy, and use coercion. US spreads the American type of life style, we may call it Americanization, as EU formally seeks Europeanization. EU is in the course of post-modern geopolitics. EU prefers multinational intervention, soft power first, compliance with the international

law and regimes, Europe focused, selects fragile states, define also gray countries or regions, conceptually claim good governance and use primarily coercive diplomacy as method.

Conceptual framework of US hegemony includes Realism and Modernism in connection with the projects; Democracy, Development and Dialogue. US Web Strategy foresees a Global Transformation based on American interests, values and goals. The US has been in search for a new vision since the end of Cold War (Mead, 2002; 134-148). George H.W. Bush has defined his vision as The New World Order between 1990 and 1994. Clinton's vision was "Globalization" and son Bush determined the "War on Terror" as vision. US scholars defined Bush type of realism as "Democratic Realism" that means Realism with democracy projects. For the time being, Barack Obama interprets his theoretical basis as The New Idealism pretending global optimism in front but ensuring American interests initially using soft power.

American hegemony is applied in two ways; (1) Regime restoration with soft power (Georgia, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan etc), (2) Nation building (Fukuyama, 2005: 101-126) with hard power (Afghanistan, Iraq). US hegemony mechanism has five components (Yılmaz, 2006: 120);

- * Global intelligence production system particularly based on the human, signal, and image intelligence

- * Global propaganda and influence system setting a web with media, civil society organizations, think-tank centers etc.

- * Global covert operations and activity units including the IMF, WB, Special Forces etc.

- * Operative institutions and instruments for nation building and regime restoration scenarios,

- * Protective security system.

First pillar of U.S. soft system is the democratization infrastructure (Piccone, 2005: 101-126). Beginning from the President, US system integrates all available institutions in the democratization process including Multinational Corporations (MNCs), universities, and think-tank centers. But the NED and USAID are the primary organs exporting democracy to selected nations and regions (Melia, 2005: 12). Nation building implies to reform government, regimes, state structure, social order in pursuit of own interests. It may start following a military operation, or as a last stage of low intensity operations or within the democracy and development projects. US military posture with soft power instruments provides great advantage for power use with a global reach. We have to add Private Military Companies (PMCs) as hard power here that contributes greatly into US security mechanisms.

Coming to EU side of power use, for security problems EU uses the instruments of Common Foreign Security Policy (CFSP) and European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP). We may detect EU particularly prefer soft power implementations. According to Olli Rhein, representative for enlargement, EU soft power instruments are followings (Rhein, 2007: 1-25);

- * Money for Development & Aid Programs

- * Trade Policy that makes 1/5 of the World Trade

- * Diplomacy in using CFSP and High Representative

- * Military as increasing civilian capacity

- * Civil missions for democratization, rule of law, human rights, election monitoring, education and

- * EU capabilities to ensure justice, freedom, and security; and partnership policies.

EU forces its democracy vision in four ways (CFSS, 2005: 2-3):

- * Copenhagen Criteria for candidates of EU full membership

- * ENP: European Neighborhood Policy for Former Soviet Union Nations
- * SAP: The Stabilization and Association Agreement Process for Western Balkans
- * EMP: Euro-Mediterranean Partnership for Mediterranean Countries.

EU uses four fundamental actors in democratization; Commission, Parliament, Council, and Minister of Foreign Affairs. EIDHR (European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights) Initiative provides budget for democracy projects (CFPS, 2005: 3). EU uses sticks & carrots as a method that means forcing the implementation of criteria in return for economic and technical aids. EU strategy consists of partnership, persuasion and local penetration techniques. The primary strategy is to use political diplomacy to manage the crisis by persuasion and conviction.

EU hard power performs the tasks in consistent with Petersberg missions. Berlin Plus agreement represents a critical milestone in the use of NATO assets in EU ops. ESDP concepts envisage preventive engagement and effective multilaterality. EU has three military actors; Rapid Reaction Forces (RRF: Operational since 2003), EU Battle Groups, EU Gendarmerie Force. That preliminary study shows the battle groups in EU military structure. EU interventions primarily foreseen to be used in the “sticks and carrots” strategy; mix of political and economic instruments (SC/HR, 2001). If carrots don’t work, the democratic and humanitarian face of EU changes and is replaced by

- * Cancellation of economic aid,
- * Political isolation,
- * Coercive methods,
- * Gradual military escalation.

EU democracy building was tested in Bosnia, Kosovo, Algeria, Gaza, Nigeria, Uganda, Sierra Leone, Nepal, Afghanistan, and Georgia. The annual EIDHR budget for fragile states is 124 million Euros. EIDHR increased numbers of fragile states from 29 (2002-2004 period) to 68. Most of the fragile states are in the Middle East and Central Asia but Indonesia, Mexico, Kampuchea, Bosnia, Turkey, Russia, Algeria, Sudan, Congo, Colombia were also listed as fragile states (Saferworld, 2005: 36). Economic aids are coordinated in line with European Conflict and Humanitarian Office (ECHO) assessments and EU Country Delegations. The Cost of a fragile state is normally 100 billion dollars. Criteria for development aid are foreseen as good governance, management of natural resources, privatization, free market, reform in security sector etc.

EU Regional Special Representatives facilitate political dialogue and regional framework agreements with other actors (Ash, 2006). In this term, EU selects alternative access points for non state actors to penetrate into region and fragile states. EIDHR and Rapid Reaction Mechanism (RRM) provide funds for new civil society, democracy, human rights projects. Civil Society Coordinators (CSCs) in EU Delegation of Country performs workshops on the country and develops a network for the NGOs, business sector and civil society by using EU funds. EU shares all info about the country with CSC and reconsiders the strategies together. EU Commission’s Country Strategy Paper and other analyses are studied in the Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit (PPEWU) for the Council.

STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF CYPRUS AND ROLES

Cyprus lies on an axis of movement, both north-south and east-west. It stands at the crossroads of three continents, Europe, Asia and Africa. It is, therefore, hardly surprising that throughout history the major powers in the region have taken an interest in controlling and settling the island. Its strategic position has always ensured that Cyprus has played a key role in history, but it has also resulted in the island becoming a victim of others’ power politics. From global and regional perspective Cyprus represents a geo-strategic mass center. The power controlling this mass center would lead to the achievement of great geo-strategic advantages and geostrategic expansion.

The current security zones in the world (Figure 3) are still in transformation (Buzan, Waever, 2003: 3). Security zones may have their own power centers and power balance that means a variation of polarity. In addition to main and sub-security zones, Buzan defines some locations as buffer or insulators where they separate some regional powers from each other. Although Turkey is a regional power; Buzan identifies Turkey as insulator rather than integrator. However, in the figure we have circled the Turkey is a natural and central part of Europe and Black Sea. Cyprus is also naturally part of the Europe and Mediterranean security zone as integrator. However, as seen in the Figure 3, adjacent areas of Cyprus such as Middle East and North Africa represent a great power vacuum area in transformation. This exposes strategical roles for Cyprus in regard to projects to broaden the influence of power centers as outlined in the Table 3.




Figure 3: Security Zones at the Beginning of 21 st Century

Cyprus which lies between the gulfs that separate Asia from Europe and the Suez Canal, and that divides Africa, has an opportunity to Caspian basin catchments, waterways of Aden and Hurmuz, could also be perfect air and marine military base (Henn, 2007: 4). Keeping Cyprus under control would ease strategic expansion from Europe to Asia and Africa. Cyprus occupies a position from which it can control energy resources of Persian Gulf and Caspian basin catchments. It would be possible to control these resources with the help of air forces placed on island. Air forces can be used to control tankers carrying oil from Russia and Caspian catchments basin to the world market, the task can be brilliantly accomplished through airbases that will take place on Cyprus (Uslu, 2004: 17).

When the oil and gas reserves, appeared in the Caspian Sea after 1990 is taken into consideration, Eastern Mediterranean and Cyprus should be regarded as an important transit route for the import and export issues related with that region. In other words, Eastern Mediterranean and Cyprus have the ability of controlling energy centers and pipelines connected with those centers. Besides, Eastern Mediterranean and Cyprus is one of the most significant geographies which can supervise sea trade running over Suez and Black Sea. Moreover, water centers and water transportation routes, to be proposed for solving water controversy in the Middle East Region in the future, will also be on area which Cyprus could easily control. Last, Cyprus also represents importance for the control of the small route states and terrorist groups surrounding Eastern Mediterranean. To sum up, those functions of Cyprus have direct impact on regional stability and an indirect impact on global stability.

POWER CENTERS AND CYPRUS

Trusting Mahan’s “Geopolitics” definition, one can assert that Cyprus has a huge geostrategic potential for countries with global ambitions like USA. The power on Cyprus can transform island into a military base and expand from Balkans to Persian Gulf, Caucasian and Middle East. This is more or less how the plan of the USA looks like. If US succeed in placing its military troops to Poland, Romania, Bulgaria and Cyprus, it will limit geo- strategic expansion of Russia to Eastern Europe, south of Turkish Gulfs and Caucasus. USA is one of the countries that has a great interest in Cyprus, and who wants to get control over energy resources and transportation lines, which results in achieving global control over world economy and total dominance. Power that has global ambitions has not dismissed Cyprus from its target list, the island that is able to control Middle East, Persian Gulf, Caucasian, Balkan, Eastern (Sayın, 2008; 55).

The security of Mediterranean Sea cannot be obtained without Cyprus, while it is also a key for the security of Middle East and Europe. Geostrategic axis, comprising Malta- Crete- Cyprus islands which cover an important region of Mediterranean, “promise” safety of Europe from south and Africa’s security from North (Sayın, 58). The fact that Cyprus lies on an oil line extended from Persian Gulf to Europe makes it rather important for the safety purposes of the pipeline. If this pipeline becomes nonfunctional, then Europe will have to import oil from South Africa. Cyprus has a chance to get a high status in the perspective of global and continental energy security, because of its ability to hold the control over already functioning and planned pipelines transporting oil from Caspian basin catchments and Persian Gulf to Mediterranean Sea. EU need to impact on Eastern Mediterranean and Cyprus. Because it is necessary in order to control the energy centers. It gives important advantage to the EU.

Table 3: Strategic Roles For Cyprus

Roles	Scope
Control of Movements (Between the Caspian region to Aden, Hurmuz, Africa, and Europe through Mediterranean)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transportation Routes (Air/Sea/Pipeline) - Energy lines including Baku-Tblisi-Ceyhan - Water ways
Strategic Expansion (Including Balkans, Black Sea, Casucasus, Aegean Sea, Middle East, Suez Canal, Persian Gulf, North Africa)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Geostrategic mass center - Supervise and develope international trade - Promising new energy resources (to be explored around it) - Cultural crossroad for soft-power purposes
Securitization (Back to power politics and post-modern security matters)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Military base/power projection for regional stability including peace keeping and humanitarian aids - Soft power knot for post-modern security - Control tower providing sea/air superiority in East Mediterranean reagon - Pad for long range weapon systems - Guard to energy lines, terrorist activities, smuggling, and illegal migration

Largely industrilized EU provide 80% of its oil need from the Middle East, and this proportion is mostly carried to Europe through Mediterranean. Therefore the EU has been trying to establish sea superiority in Mediterranean and Aegean Sea. EU has involved itself for full membership of Cyprus in order to control strategic units in the Eastern Mediterranean (Alemdar, 2009). In addition to that, East Mediterranean and Cyprus, which could supervise crucial trade routes and energy centers, directly provide political advantages for the actor having word on East Mediterranean and Cyprus. Safety of European energy is totally depends on the security of the energy traffic at this region.

The basic interest of Russia in Middle East and Eastern Mediterranean is to ensure a broad influence as possible as in the area gaining importance on account of either its oil richness or strategic position. Cyprus plays a guard role for Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline, Ceyhan terminal and Suez Canal, which is the main point for petroleum that go to the Mediterranean Sea. Both Tartus and Latakia in Syria are significant for both Syria and Russia in that they face the outlet of the Ceyhan end—the receiving end—of the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan oil terminal giving Russia and its partners the ability to disrupt or secure the port and route during the possibility of the eruption of any future war(s) with the United States (Nazemroaya, 2006; 1). The island must be under the control of Russian-sided government instead of Western or at least, should stay independent and nonaligned. Russia sees the Cyprus as NATO base and therefore prefers the island as independent. In that term, tendency of political power in the Greece becomes the determiner for Russian policy on Cyprus.

Geostrategic importance of Cyprus for Turkey is vital Turkish security and defense concerns in many ways. Cyprus, is only 65 km from Turkey, has importance for Turkey geographically. Turkish coasts completely surround Eastern Mediterranean from the Northern part. Then Cyprus has same advantages for Turkey to the control of Eastern Mediterranean. Cyprus is also the key point for Turkish Sea Strategy (HAK, 1995; 72-75). The island controls Turkey's harbors such as Mersin, as well as Syria's and Israel's. It also ensures unsinkable missile launching pad and control tower on air and sea routes in Eastern Mediterranean including Turkish southern waters. It also provides security of oil traffic from Middle East. Turkey fears that Cyprus would be used as a "springboard" for the invasion of Turkey from the South.

Cyprus has a dual strategic importance for Greece. In addition to historical ambitions connecting island to homeland in Enosis at the backside, Athens sees Greek influence over the Cyprus as adding to Greece's geostrategic importance in practice (Dize, 2002; 41). This, in turn, is expected to make Greece even more important in the eyes of its EU and NATO partners, which consider Cyprus as being situated at a traditional cultural crossroads and therefore as a bridge between Europe and Middle East. Moreover, this would further increase the geostrategic value of Greece in relation to that of Turkey, to which the United States currently pays significant attention. Another strategic value for Greece is that the island not only is situated closely to the Turkish mainland, but also in Turkey's so called 'soft belly'. This would create a significant degree of insecurity to Turkey especially if medium-and/or long-range weapons systems were to be installed on the island and a strong Navy was to be deployed in the area.

SCENARIOS FOR CYPRUS IN TERMS OF GLOBAL POWER RELATIONS

Based on Cyprus' strategic significance and his related benefits, it is very probable building up several scenarios considering the global power competitions and their applied systematics. Nevertheless, none of these scenarios have the chance to come true in near future, as it is very up and trendy that deadlock is presenting itself as the only working solution for such a long time. Considering the global powers as USA EU, and the regional players like Turkey and Greece, we can still focus on three main scenario analysis (Table 4 provides an outline). Although these are listed below in order of precedence, it is still probable that of any one of them taking place while the previous one is still not likely to happen.

- EU membership of a united Cyprus under the dominance of Greek Cypriot Authority.
- A rather loose confederation structure under US guarantor rights (maybe using NATO farmework)
- Division of the island and international recognition of North Cyprus Turkish Republic as a result of the deadlock.

Cyprus Scenario 1; A Unifed Cyrprus as EU Member

If a newer version of Annan Plan, which is placating Greek Cypriots and diluting Turkey's rights to guarantee, is committed by counter parties, there will emerge a Greek Cypriot dominated

government structure. Greek Cypriots would diffuse to whole island and get him under control physically within a short period just like the quid pro quo's (compromises) they achieved in the cases like, land and internally displaced people. While Turkey will be remained to be kept outside EU, and with some more impositions and tricks on EU, Greek Cypriots will control the support aids coming from EU to Cyprus for not to let them reach Turkish region and to force the pace of Turkish side's pine away. As a result, the rights of Turkish Cypriots and Turkish Governments guarantee will remain unfulfilled on paper.

It is mostly probable that a picture come in view where EU improves its strategic perspective and starts competing with Turkey, US and some countries over the Levant to regional geographies. Cyprus is offering to EU some essential strategic opportunities not only over the region but also by means of a global visionary perspective. The inclusion of Cyprus to EU will add an important value to EU's strategic vision and its projection of power management strategies. Wherewithal EU wants Cyprus as a whole and where Turkish side is dissoluble under Greek Cypriot dominance. We face the same damaging attitude like a tacit politics which is being applied to other Islamic populated European countries. At the same time, they demand on Turkish government support to this united Cyprus project while leaving out the Turkey's EU membership matter, out of the plan, trying to kill two birds with one stone in other words. EU will get rid of being the object of Turkish side of Cyprus and Turkey, and by doing so, it will give rise to the protectionism of Christian - Rome culture which lies in deep heart of EU.

The EU membership of a united Cyprus brings along some other threats which slipped from Greek's notice also. The changes, in its traffic and in demographics of its population may drag along the island to new journeys, he may get less recognized and more cosmopolitan whereas EU starts to follow different perspectives on three different continents under its global restructuring policy. The power rivalry for Cyprus would be much more apparent when EU would start to apply its main politics by all means, to be more specific, when the three front runner countries, England, Germany and France will hold the reins. This rivalry will turn the island into not only the military base of near geographies payoffs but also the object of them. Moreover, under these circumstances Cyprus would have to take US requests as for granted. The main tragedy will be observing the Greek Cypriots being dissolved with the immigrations and changes coming from Europe while they're trying to dissolve Turkish Cypriots in the same time.

Shortly, a EU member united Cyprus will be an assimilation pot for both Greek and Turkish Cypriots while Turkish affluence in the island will be firstly assimilated and transmigrated predominantly by Greek side first. And Turkey, left out of EU, will lose also its geographical, political and social chance over Cyprus forever. Turkey will have to watch and bear the negative reflections of the big powers fait accompli and rivalry in the territory. When military, economic and energy wise opportunities around the island are brought to agenda, Turkey will be left out and this will force Turkey to face it out with EU directly. Cyprus will be counted as EU's land and Greece will have the chance to leave Turkey across EU for the concerns related. As a result, a EU member united Cyprus scenario must never be approved by Turkey without clearing away the disadvantages of this plan. The respects are as follows;

- Non approval of every new permanent structure before the full membership of Turkey to EU.
- No compensation from the active guarantor status of Turkey
- For unified solution, support a model where two separate governments having strong administration structures coming together under a loose confederation.
- Speed up the studies to increase Turkey's exclusive economic zones around the island by taking into consideration the possible arrangements that may come up in future.

Table 4: Cyprus Scenarios

Scenarios	Complications	Winners	Muddy	Losers
Unified Cyprus in EU (Assimilation game)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Greek Cypriot assimilation in short term * Long term assimilation of both sides in EU * Tool for EU power politics (Europeanization) * No gain for Turks 	EU	Greek Cypriots Greece US	Turkish Cypriots Turkey Russia
US Guarantorship for a Confederal Cyprus (Melting Pot)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Governments under American supervision * American dependency and reactions * Tool for US power politics (Americanization) * Heavy military concentration including NATO presence 	US	Greek Cypriots Greece Turkish Cypriots Turkey	EU Russia
Dividen Cyprus (Keep your way)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Two federal states with certain boundaries * Independent and sovereign governments in coordination for shared interests * Long term stability and lasting peace * No foreign intervention 	Greek Cypriots Greece Turkish Cypriots Turkey	EU US Russia	-

Cyprus Scenario 2; Cyprus Under US Guarantorship.

The strategic importance of the Turkish port of Ceyhan-situated about 70 km from the northern tip of Cyprus is increase over the coming years as northern Iraqi oil flows out on the Kirkuk-Yumurtalik pipeline and the ambitious BTC pipeline comes on stream. The US already has a base close to the port, in Turkey's Incirlik air base. The island "could become an offshore financial and services centre" for US corporations. Arab fears that Cyprus will become a US protectorate have been heightened by Washington's moves to redeploy its military forces in Germany to bases further east (Katsinaris, 2004; 1). There are very high stakes for the US, not least of which are the oil and gas resources of the Persian Gulf, Central Asia and North Africa, an expanding military presence throughout the Caucasus and the ambitious Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) oil pipeline.

Because using the Island as a logistics base would allow the Pentagon more flexibility in planning its interventions in the Middle East and give it firmer control over the oil-rich regions of the Middle East, North Africa and the Caspian Sea. A US base on Cyprus would increase US "emergency intervention capacities" in the Caucasus, Middle East and Central Asia and boost Washington's pre-emptive strike capacity, as well as guaranteeing it a "security belt" in the area. Cyprus's southern extremity is just 200 kilometres from the Suez Canal. The strategic planning department of the US European Forces Command considers Cyprus a "strategically important place" because of its proximity to the oil fields of the Middle East, the Caucasus and Africa, as well as for the security of the BTC oil corridor.

Washington studied for the possibility of "sending a military force to Cyprus, in the form of a peacekeeping force" (Athanasiadis, 2004: 1) "US officials have already proposed this to the TRNC, stressing the island's strategic importance for the superpower's geopolitical interests", wrote Daily Times diplomatic correspondent. Cyprus would be turned into an "international mandate country" serving the interests of the US and its British ally. NATO is particularly interested in getting access to the Gecitkale airport in the north of the island. This scenario may be applied under the circumstances if EU cannot reach a solution at its own will. As per modus operandi, US may suggest not only keeping an army on the island but also a guarantor role in the NATO as well.

As a result of such a model it will be much easier to protect Turkish identity and existence on the island whereas the governments keep their strong positioning in a rather loose federated structure. Turkey, unfortunately will remain to stay out of EU, but will not have to face the problems directly against EU about security, economics, energy and other topics related to the island. While US is strengthening its position and efficiency in the Levant a discomfort may occur in neighbour geographies, ignoring Turkey's benefits. The significant role of US will increase in solving the problems between Greece and Turkey and the guarantorship of US in the island will not be similar to role Turkey has performed, and when the relationship of these two countries are collapsed, ipso facto, it will lose its meaning. Moreover, Turkish Republic of northern Cyprus economy will remain dependant on Turkey.

US guarantee rights must not bring any limitations to Turkey or shouldn't tie up its rights derived from international agreements and pacts to avoid such disadvantages. The studies to increase Turkey's exclusive economic zones around the island should be accelerated too. On the other side, the existence of US and its hegemonic expectations on the territory will draw the hostile reactions of Middle East countries initially and other near geographies following them and Cyprus will become a target. The Europeanization will be replaced by Americanization, and this will trigger the instability and tendency to rebel towards foreign power elites.

Cyprus Scenario 3; Division of Island.

The division of the island can be considered if and only if the above scenarios with US and EU might not work or realized, and it becomes a shared world public opinion that there is no probable solution out coming from the meetings of counterparties. This may happen, while Greek Cypriots are persisting to reject the probable solutions for pushing more compromises same as during Annan Plan, and Turkey is deciding to go in his own way very precisely. Eventually, these two governments who are already incompatible for living together will be left to their own wills. A final settlement like this will protect the rights of Turkish existence on the island and the ambiguity would disappear. Two governments which are trapped in a small island would have to collaborate in many areas even if they don't want to, and confederate consciousness will be implemented actually in coming times.

Turkey will remain keeping the competitive edge to follow up some independent policies oriented in future with the division of the island and also Turkish austerity would be able to kept unknown mainly for military and some other areas. Hence Turkish Republic of northern Cyprus will be more and more dependant on Turkey's support to be recognized worldwide and develop economically. If this recognition doesn't take place, Turkish Republic of northern Cyprus may choose to merge with Turkey. Naturally, the lobbying activities of Greek Cypriots and Greeks over US and EU will remain increasingly. This may end up in United Nations' Security Council's drafting some sanctions and joint resolutions against Turkey, if United Nations, USA and Russia would take sides with EU with the reactions of Greek to Turkey. However, Turkey has enough power and opportunities to suffer from the those reactions. Another negative time frame may and will start between Turkey and EU and the membership process most strongly would fell through. This shouldn't be considered as a big loss as EU has never been sincere in accepting Turkey as a member.

It will be best time to come up with the division of island solution, when Greek Cypriots are displaying an utmost uncompromising attitude about the matter. Until this, it is essential to impress the international public opinion with strong arguments and get them used to with the idea. The steps along must be taken by Turkey and Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus together. The acceptance of big powers about the recognition, like US should be prearranged and ally countries are better to get used with the new structure plan. Cooperation with Israel/Jewish Lobby will be very useful to reduce the repulse from US and England, and allying with them and other influential countries. A multi-purposed action plan has to be prepared for serial betterment in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, just in case such a division may come alive.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the world is in an evolving period manipulated by the Western hegemony represented by the U.S. and EU as its complementary to reach a civilization ruled by Western values and serves for their interests. The U.S. is the unique super state able to make all types of interventions into all regions of the world. It is not certain that rising powers will become rivals for the U.S. The world is in a period of transformation in course of modernization and democratization aiming at national power by influencing state sovereignty and identity. At the first quarter of the 21 st century, nation-states are in danger to lose their power capacity and power implementation instruments. EU strategy consists of partnership, persuasion and local penetration techniques. American hegemony is applied in two ways; either regime restoration with soft power, or nation-building with hard power. Two sides of Cyprus are also in the great risk of danger of transformation manipulated by the Western Hegemony represented by EU and USA with different mechanisms.

The geostrategic importance of the Cyprus has not declined over the years, and could even be argued to have increased. Its strategic position has always ensured that Cyprus has played a key role in history, but it has also resulted in the island becoming a victim of others' power politics. Taking account the future power relations, we have envisaged three scenarios for future Cyprus; (1) An unified Cyprus with the domination of Cypriot Greek side in EU, (2) A confederal Cyprus with two strong federal states under the U.S. guarantee, and (3) Division of Island. As evaluated above, hegemonic power centers will not bring a lasting peace for Cyprus and they can harm the both local sides in Cyprus in a long term. For that reason, governments in Cyprus should develop their own ways to struggle with any hegemonic polars to maintain and ensure their survivability. The best solution would be a kind of division by maintaining their own and strong federal state in the farmework of a loose confederal structure. However, if reunified, Turkey would need a guarantee that strategic things would not be lost.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, Jeffrey C. (1995), *Modern, Anti, Post and Neo*, New Left Review, C.120.
- Arı, Tayyar. (1997), *International Relations (Uluslararası İlişkiler)*, ALFA Yayınları, 2. Baskı, İstanbul.
- Ash, Timothy Garton. *Regime Change by European Method*, New York Times, (17 Sep, 2006).
- Barrett, Michele. (1997), *Ideology, Politics, Hegemony: from Gramsci to Laclau and Mouffe*, *Mapping Ideology*, Ed. Slavoj ZIZEK, Verso, London.
- Baylis, John and Smith, Steve. (2005), *The Globalization of World Politics, An Introduction to International Studies*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Bradford, Jr. Colin I. (Oct, 2005), *Global Governance Reform for the 21 st Century*, Brooking Institution, Washington D.C.
- Buzan, Barry and Waever, Ole. (2003), *Regions and Powers, The Structure of International Security*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Centre For European Policy Studies (CFSS), (2005), *The Reluctant Debutante, The European Union as Promoter of Democracy in its Neighbourhood*, CPS Working Document No.223, Bruxelles.
- Cooper, Robert. (2005), *Demolish of Nation-State (Ulus Devletin Çöküşü)*, Güncel Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- Diez, Thomas. (2002), *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict*, Postmodern Union, Manchester University Press, New York.

- Faber, Peter R. (2004), *NATO's Military Transformation Past, Present, Future*, NATO Defence College Occasional Paper: After İstanbul, Rome.
- Gaudin, Jean-Pierre. (1998), *Modern Governance, Yesterday And Today: Some Clarifications To Be Gained From French Government Policies*, International Social Science Journal, No.155.
- HAK. (1995), *Kıbrıs'ın Dünü Bugünü Yarını*, Harp Akademileri Basımevi, 1995, İstanbul.
- Henn Francis. (2007), *Cyprus: The Geo-Strategic Dimension*, Contemporary Review, (Summer 2007).
- Heywood, Andrew. (2007), *Political Ideologies (Siyasi İdeolojiler)*, Adres Yayınları, Çev.: A.K. BAYRAM, Ankara.
- Joffe, George. (2001), *European Multilateralism and Soft Power Projection in the Mediterranean*, Centre for International Studies, Cambridge University.
- Katsinaris, Stephen. *Cyprus: Washington Seeks New Military Base*, Green Left Weekly, (June 9, 2004).
- Kesselman, Mark. (1973), *Order or Movement? The Literature of Political Development As Ideology*, World Politics, October 1973.
- Krauthammer, Charles. (1992), *The Unipolar Moment, in Rethinking America's Security*, Allison and Treverton, New York.
- Mead Walter Russell. (2002), *Special Providence American Foreign Policy And How It Changed The World*, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Books, New York.
- Melia, Thomas O. (2005), *The Democracy Bureaucracy, Infrastructure of American Democracy Promotion*, Georgetown University.
- Nazemroaya, Mahdi Darius. *Russian Base in Syria, a Symmetrical Strategic Move*, Global Research, (July 28, 2006).
- Nye, Joseph S.Jr. (2004), *Soft Power and American Foreign Policy*, Political Science Quarterly; Summer 2004; 119, 2; Research Library Core.
- Nye, Joseph S.Jr. (2003), *Amerikan Gücünün Paradoksu*, (Çev.: Gürol KOCA), Literatür Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Öngün, Çetin. (2007) *Amerikan Gücüne Tarihsel Bir Yaklaşım (A Historical Approach to the American Power)*, Asil Yayın Dağıtım, (Ankara, 2007).
- Rehn, Olli. (2007), *Avrupa'nın Gelecek Sınırları (Future Boundaries of the Europe)*, Çev. O. Şen, H.Kaya, 1001 Kitap Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Piccone Theodore J. (2005), *International Mechanism for Protecting Democracy*, Edit. Morton H. HALPERIN and Mirna GALIC, Council on Foreign Relations, 2005.
- Posen, Barry R. & Ross, Andrew. *Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy*, International Security; 21, (Winter 1996/1997).
- Taylor, Claire. *European Security and Defence Policy: Developments Since 2003*, House of Commons, Research Paper 06/32, London, (8 June 2006).
- Saferworld-International Alert. (2005), *Developing an EU Strategy to Address Fragile States: Priorities for the UK Presidency of the EU in 2005*, London.
- Sayın, Fatih Mehmet. (2008), *Solution of the Cyprus Problem and Turkish Position*, Journal of Qafqaz University, Number 24.
- Secretary General/High Representative and the Commission. (June 2001), *EU Programme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts*, endorsed by the Göteborg European Council.

Strange, Susan. (1987), *The Persisting Myth of Lost Hegemony*, International Organisation, C.41, No.4.

Uslu, Nasuh. (2004), *The Cyprus Question As An Issue of Turkish Foreign Policy and, Turkish-American Relations: 1959-2003*, (Nova Yayınları), İstanbul.

Uzgel, İlhan. (2003), *Hegemon Güç Kutusu (Hegemonic Power Box)*, (Ed. Baskın Oran), Türk Dış Politikası, Cilt I, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.

Volgy, Thomas J. – Kanthak, Kristin – Fraizer, Derrick – Ingersoll, Robert S. (2005), *Resistance to Hegemony within the Core*, Matthew B. Ridgway Center for International Security Studies, University of Pittsburgh.

Yılmaz, Sait. (2006), *21. Yüzyılda Güvenlik ve İstihbarat (Security and Intelligence in the 21 st Century)*, ALFA Yayınları, İstanbul.

Yılmaz Sait. *Küresel, Bölgesel ve Ulusal Düzeyde Türkiye için Yeni Bir Yaklaşım (A New Approach for the Turkey)*, Cumhuriyet Strateji Dergisi Yıl: 3, Sayı: 152, (26 Mayıs 2007).

Yılmaz, Sait. (2007), *Güç ve Politika (Power and the Policy)*, ALFA Yayınları, İstanbul.

Internet Sites:

Alemdar, Şakir: *Strategic Importance of Cyprus*, Web Sitesi: http://sakiralemdar.blogcu.com/strategic-importance-of-cyprus_34101351.html

(Access, Oct 5, 2009).

Iason Athanasiadis. (2004). *US Seeks Major Military Base On United Cyprus*, Asia Times Online, <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle East/FD10Ak04.html> (Access, Oct 5, 2009).