



МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ОПЫТ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО УПРАВЛЕНИЯ

INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

DOI: 10.22363/2312-8313-2023-10-4-567-582

EDN: PHXCKC

Research article / Научная статья

Georgios Vasiliou and the Imperatives of Cyprus's Foreign Policy: Examining the Role of the Individual in International Relations

Vladimir S. Izotov¹ , Natalia V. Kardash² 

¹The National Research University — Higher School of Economics,
11, Pokrovsky Bulvar, Moscow, Russian Federation, 109028

²Peoples' Friendship University of Russia named after P. Lumumba (RUDN University),
6, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation, 117198

 nk@vkeyprus.com

Abstract. The article examines the foreign policy strategies of the third President of the Republic of Cyprus, Georgios Vasiliou (1988–1993), through the prism of the anthropology of international relations. The main emphasis is on his attempts to resolve the Cyprus conflict and successfully integrate Cyprus into the EU. The analysis explores the interconnection of various factors in Cyprus's foreign and domestic policies, which are related to the peculiarities of its political culture and internal party-political processes. The authors conclude that Vasiliou's policy was largely shaped by the peculiarities of his personality, biography, education level, and overall political culture. The correctness of Cyprus's European choice and Vasiliou's leading role in this process is yet to be evaluated by future generations. It is this choice that allowed Cyprus to timely initiate the mechanisms of modernization, transforming it into a modern democratic and innovative state. The work incorporates little-known biographical facts and materials from the Cyprian newspaper and personal interviews with the former president.

Keywords: anthropology of international relations, anthropological diplomacy, Eastern Mediterranean, Georgios Vasiliou, decolonization, EU, European integration, Cyprus, Cyprus conflict, TRNC

© Izotov V.S., Kardash N.V., 2023



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

Conflicts of interest: The authors declared no conflicts of interest.

Article history:

The article was submitted on 30.09.2023. The article was accepted on 30.10.2023.

For citation:

Izotov V.S., Kardash N.V. Georgios Vasiliou and the Imperatives of Cyprus's Foreign Policy: Examining the Role of the Individual in International Relations. *RUDN Journal of Public Administration*. 2023;10(4):567–582. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8313-2023-10-4-567-582>

“Unexpected” decolonization and the geopolitical etymology of the conflict

The Cyprus conflict remains one of the most complex products of the decolonization processes that took place in the 50s and 60s of the last century. In less than 10 years, the political structure of the world has been transformed, a significant part of which was made up of newly independent states. Of course, this has become one of the most significant achievements of the established institutional system of global regulation headed by the United Nations [1]. However, most of the postcolonial countries continued to remain dependent (economically, militarily, culturally) on the former metropolises. The degree of such “phantom attachment” in some cases was very strong, and was largely due to the effect of surprise for the post-war grandees of world politics who lost their overseas territories. Insufficient attention, and sometimes misunderstanding of the processes that began on the periphery of the world system, can be considered one of the fundamental causes of subsequent conflicts. There is a reasonable opinion that the theories of international relations, developing in the mainstream of Western-centric approaches, proved unable to reflect the radical changes taking place in the world system, and above all, to predict the accelerated decolonization of the “second world” in the post-war period [2]. The old metropolises did not immediately accept the new postcolonial reality. In some cases, attempts to reorganize colonial empires led to conflicts, such as the war in Algeria in 1954–1962. But it was not only the ex-metropolises that were active. Neighboring countries also began to pursue an active policy of influencing new states. These processes were especially enhanced by the effect of ethnic and religious community. In addition, due to historical circumstances, several countries with divergent interests could claim special relations with the new postcolonial subjects of the world system. In this case, there was a zone of constant geopolitical tension with high conflict potential. It is precisely such circumstances that have become characteristic markers of the Cyprus case, based on the long-term ethnic and religious confrontation between the two communities living on the island — the Greek and the Turkish.

The acute phase of the conflict began even before the collapse of the colonial system, in the mid-1950s, with the struggle of the National Organization for the Liberation of Cyprus (EOKA) against the British army and ethnic Turks. In response, the Turkish Resistance Organization (TMT) was established with

the direct support of Ankara “in order to protect the Turkish minority”. The end of the 1950s and 1960s was marked by armed clashes teetering on the brink of civil war. The situation became particularly acute in 1963, when the first president of independent Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios (Michalis Muskos), under pressure from the right-wing radical environment from EOKA, proposed amendments to the Constitution that limited the rights of Turkish Cypriots. A tragic pause in the conflict was put by the Turkish occupation of the northern part of the island (about 37 % of the entire territory) in July 1974, during which more than 180 thousand Greek Cypriots were expelled from their places of historical residence. In 1983. The legal “registration” of a pseudo–state, the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC), recognized only by Turkey, has also been completed. The UN Security Council adopted a corresponding resolution (Pakistan was the only one of the 15 countries that voted “against”) declaring this act “legally invalid” and calling for the repeal of the unilateral declaration of independence.

Since then, fruitless attempts have been made to reconcile the two communities. The negative development of the situation was facilitated by the growing fragmentation of public consciousness in different parts of the island along religious and ethnic lines, increasing mutual distrust. There was also an acute problem of property in the north of Cyprus, which the Greek Cypriots insisted on returning.

In 2004, the population of the TRNC voted for a plan providing for the federalization of Cyprus with subsequent membership (as a single state) in the EU. However, the well-known initiative of UN Secretary General Kofi Annan did not receive the necessary support among Greek Cypriots. As a result, the Republic of Cyprus became an EU member, with only the southern part of the island under its political control¹. In the north, the TRNC continues to exist, a pseudo–subnational state entity that is not recognized by the international community [3].

Thus, we are faced with a unique conflict, the determination of which is extremely multi-layered. This is both the problem of the Turkish minority in Cyprus (less than 20 %), and the historical division along the ethnic and religious frontier, and the projection of the political, economic and cultural influence of Great Britain, Greece, and Turkey [4].

The London-Zurich Agreements of 1959, which consolidated the independence of Cyprus from the United Kingdom, also played a role. According to many researchers, it was their legal unnaturalness and deliberate unreality that provoked a series of crises in the young state. In particular, the “Guarantee Agreement” within the framework of these agreements became a political and ideological cover for the Turkish invasion [5].

¹ A special legal agreement regulating the admission of Cyprus to the EU interprets the situation as follows: officially, the entire island is part of the EU. However, the EU regulations do not apply to its northern part.

The peculiar specification makes it difficult to accurately classify the Cyprus conflict. However, most political scientists tend to define it as ethnic-religious, applying a set of approaches to modeling and optimizing the situation, including the classic “prisoner’s dilemma” for game theory. It is noteworthy that such attempts were made even before the Turkish intervention. In 1973, Norwegian political scientist Malvern Lumsden tried to use this theory to find a solution to the Cyprus issue. Four possible options were considered: war, peace, enosis (annexation of the island to Greece), tasim (division of Cyprus into two parts followed by the annexation of the northern territories to Turkey) [6]. A year later, the first option became a reality.

The anthropology of international politics: the Cypriot dimension

The problem of the individual’s role in solving international political conflicts lies within the broader boundaries of research in the field of international relations. As a scientific discipline, the anthropology of international relations began to develop in the 1970s [7-12], having formed by the end of the twentieth century a stable opinion that “individuals have always played a more significant role in the international system than the one that was traditionally recognized for them” [12. P. 137]. However, even in these works, the theme of the role of an individual political leader in solving international conflicts fades into the shadows against the background of the development of more general theoretical and methodological issues. Even at present, a number of authors believe that the anthropology of international relations (which studies, among other things, the importance of personality in conflict resolution) has not yet reached the level of an established independent scientific discipline. Most publications of this kind so far demonstrate the beginning of the development of a new branch of knowledge with all the ensuing consequences [13].

At the same time, there is a very extensive source base devoted to the analysis of the Cyprus conflict and the search for ways to resolve it [14-22]. Political science studies of the role of personality in Cypriot politics are mainly focused on the first President of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios. One of the most famous was the monograph by the English researcher Stanley Mayes, published back in 1960 [23]. Let us note in passing that the work raises big questions from the point of view of historical objectivity and impartiality of the author’s position. Mayes holds Makarios responsible for delaying the negotiation process and provoking the development of events that eventually led to an imperfect and potentially explosive settlement system through the London-Zurich Agreements (see above). In Russian science, the personality of Makarios attracts researchers, including a unique example for twentieth-century Europe of a clergyman combining the highest spiritual and secular authorities in one person [24].

Georgios Vasiliou: a very brief biography

The future third president of Cyprus was born in 1931 in Famagusta (the Greek name is Ammochostos). Two years later, the family moved to Greece (Lesbos Island), where his father worked as an ophthalmologist and his mother as a dentist. My parents were political activists, my father was a member of the Communist Party². As a communist and a British citizen, he was forced to flee to Cyprus after the German occupation of Greece in 1941. In a few years, he will return to Greece in order to participate in the partisan movement. When the detachments of the Democratic Army of Greece (the armed wing of the Communist Party) were defeated by government forces in 1949, Vasiliou's parents ended up in the USSR, where they lived until their return to Cyprus in 1961. Georgios Vasiliou stayed to study in Europe, first in Switzerland, then in Hungary, where he lived for almost ten years.

His youth and education in Hungary during the 1950s were very significant from the point of view of forming Vassiliou's political views. According to him, he was an ardent supporter of the renewal of the socialist regime. Within the Hungarian Communist Party, he joined the progressive faction, whose goal was to build "socialism with a human face". Unfortunately, the ex-president states: "in practice, it turned out that dictatorship and socialism are incompatible, because socialism presupposes real democracy and respect for human rights" [25].

After the suppression of the Hungarian uprising in 1956, he remained a member of the Communist Party for several years, but three years later he was expelled from it, while "remaining faithful to the ideas of progress and socialism". The future president, having received a government scholarship for representatives of the working class (he worked as a turner at a factory), graduated with honors from the Faculty of Political Economy at one of the leading universities and began working at the Academy of Sciences on a dissertation "Methods of state intervention in the development of the English economy" [26]. After its successful defense in 1960 Vasiliou moves to the UK, where he attends lectures at the London School of Economics and works in various commercial companies. Three years later, the future president returns to Cyprus.

In the context of our research, it is important to note that in post-war Hungary, for historical reasons, one of the strongest economic schools among the countries of the socialist bloc was preserved. World-class scientists worked at universities. It is enough to name the names of Bela Balassa and Bela Shiposha. The first of them emigrated to the United States after the 1956

² In one of the interviews, Vassiliou says: "I was a young idealist, raised in a family where they sincerely, enthusiastically, selflessly believed in the idea of socialism. The following years (after moving to Hungary in 1950) were a period of slow but steady realization of how crude the reality behind the slogans and beautiful words was".

uprising, becoming one of the creators of the theory of economic integration. His work largely laid the theoretical foundations for the functioning of the European Economic Community (EEC) and later the European Union. Bela Shiposh is an outstanding econometrician and forecaster, who was the first to prove that long cycles of the world economy in 50–60 years (Kondratiev cycles) are present in the time series of former socialist countries. It can be assumed that familiarity with the works of these and other scientists influenced Vassiliou's views, including laying a tendency to a systematic analysis of the situation based on political economic methodology and consolidating ideas about the advantages and prospects of integration of democratic countries. Later, this will manifest itself in a firm foreign policy (European integration) position and confidence in the only possible European future for Cyprus.

Georgios Vasiliou returned to Cyprus in 1963 and soon founded the Middle East Marketing Research Center, specializing in the study of market conditions in Greece, the Middle East, Iran, and the Persian Gulf states. In fact, it was the first international consulting company in independent Cyprus. By the mid-1980s, Vassiliou has earned a reputation as one of the most astute and systemically minded economists. “I spoke on the radio, wrote articles, presented papers at conferences”, he says in an interview, “so my political career began imperceptibly”.

In 1988, Vassiliou, running as an independent candidate, but with the support of the Communist AKEL Party, won the presidential election. Five years later, in 1993, he was re-elected for a second term, but lost slightly to the candidate from the center-right party DISI Glafkos Clerides. After that, Vasiliou founded the Free Democratic Movement party, and in 1996 became chairman of the United Democrats party. In 1998–2003, Vassiliou was responsible for the negotiation process on the country's accession to the EU, bringing it to a final positive decision. This is an extremely concise biography of the third President of Cyprus, to the individual stages of which we will return in the context of our study.

Restarting the negotiation process: external and internal barriers

The search for a solution to the “theorem” of the Cyprus conflict is the main foreign policy line of any president. The strategy of action in this area is not a matter exclusively of international diplomacy. It is obvious that from a theoretical point of view we are dealing with a complex (or rather, unique) combination of structural factors of foreign and domestic policy [27; 28]. After winning the elections in February 1988 Basilio under the auspices of the United Nations and with the mediation of Oscar Camillon (ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs of Argentina) began negotiations with Rauf Denktash (President of the TRNC in 1983–2005) on new terms.

It is important to note that the process of inter-communal negotiations in 1988–1992 coincided with the fundamental transformation of the system of international relations, the destruction of the socialist bloc, the collapse of the USSR and the significant strengthening (after the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992) of the united Europe as a subject of world politics.

The principled innovative position of the new President of Cyprus was the refusal to set up negotiations with “preconditions” requiring the withdrawal of Turkish troops and displaced persons from the occupied territories. The previous president Spyros Kyprianou adhered to exactly this position with the active support of Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreu. It is noteworthy that Vasiliou openly criticizes the national populist position of the latter: “Papandreu wanted to present himself as a great patriot and liked to speak with great sounding, but meaningless slogans” [25. P. 64]. Such episodes expose the popular political myth that the Cypriot policy on the unification of the island is only a projection of the Greek approach and does not have proper independence. The reset of the negotiation process has not only demonstrated a more realistic vision of the situation compared to the presidents of the predecessors (the abolition of a condition that is not a priori feasible for the TRNC), but also new, more optimistic, “horizons of reality” in resolving the conflict.

However, the Turkish Cypriot side did not show sufficient flexibility, insisting on a political formula involving the creation of two states according to the confederation model, as opposed to an integral federal state with a single international entity proposed by the Greek Cypriot side. At the same time, in the long term, the TRNC proposed a kind of “federation by evolution” model, involving the transfer of power to the central government. Denktash’s position (characterized by an internal and external authoritarian style) was uncompromising — a federal model should be created from two independent states, but the degree of political independence of these subjects remained unclear. As a result, the Turkish Cypriot side actually blocked the holding of the UN Conference on Cyprus announced at the end of 1991. Perez de Cuellar publicly noted the extreme inflexibility of Denktash’s position, insisting that each side acts as a bearer of state sovereignty, which remains after the creation of the federation, including the right to secession [29]. The UN Secretary General publicly condemned the demands of the Turkish side, stating that “the introduction of a new concept of separate sovereignty and the right to secession ... will fundamentally change the nature of previous decisions provided for in the previous (basic) high-level agreements of 1977-1979” [30]. In November 1992 the UN also adopted an important resolution No. 789, which stated the deep crisis of trust existing in relations between the two sides and condemned the position of the Turkish Cypriot side. As a result, negotiations were postponed approximately until March 1993 [31].

However, there was not enough consolidation on the issue of unification within Greek Cypriot politics either. According to Vasiliou, the negotiation process increasingly turned out to be (In all likelihood, intentionally — authors)

hostage to legal casuistry: “All the discussions began to revolve around what is meant by the word ‘federation’ and how it functions. Unfortunately, under various pretexts, all proposals for the introduction of a federal system were rejected” [25. P. 71]. It is necessary to take into account the persisting nationalist opposition, which the president had to reckon with. One of the key achievements should be recognized, despite strong internal political resistance, the adoption in 1989 by the National Council of Cyprus of a document in which, for the first time since 1974, the ideas of a federal structure and political equality between the two communities were approved. This was an important element in the conflict resolution strategy. In fact, the only solution was fixed, which boils down to the fact that Cyprus should be a single independent state, which completely eliminated the ideas of enosis and Taksim from the field of negotiations (and practically from the public political field). But in 1991–1992, the opposition consolidated. The so-called “rejectionist front” was formed: a bloc of national conservative forces based on the convergence of the EDEK and DIKO parties. The Cypriot Orthodox Church, an influential informal political entity, also supported their position.

Nevertheless, at this stage, the Cypriot diplomacy under the leadership of Vassiliou managed to “ideologically” win an important round of negotiations. The inflexibility of the Turkish Cypriot position was conveyed to world public opinion, primarily to the united Europe. In the future, this fact played a role in accelerating the process of Cyprus’ accession to the EU. Later, in April 2001, Denktash would write to UN Secretary General Kofi Annan: “The European Union should be aware of the granting of a unilateral and illegal Greek Cypriot application to join the EU. Unfortunately, our numerous attempts to convince the EU of the possible consequences of this unilateral policy have been ignored” [32]. However, such diplomatic demarches were no longer valid. The international position of the TRNC leader has been undermined by apparent inflexibility in previous rounds of negotiations.

The European vector and internal democratization

The course towards joining the EU has become the second (after the Cyprus settlement) absolute imperative of Vassiliou’s foreign policy, included in his election program. According to him, he believed in the European idea long before he became president. Back in 1963, he says in an interview, — “together with Takis Hadjidimitriou (a Cypriot politician, a member of the EDEK party) and other friends, I founded the movement for Europe ... and remained a firm supporter of the idea of the EU and the customs union” [26. P. 30]. Vassiliou also (while still outside the political field) enthusiastically supported the 1972 Association Agreement. between Cyprus and the European Economic Community, the institutional predecessor of the EU.

Vassiliou assessed the intention to become part of a united Europe not as a populist curtesy to the West, which means nothing in practical terms, but

a turn towards European law and institutions. In his speeches and articles, he repeatedly repeated that “the full application of *aquis communautaire*³ — the best guarantee of a decent life for every Cypriot, whether Greek or Turkish”. For all 15 years, from the filing of the application in 1990 to the moment of accession in 2004, Georgios Vasilou was the main political figure — the guide of Cyprus to the EU. First as president and later as an official representative and coordinator of the European integration process.

In the field of domestic policy, the most important task (interconnected with the European course) was the democratization of Cypriot society, reducing the share of radical nationalist and anti-Western sentiments. Let us draw attention to the fact that Vasiliou took a consistent position on the key event in Cypriot history — the military coup in July 1974, committed by the Greek nationalist organization EOKA-B in order to join the island to Greece as soon as possible. It was these actions that gave Turkey the reason to send troops and marked the beginning of the further tragic division of the island. “It was a fatal event”, Vasiliou is sure, “if you make mistakes and commit crimes, you have to pay for it” [26. P. 24]. In general, he is convinced that Cyprus has become a victim of nationalist sentiments rooted in the 1950s and 60s, expressed in the slogan “*Ενωσις και μόνον Ενωσις*”⁴.

“When I became president”, he recalls, “I wanted people to feel free. Therefore, we have lifted the ban on civil servants belonging to any political party or expressing its ideology” [25. P. 74]. In one of the interviews, Vasiliou reports interesting facts: “Previously, in state institutions it was allowed to read only the newspaper of the ruling Eleftherotypia party, otherwise it would be the end of a career. It was impossible to come to work with the opposition newspaper — ‘Haravgi’ or ‘Alicia’⁵, for example... But I immediately made it clear to the ministers: it doesn’t matter to me which views, left or right, they hold. The main thing is to work with full dedication for the benefit of the country” [26. P. 24]. The powers of law enforcement agencies, primarily the Central Intelligence Service, were significantly limited. Important changes have also taken place in the information and political space — the monopoly of the Cyprus Broadcasting Corporation has been abolished and conditions have been created for the operation of independent radio stations. It is obvious that the line of political pluralism in all spheres was necessary to create sustainable public support for the strategy of European integration of Cyprus. The left-wing spectrum of political elites and society still sympathized with

³ “Community heritage” (French) is a set of principles, rules and norms of the EU that must be preserved in the course of its activities and further development.

⁴ “Enosis and only enosis” — gr. It is interesting that Vasiliou commented on the viability of this idea during his presidency: “Many still believed in enosis... despite the fact that the idea of a federal solution (to the Cyprus problem) was supported by AKEL and DISI, the two majority parties. There was no doubt that there were still a large number of people who believed in enosis among the supporters of DISI.” См. 25:109.

⁵ Accordingly, the press organs of the AKEL and DISI parties.

the Non-Aligned Movement [33. P. 34] (whose role was rapidly declining) and linked EU membership with the inevitable integration into NATO.

The authors, limited by the volume and the main topic of the article, are forced to characterize the economic policy of President Vasiliou very briefly. Excellent political economy education, early involvement in transnational business and international financial and economic cooperation, a deep understanding of European integration processes — all these factors are reflected in the economic course. From the first days of the presidential cadence, Vassiliou carried out measures to reduce the level of economic nationalism, modernizing the economy on the basis of active internal reforms and the development of international relations. For the first time in its economic history, Cyprus began to open to the outside world. The sphere of tourism and services began to actively develop, becoming the main source of foreign exchange earnings. Today, Cyprus is confidently among the top ten countries in the world in terms of reliability and quality of the shipping industry [35]. The foundations of this success were laid under President Vasiliou. In the late 1980s, a special fee was introduced based on the tonnage of the vessel and a campaign was launched to promote Cyprus as an international shipping center. Strategic orientation towards active transnationalization also implied progressive fiscal reform. Income tax rates were significantly reduced, as well as several outdated taxes were abolished. For foreign companies operating on the island, the rate was also reduced to 4.25 %.

It is important to emphasize that in many ways the general economic policy was determined by the course towards EU membership, faith in European political values, the effectiveness of supranational integration mechanisms and a legal orientation towards the adoption of *aquis communautaire*.

Conclusion

Let's summarize the results of our research and formulate the main conclusions. Firstly, and this is the most significant, the policy pursued by Vasiliou was largely determined by the characteristics of his personality, the level of general and political culture. The influence of this culture on international relations is due to the fact that it is formed by people raised on certain values. Those same personalities are political leaders who are the main focus of the anthropology of international relations [12:45]. First of all, this applies to the two most important interrelated lines of the third president's foreign policy — the settlement of the Cyprus conflict and European integration.

Secondly, thanks to his progressive European education, deep economic and political study of two systems — capitalist and socialist (the political beliefs of his parents and their life in the USSR), he was perfectly prepared for the turning point in world history, during which his presidency took place. The rapid breakdown of the bipolar system and the end of the cold war disoriented the political leaders of many countries, but Vasiliou was not one of them. A consistent course towards

European integration (the application for membership was submitted before the collapse of the USSR), a timely understanding of the declining role of the Non-Aligned Movement, a reset of relations with the UN and leading international organizations, an updated and extremely proactive position on solving the Cyprus problem had a cumulative effect. The international community has become more critical of the TRNC and Ankara behind it. This factor, in turn, played an important role in the historic decision to admit Cyprus to the EU.

Thirdly, the socio-political aspect is of great importance. The youth and student years of the ex-president formed a rather rare type of open political culture in Cyprus at that time, a person who later joined the elite⁶. Its main components are a good education, knowledge of several European languages, and an analytical view of political and economic processes at the regional and global levels. He represented an almost ideal type of “international man” — the main actor and object of study of the anthropology of international relations [12. P. 130]. Let us emphasize that in the field of integration ideology, Vassiliou has always considered himself to be a supporter of radical federalism in the spirit of one of the founders of the modern model of European integration, Altiero Spinelli, believing in the creation of the “United States of Europe” — a total federation with an emphasis on accelerating political integration [36-38].

A realistic assessment of the ongoing political processes, based on a scientific and analytical approach, made it possible to critically comprehend what was happening and make (requiring considerable political courage at that time) a European choice in foreign and domestic policy.

In the first case, we can say that the Cypriot authorities have performed a diplomatic feat. Within the united Europe, there was a strong opposition from a group of states opposed to the accession of Cyprus. In particular, they feared the “import of geopolitical problems into the EU”, as well as the deterioration of relations with Turkey. Many pointed out the obvious international legal nonsense: Turkey, as a candidate for EU membership, occupies the territory of a member state [39].

In the field of domestic policy, the President also had to face certain difficulties derived from the traditional political culture of Cyprus. The unique historical and social conditions on the island have formed a special syncretic type (gr. συγκρητισμός — compound) of the political worldview. There was a peculiar integration of European influence (Venetian and British colonization) with the communal structure of agrarian societies typical of the Eastern Mediterranean. The introduction of the nation to European political culture and the rejection of a worldview based on the ideas of “patriotic demagoguery” [25. P. 59] have become the main ideological lines of domestic policy.

Fourthly, time has shown the ambivalent relationship between the European course and the fate of the Cyprus issue. It is difficult

⁶ From this point of view, Basil's statement is significant: “A true intellectual does not associate his ability to think with his place of birth” [25. P. 193].

to overestimate the political and socio-economic benefits of joining the EU today. The inverse “dependence” is also growing. Given the potential for the development and export of hydrocarbon deposits in the Eastern Mediterranean, Cyprus is becoming an important player in the strategy of ensuring European energy security. The island state is also emerging as a leader in shipping, IT technology, science and innovation. The foundations of today’s success were laid precisely in the 1980s and 1990s, when the course was taken towards the openness of the economy and its transnationalization. Vassiliou, a former head of a consulting company operating in several countries around the world, was well aware of the benefits of this approach. This became an important competitive advantage of Cyprus during the third wave of globalization [40-42], the beginning of which coincided with his presidential term. On the other hand, Cyprus’s accession to the EU with a divided territory has significantly slowed down the settlement process. It must be admitted that the Turkish part of the island faced actual disregard for its interests [32]. As a result, the attitude of Ankara and the TRNC towards the mediation efforts of international organizations (the UN and the EU) has become, to put it mildly, more skeptical. In the future, this became one of the reasons for the freezing of Turkey’s European integration process [43].

In any case, time has confirmed the wisdom of the European choice and, without exaggeration, the outstanding role of Vasiliou as the main initiator and navigator of this process has yet to be appreciated by future generations. This is what allowed Cyprus to launch the mechanisms of economic and political modernization in a timely manner, which made it a modern innovative state — “Mediterranean Singapore”, which occupies high places in European and global rankings. From the chronological point of view of today, it is obvious that the five years of his presidency have become more important for Cyprus than the ten-year cadences of his predecessor (Spyros Kyprianou) and successor (Glafkos Clerides). Of course, such an assessment does not detract from the achievements of these political figures, who at one time received a mandate of trust from Cypriot citizens.

In an interview, Georgios Vasiliou said that he dreams of seeing a united Cyprus in his lifetime. Unfortunately, this seems unlikely on the foreseeable political horizons. Today, the negotiation process has actually rolled back decades. There are significant changes in political rhetoric related to the name “TRNC”. Ankara defiantly prefers to use the term “Turkish Republic of Cyprus”, emphasizing the full control of the northern part of the island. A recent statement by Hulusi Akar (ex-Turkish Defense Minister) is symptomatic: “In 2023 We are talking about two equal sovereign independent States. This must be accepted. In the Aegean Sea, the Eastern Mediterranean and Cyprus, we are determined to defend the rights and laws of both our own and our Cypriot brothers” [44].

Both sides are responsible for the current situation, having repeatedly missed the opportunity to enter fruitful negotiations on the creation of a bi-zonal

ethnofederation [45]. In addition to regional factors, the crisis of the UN system and the mechanisms of informal regulation of international relations also played a role. Moreover, it is pointless to look for a measure of “guilt” for Vasiliou for the current situation. All the presidents who were in power after him adhered (to varying degrees) to more conservative and nationalist views, often losing sight of the vector for the transformation of the international political perception of the world, laid out in his time by Vasiliou. As the ex-president himself admitted, “domestic political factors and thirst for power may be of priority importance and become the reasons for the delay in resolving the Cyprus issue” [25. P. 73].

In conclusion, it should be noted that researchers of the role of personality in international relations often do not see smaller, but also important examples in the shadow of the large pieces of the “great chessboard”. From this point of view, the life and political fate of the third President of Cyprus is of great interest and undoubtedly opens a wide field for future research.

REFERENCES

1. *Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples*. URL: http://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/declarations/colonial.shtml (accessed: 11.10.2023) (In Russ.).
2. Cygankov P.A. *Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija* [International Relations]. Moscow: Novaja shkola; 1996 (In Russ.).
3. Dobronravin N.A. *Modernizacija na obochine: vyzhivanie i razvitie nepriznannyh gosudarstv v XX — nachale XXI veka* [Modernization on the Sidelines: Survival and Development of Unrecognized States in the XX — Early XXI Century] SPb.: M-Centr; 2013 (In Russ.).
4. Epaminondas E. A Hybrid Model of Mediterranean Capitalism with British Influences: The Case of Cyprus. *Management & Organizational History*. 2016;11;11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449359.2016.1216865>
5. Izotov V.S. Kiprskij konflikt kak geopoliticheskij razlom v ES: regional'nye i global'nye aspekty [The Cyprus Conflict as a Geopolitical Rift in the EU: Regional and Global Aspects]. *Transformacija politicheskikh sistem v kontekste global'nogo razvitiya*. Voronezh: VGU; 2011 (In Russ.).
6. Lumsden M. The Cyprus Conflict as a Prisoner's Dilemma. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 1973;1:7–32.
7. Etheredge Lloyd S. *A World of Men: The Private Sources of American Foreign Policy*. Cambridge: Mass.: MIT Press; 1978.
8. Linklater A. *Men and Citizens in the Theory of International Relations*. New York: St. Martin's Press; 1982.
9. Nicholson M. Individuals and Their Influence on the International System'. *Individualism and World Politics*. Girard M. (ed.) London: Macmillan; 1999. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-27032-3_2
10. *Individy v mezhdunarodnoj politike* [Individuals in International Politics]. Ed. by M. Zhirar. Moscow; 1996 (In Russ.).
11. McDermott R. *Political Psychology in International Relations (Analytical Perspectives on Politics)*. University of Michigan Press; 2004.
12. Batalov Je.Ja. *Antropologija mezhdunarodnyh otnoshenij* [Anthropology of International Relations]. Moscow: Aspekt Press; 2018 (In Russ.).
13. Kuznecov A.M. *Chelovek v mezhdunarodnyh otnoshenijah: dan' vremeni ili neobhodimaja transformacija paradigmy?* [Man in International Relations: a Tribute to Time or a Necessary Paradigm transformation?]. *Politicheskaja konceptologija*. 2013; 2 (In Russ.).

14. *Cyprus: A Regional Conflict and Its Resolution*. Ed. by Norma Salem. London: Palgrave Macmillan; 1992. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-12781-8>
15. Richmond O. The Cyprus Conflict, Changing Norms of International Society, and Regional Disjunctures. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*. 1999; 1 (13). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09557579908400288>
16. Mills G. In Hope of an Olive Branch? The Cyprus Problem in International Relations. *South African Journal of International Affairs*. 2000; 1 (7). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10220460009545296>
17. Rothman J. Conflict Research and Resolution: Cyprus. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 1991; 518.
18. Michalis M.S. The Cyprus Peace Talks: A Critical Appraisal. *Journal of Peace Research*. 2007; 5 (44). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343307080857>
19. Nugent N. Review of A New Look at the Cyprus Problem. *International Studies Review*. 2003; 2 (5).
20. Hannay D. *Cyprus: The Search for a Solution*. London: Tauris; 2004.
21. Bryant R., Hatay M. *Suing for Sovereignty: Property, Territory, and the EU's Cyprus Problem*. Global Political Trends Center; 2009.
22. Kyriacou A.P. A 'Just and Lasting Solution' to the Cyprus Problem. *Search of Institutional Viability, Mediterranean Politics*. 2000; 5 (3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13629390008414736>
23. Mayes S. *Cyprus and Makarios*. London: Putnam; 1960.
24. Rjabova E.L. Kul'turologicheskaja model' politicheskogo liderstva: svjashhennosluzhitel' na vershine gosudarstvennoj vlasti [The Culturological Model of Political Leadership: A Clergyman at the Top of State Power]. *Kul'tura mira*. 2021; 3 (9) (In Russ.).
25. Kyzyljurek N. *Georgios Vasiliu: razmyshlenija o proshlom i budushhem* [Georgios Vasiliou: Reflections on the Past and the Future]. Moscow: Ves' Mir; 2016 (In Russ.).
26. Kardash N. *Ostrov sokrovishh. Prikljuchenija otvazhnyh biznesmenov* [Treasure Island. Adventures of Brave Businessmen.]. Limassol: Vestnik Kipra; 2016 (In Russ.).
27. Rosenau J. *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World (Cambridge Studies in International Relations)*. Cambridge; 1997.
28. Tjurina I.A. Sistemnyj podhod k izucheniju vzaimosvjazi vneshnej i vnutrennej politiki [A Systematic Approach to the Study of the Relationship between Foreign and Domestic Policy]. *Izvestija RGPU im. A.I. Gercena*. 2006; 22 (In Russ.).
29. Migdalovitz C. *Cyprus: Status of U.N. Negotiations*. URL: <https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/eoir/legacy/2013/06/13/Cyprus%20Status%20of%20U.N.%20Negotiations.pdf> (accessed: 11.10.2023).
30. *Security Council Resolution 716 (1991)*. URL: http://www.hri.org/Cyprus/Cyprus_Problem/p_716.html (accessed: 11.10. 2023).
31. *Decision of November 25, 1992. (3140th Meeting): Resolution 789 (1992)*. URL: https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/sites/www.un.org.securitycouncil/files/89-92_08_cyprus.pdf (accessed: 11.10.2023) (In Russ.).
32. *Sulejmanov A.V. Problema Kipra: istorija i sovremennost'* [The Cyprus Problem: History and Modernity]. *Mirovaja jekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija*. 2019; 2 (63). <https://doi.org/10.20542/0131-2227-2019-63-2-75-84> (In Russ.).
33. Ker-Lindsay J. Shifting Alignments. The External Orientations of Cyprus since Independence. *The Cyprus Review*. 2010; 22 (2).
34. Sepos A. *The Europeanization of Cyprus: Polity Policies and Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; 2002. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230229822>
35. *Cypriot Flag Now 8th Most Trustworthy in World of Shipping*. URL: <https://cyprus-mail.com/2023/06/23/cypriot-flag-now-8th-most-trustworthy-in-world-of-shipping> (accessed: 10.10.2023).
36. Pistone S. Altiero Spinelli and the Strategy for the United States of Europe. Levi L. (ed.) *Altiero Spinelli and Federalism in Europe and the World*. Milan; 1990. DOI:10.1007/978-1-349-23984-9_11
37. Pinder J. Altiero Spinelli's European Federal Odyssey. *The International Spectator*. 2007; 4 (42). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03932720701722944>

38. Verhofstadt G. Strany Evropy dolzhny ob#edinit'sja v federaciju [The Countries of Europe Should Unite into a Federation]. *Rossijskaja gazeta*. 17.12.2012. URL: <https://rg.ru/2012/12/17/verhofstadt-poln.html> (accessed: 11.10.2023) (In Russ.).
39. Stergiou A. The History of Cyprus. *The Middle East and North Africa. 68th Edition*. Routledge; 2022.
40. Martell L. The Third Wave in Globalisation Theory. *International Studies Review*. 2007; 9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2007.00670.x>
41. Hopkins A. The History of Globalization — and the Globalization of History? *Globalization in World History*. Ed by A.G. Hopkins. London: Pimlico; 2002.
42. Scholte J.A. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave; 2005.
43. J Erdogan o vstuplenii v Evrosojuz: Turcija bol'she nichego ne zhdet ot ES [Erdogan on Joining the European Union: Turkey Expects Nothing More from the EU]. *Kommersant*. 01.10.2023. URL: <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/6251344> (accessed: 11.10.2023) (In Russ.).
44. «Τουρκική δημοκρατία της Κύπρου» τα κατεχόμενα, λέει ο Ακάρ [“Turkish Republic of Cyprus” the Occupied Territories, Akar Says]. URL: <https://cyprustimes.com/politiki/tourkiki-dimokratia-tis-kyprou-ta-katechomena-leei-o-akar/> (дата обращения: 11.10.2023) (In Gr.).
45. Izotov V.S. Dvuhzonal'naja jetnofederacija kak budushhee Kipra [Bi-zonal Ethnofederation as the Future of Cyprus]. *Vestnik Kipra*. 26.09.2015. URL: <https://vkcyprus.com/articles/834-ethnic-federation> (accessed: 11.10.2023) (In Russ.).

Information about the authors:

Vladimir S. Izotov — PhD in Political Sciences, Leading Expert, Associate Professor, National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE University) (Russian Federation) (ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4822-5896) (e-mail: vizotov@hse.ru).

Natalia V. Kardash — Postgraduate Student of the Department of Comparative Political Science, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia named after Patrice Lumumba (RUDN University) (e-mail: nk@vkcyprus.com).


Георгиос Василиу и императивы внешней политики Кипра. К вопросу о роли индивида в международных отношениях

В.С. Изотов¹ , Н.В. Кардаш² 

¹Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики»
(НИУ ВШЭ),

109028, Россия, Москва, Покровский бульвар, д. 11

²Российский университет дружбы народов им. П. Лумумбы,
117198, Россия, Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, д. 6

 nk@vkcyprus.com

Аннотация. Статья рассматривает внешнеполитические стратегии третьего президента Республики Кипр Георгиоса Василиу (1988–1993 гг.) через призму антропологии международных отношений. Основное внимание уделяется попыткам решения кипрского конфликта и успешной интеграции Кипра в ЕС. Анализируется взаимосвязь ряда факторов внешней и внутренней политики Кипра, связанных с особенностями политической

культуры и внутренними партийно-политическими процессами. Авторы приходят к выводу, что политика, проводившаяся Василиу, в значительной степени определялась особенностями его личности, биографией, уровнем образования, общей и политической культуры. Правильность европейского выбора и ведущую роль Василиу в этом процессе ещё предстоит оценить будущим поколениям. Именно это позволило Кипру своевременно запустить механизмы модернизации, сделавшие его современным инновационным государством. В работе использованы малоизвестные биографические факты и материалы нескольких личных интервью с экс-президентом.

Ключевые слова: антропология международных отношений, Восточное Средиземноморье, Георгиос Василиу, деколонизация, ЕС, евроинтеграция, Кипр, кипрский конфликт, ТРСК

Заявление о конфликте интересов: Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

История статьи:

Поступила в редакцию: 30.09.2023. Принята к публикации: 30.10.2023.

Для цитирования:

Изотов В.С., Кардаш Н.В. Георгиос Василиу и императивы внешней политики Кипра. К вопросу о роли индивида в международных отношениях // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Государственное и муниципальное управление. 2023. Т. 10. № 4. С. 567–582. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8313-2023-10-4-567-582>