



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

SASKATOON, CANADA
S7N 0W0

October 27, 1992

Mr. Vassos Hadjiyerou
5 Calvos Street, Acropolis
Nicosia
Cyprus

Dear Mr. Hadjiyerou

Best greetings across the months and the miles. I am writing to bring you up to date on our Cyprus work and let you know how our plans for the future are progressing.

I am pleased to enclose a copy of the report on a conflict analysis workshop that was held in England in mid-1991, bringing together interested and influential individuals from the two communities for dialogue and peacebuilding discussions. The initial report was sent to participants in late 1991, and I have delayed sending out the final report to a wider network until the future of the project was clarified.

As you may know, in the February 1992 budget, the Canadian government announced the closure of the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security. At that time, I had submitted a proposal to continue the Cyprus workshop project to the Peace and Security Competition Fund administered by the Institute. This fund was eventually reconstituted as the Cooperative Security Competition Program of the Department of External Affairs and International Trade, and in August I was informed that my project had been partially funded assuming certain conditions could still be met. I am pleased to say that I have now received final approval to proceed with a project involving further workshops.

Thus, I am now in a position to begin exploring and planning for the possibility of further workshops in the areas outlined in the enclosed report, that is, education-journalism, business-economics, and social research-policy. As you know, at the present time, the political discussions are moving into a critical stage, and any planning of intercommunal activities will need to be sensitive to the outcomes of the current negotiations. Thus, I plan to visit Cyprus in January to begin consultations with a wide range of people on the directions that a workshop project might fruitfully follow.

I would like to thank you very much for your past interest and support for this work. If you have any comments on the report or any suggestions on how we might proceed, I would be pleased to hear these. In the meantime, I send all best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ron Fisher".

Ron Fisher, Ph.D.
Professor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Peacebuilding for Cyprus:
Report on a Conflict Analysis Workshop
June 17-21, 1991
Final Report
Ronald J. Fisher
May, 1992**

Note: Inquiries may be directed to Professor Ron Fisher at the Department of Psychology, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada, S7N 0W0. Many individuals and organizations contributed to the successful completion of this project, both in Canada and abroad. In particular, the author wishes to express deep appreciation to the participants and key associates from the two communities on the island, who while remaining anonymous, deserve a great deal of the credit for the outcomes. In addition to core funding and administrative support from the Institute, supplementary funding for site visits was provided by a research grant from the Faculty of Social Sciences at Carleton University. The initial site visit was made possible through the cooperation and support of the Department of National Defence. Finally, this project could not have been completed without the ongoing assistance and consultation provided by United Nations personnel, both in the Office of the Secretary General in New York and serving with UNFICYP on the island.

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	3
Preparation for the Workshop	6
Description of the Workshop	13
Introductions	13
Individual Perspectives of Major Issues	14
Underlying Concerns: Fears and Needs	16
Assurances and Acknowledgements	19
Principles and Qualities of a Renewed Relationship	21
Peacebuilding Activities, Resistances and Constraints	23
Evaluation and Closure	28
Evaluation of the Workshop	30
Conclusion	33
References	35

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Cyprus conflict has proven to be one of the most intractable disputes on the international scene and has drawn the attention of numerous third parties. Based on a strong commitment to peacekeeping and the role of the United Nations, Canadian interest was initially expressed by the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security through a series of interdisciplinary seminars, held in 1988-89. The current project builds on the seminar series to assess the potential of conflict analysis workshops as a means of facilitating dialogue and encouraging peacebuilding between the two communities.

The project included three site visits to the island and a weekend workshop in Ottawa in December of 1990 which brought together influential individuals of Greek and Turkish Cypriot origin living in Canada. The culmination of the project described in this report was a four-day workshop held in England in June of 1991 which provided a rare opportunity for sustained dialogue between Turkish and Greek Cypriot influentials from the island. The workshop sessions were facilitated by an international panel of social scientist-practitioners with expertise in conflict resolution. The workshop involved an intensive analysis of the conflict and the creation of ideas on joint peacebuilding activities with concepts provided by the third party panel.

The Greek and Turkish Cypriot participants were identified and invited with the assistance of key associates in each community with an attempt to represent as broad a political spectrum as feasible and to gain representation from the fields of social research, education, journalism and business. In addition to personal interviews prior to the workshop, participants were provided with a written outline which described in detail the nature and demands of the project. The venue for the workshop was a secluded yet accessible management conference centre in the English countryside close to London.

In terms of discussion topics, the workshop covered a number of critical areas suggested by

the third party panel. Major issues were identified through the individual perspectives of the participants. For Turkish Cypriots, the issues of equality, partnership, and recognition of their distinct identity were paramount. For Greek Cypriots, primary issues included Turkish influence, territory, the rights of refugees, and Turkish settlers. Joint issues identified by both panels included the lack of confidence and empathy in the current relationship and the lack of motivation to resolve the conflict. In terms of fundamental fears, the Greek Cypriot panel feared Turkish expansionism, recognition of the North, and cooperative efforts that might consolidate the status quo. The Turkish Cypriot panel's primary fear was of Greek Cypriot domination, both politically and economically. The third party panel's analysis suggested that the fear of losses in moving from the status quo outweighed the desire for gains that any renewed relationship might bring. In discussing basic needs, both sides identified security, equality, recognition of diversity and control of and access to territory. The third party noted that both sides saw many mutual benefits in a renewed relationship including economic well-being, longterm security, and cultural enrichment. Each side then brought forward acknowledgements and assurances for the other in order to address the articulated fears and needs and to be able to move toward the future. In discussing the type of desired future relationship between the two communities, the two panels came close to achieving consensus. Qualities of the relationship would include respect, trust, and empathy, and it would be based on the central understandings of past agreements as well as a fair adjustment of territory, assurances for human rights, and minimal outside interference. Outstanding questions which remained to be completely resolved centred around the nature and conditions of self-determination for each community and the nature of the security guarantees provided in any new agreement. Finally, the participants discussed potential peacebuilding activities in the areas of social research, economics and business, and education. A number of specific projects were identified through a high degree of cooperation and creativity. The third party panel provided input on different types of

peacebuilding actions and also the many constraints, resistances and pitfalls in carrying them out.

Closing comments and evaluations indicated that the workshop was a rare opportunity for constructive dialogue which resulted in increased understanding and considerable mutual learning for the participants. In addition, there were some new insights into old issues, and some valuable joint thinking on peacebuilding activities and a desired future relationship. However, the third party pointed out that deep fears based on the traumas of the past tend to overwhelm positive visions of the future. Therefore, almost every positive initiative succumbs to some resistance or constraint and the parties are thereby held hostage by their conflict. Nonetheless, all participants were very satisfied with the workshop and saw it as very useful. The workshop met or exceeded most expectations for communication and dialogue, and there was a strong call for more workshops involving an expanding network of individuals.

Introduction

The Cyprus conflict has proven to be one of the most intractable disputes on the international agenda over the last three decades. Following the formation of the United Nations Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) in 1964, a variety of third party initiatives have attempted to move the conflict toward settlement with very little success. The efforts of the United Nations, particularly the Office of the Secretary General, have been and continue to be at the centre of mediatory activities.

Canada has been a core contributor to UNFICYP from the beginning and continues to maintain and bear the cost of a comparatively large peacekeeping contingent on the island (Mitchell, 1988). In addition, many Canadians of Cypriot origin maintain an active interest in the conflict and remain ever hopeful of its ultimate resolution. These considerations led the Institute to undertake a major study on Cyprus through a series of seminars during 1988-89 under the conflict resolution element of its mandate. An integrated summary of the presentations and discussions from these seminars was published as an Institute working paper (Lafreniere and Mitchell, 1990), and a set of selected and edited papers has been published in book form by Macmillan of London (Salem, 1992).

In 1990, the Institute initiated a follow-up project on the Cyprus conflict designed to assess the usefulness of a discussion workshop approach for examining the potential and the difficulties of the transition from peacekeeping to peacemaking. In particular, the objective was to explore the utility of conflict analysis workshops for facilitating informal dialogue between the two communities and for serving as a peacebuilding mechanism.

The project culminated with a four-day workshop held in England in June, 1991, which brought together influential individuals from the two communities for an analysis of the conflict and a consideration of potential peacebuilding activities. Prior to this, there were three site visits to the

island by the Project Director and a weekend workshop in Ottawa in December, 1990, which involved dialogue among Canadians of Greek and Turkish Cypriot origin and provided invaluable preparation for the later workshop (Fisher, 1991). Overall, the project attests to the Institute's interest in the Cyprus conflict and provides an example of the type of demonstration research that is necessary to assess the usefulness of the workshop approach for understanding protracted conflict and encouraging movement toward resolution.

The purpose of the June workshop was to provide an opportunity of informal, unofficial dialogue on the Cyprus conflict between influential Turkish and Greek Cypriots living on the island. The discussions were facilitated and moderated by an international panel of social scientist-practitioners serving as third party consultants. Participants engaged in an intensive analysis of the conflict based on their own knowledge and experience combined with concepts and models about intergroup and international conflict provided by the third party team. The workshop also explored potential peacebuilding activities to encourage the transition from peacekeeping to peacemaking, and provided an indication of the usefulness of conflict analysis workshops in the conflict resolution process.

The workshop was held at a secluded yet accessible management conference center in the English countryside about thirty-five miles from London. Participants arrived on a Monday afternoon and departed the following Saturday morning. Sessions were held each morning and afternoon, with one evening session held in lieu of one afternoon that was devoted to recreational time. Participants took all meals together and the evenings were typically spent in socializing. Thus, the approximately four days of meeting time was a rich combination of formal and informal interaction. A broad and sequenced agenda was proposed and modified as appropriate by the third party within the context of an open discussion format.

This report will first describe the preparations for the workshop including the identification

of the third party panel, the site visits, the inviting of participants and the nature of the workshop setting. The workshop will be described based mainly on the author's observations and impressions supplemented by observations of other panel members. An attempt will be made to describe both the process and the content or substance of the discussions. The description will generally follow the order in which discussion flowed, but some reorganization of points within agenda items will be done in order to better capture the essence of discussion in relation to the agenda. An evaluation of the workshop will be provided based mainly on the reactions of participants to post-workshop questionnaires. The conclusion will comment on the utility of the workshop as an initial peacebuilding activity.

Preparation for the Workshop

The panel of third party consultants included Ron Fisher as Project Director, and Herbert Kelman, Chris Mitchell and John Groom, all of whom were principal investigators for the Cyprus project. Brian Mandell, also a principal investigator, who had taken part in the December workshop, was not able to participate due to another commitment.

In terms of background and interests, Ronald J. Fisher is a Professor of Psychology at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada, and at the time of the workshop was a Visiting Senior Research Fellow at the Institute and the Visiting Professor of Social Sciences at Carleton University, Ottawa. He has a longterm interest in the social psychology of intergroup and international conflict resolution and has contributed to the development of third party consultation since the early 1970s. Herbert C. Kelman is the Cabot Professor of Social Ethics in the Department of Psychology at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., and has made seminal contributions to the social psychology of international relations. He has been a pioneer in the development of the workshop approach since the mid 1960s, having organized numerous workshops

on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as well as being a third party panel member in a number of Cyprus workshops. Christopher R. Mitchell is Professor of Conflict Resolution and International Relations in the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia, U.S.A. Like Herbert Kelman, he is one of the pioneers of the workshop approach, having begun his work in international relations with John Burton, the primary creator of the conflict analysis workshop. Chris Mitchell has been a panel member in a number of workshops on various protracted conflicts, including Cyprus. A.J.R. Groom is Professor of International Relations at Kent University, Canterbury, England. John's contributions to the development of the workshop method and his interest in the Cyprus conflict also date back to work in the 1960s with John Burton and the Centre for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, which John Groom directed for a number of years. This background information is provided to identify the third party panel as an international and multi-disciplinary group with longterm interests in both conflict resolution and Cyprus, and with considerable expertise in workshop methodology.

An initial site visit to Cyprus by Fisher and Mandell was undertaken in May of 1990 with the support and assistance of the Department of Defence and UNFICYP, including the Canadian Contingent. Flights to Cyprus on military aircraft were provided as were accomodation and rations at the Canadian Barracks, situated in part in the old Ledra Palace Hotel in the Buffer Zone. In addition to providing a first hand view of the conflict and Canadian peacekeeping operations, the visit was essential for assessing the initial interest in and feasibility of the workshop approach. Informal interviews were held with a wide array of Greek and Turkish Cypriots in both official and nongovernmental roles. The longstanding contribution of Canada to UNFICYP and the Institute's initial Cyprus project provided a positive base from which to explore further possibilities with people on both sides of the Green Line. In general, there was qualified to enthusiastic support for the project mixed with some healthy skepticism, and many useful questions were raised about the

nature and location of the workshop, the general identity of the participants, and the objectives of the project. These impressions were shared and discussed at a planning meeting at the Institute in June, 1990, which brought together several of the principal investigators and project consultants. From this meeting emerged the directions for the second site visit and for a weekend workshop to be held in Ottawa.

A second site visit by Fisher was carried out in October, 1990 to further gauge and elicit support for the project and to continue seeking guidance on the design of the workshop. In addition, the visit was necessary to identify key associates in each community who served as consultants on many issues, including the timing of the workshop and the selection of potential participants. Without this high quality consultation and advice from knowledgeable and committed individuals, the project might be inappropriately or ineffectively implemented or fail entirely. A large number of informal interviews were held with a variety of individuals on both sides of the Green Line. As with the first site visit, the advice and assistance of UNFICYP personnel was instrumental to successful. It was concluded that there was sufficient interest among a broad spectrum of Cypriots in a workshop, and that there would not be official concerns or disapproval in either the North or the South of the island about the event.

In December, 1990, a conflict analysis workshop on the Cyprus conflict was held at the Institute in Ottawa, bringing together individuals primarily of Turkish and Greek Cypriot origin living in Canada (Fisher, 1991). This workshop was an important event in terms of engendering dialogue between the two sides, and also served as a very useful preparation for the June workshop by bringing members of the third party panel into a working relationship. In addition to ten members of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot panels and four members of the third party panel, the workshop was attended by approximately fifteen participant-observers drawn mainly from a graduate class in international mediation and problem solving which provided part of the context

for the workshop. Seventeen hours of discussion focused on underlying needs and fears of the two communities, mechanisms for addressing these, disadvantages of the status quo, resistances to resolution, and ways of providing mutual reassurance. There was a very useful exchange of perceptions and the generation of some new realizations, and some consensus on the nature of a renewed understanding required to resolve the conflict. Evaluations evidenced high levels of satisfaction and usefulness, with constructive advice for the third party panel to be more active in reducing unproductive communication and controlling competitive and argumentative interchanges. The overall sense was that key issues had been identified and that mutual understanding of the two sides' concerns had taken place.

A third and final site visit was carried out in February, 1991 by Fisher for the primary purpose of identifying and inviting participants from the two communities. In addition, advice and consultation continued to be elicited on the timing of the event, particularly in light of the forthcoming parliamentary elections in the South of the island scheduled for May. In consultation with the key associates in both communities, participants were invited who represented as broad a range on the political spectrum as feasible, and who came from a variety of fields and professions, primarily social research, higher education, business and journalism. The continuing advice and assistance of UNFICYP personnel, particularly the Force Commander and the Humanitarian Branch, was essential to the logistics of the visit and the progress of the project. It was concluded that interest in and commitment to the project was high among the people contacted in both communities, and that the month of June would be an appropriate time with a venue in England being an attractive and safe location.

In terms of inviting participants and informing them of the nature of the workshop, personal invitations were extended during the third site visit. The workshop was described as a unique, voluntary opportunity for dialogue and analysis, which would be highly interactive and relatively

open in terms of agenda. The facilitative and consultative role of the third party, in contrast to a directive or judgemental role, was also stressed. Following the site visit, formal letters of invitation were sent along with a detailed outline of the workshop.

The outline described the purpose of the workshop in the context of the project, stressed the informal and participative nature of the interaction, and outlined the initial agenda suggested by the third party. It was noted that the workshop was closed to anyone other than invited participants, including the media, and the confidentiality of the sessions was stressed. The methods of evaluating and reporting on the workshop as a research enterprise were described, and appreciation was expressed for the considerable time and energy that participants would invest. The purpose of the outline was to communicate the demands of the workshop, to assure participants of professional conduct by the third party panel, and to seek informed consent for participation.

All of the individuals who were invited to come subsequently confirmed their participation by mail. Information on the workshop venue was sent to participants as was a pre-workshop questionnaire and a copy of a press release. The press release described the general nature of the project and the workshop, and was selectively distributed in Canada, Europe and Cyprus at the beginning of June in order to inform the media and hopefully counteract any misunderstandings that might be generated about the workshop.

The participants who attended the workshop were an impressive group of individuals who are widely respected and influential in their respective communities. They came from a variety of professions and careers with educational backgrounds at the university level often including postgraduate studies. Their general interests covered the fields of higher education, social research, business and journalism, and most had cross-cutting interests in which a primary field of endeavour was supplemented by secondary interests and involvements. Thus, they collectively represented a

rich network of interconnections within and to some degree between their two communities. All participants to varying degrees have ongoing contact with major opinion leaders and official actors in their community. However, in terms of political interests and positions, the participants were generally apolitical, in the sense of not being strongly identified with political parties. At the same time, they generally represented the political mainstream and the modal opinion within their two communities, rather than the extremes in terms of ideology or espoused solutions to the Cyprus problem. With regard to the latter consideration, all participants would be regarded as favouring a federal solution of some fashion. In terms of demographics, the participants were middle aged, male professionals, all of whom are well established in their careers. Thus, younger, working class and female representation was not evident at the workshop and representativeness was therefore limited. Attempts were made to secure participation by women, but unfortunately these were unsuccessful in the time available and within the constraint of an approximate matching of professional fields across the participants from the two communities. Future workshops should look to address these limitations, particularly as they relate to important areas of interest such as primary education, humanitarian and social welfare interests, the concerns of working people, and so on. However for the present workshop, the central consideration was that the participants were a moderately representative group of concerned and articulate influentials who are committed to a peaceful resolution of the conflict and to a vibrant and productive future for Cyprus.

Prior to the arrival of participants, the third party panel held a planning meeting at the workshop site to go over the agenda, discuss role coordination among the panel members, and to consider the social and physical arrangements for the sessions. This meeting also provided the project director an opportunity to brief the panel members on the backgrounds and interests of the participants and to review the current state of the conflict and the atmosphere on the island. The major agenda items as described in the outline to participants included the main issues in the

conflict, the underlying concerns, the overall, in-principle shape of a solution, the resistances and constraints impeding resolution, and concrete peacebuilding activities.

The panel decided to emphasize issues that are sustaining the conflict, look for similarities in underlying needs and fears, stress the qualities and type of relationship necessary for a solution, try to bring about understanding of the other side's resistances and constraints, and encourage joint peacebuilding actions of both a de-escalatory and cooperative nature. Procedural mechanisms for covering the topics were also discussed, for example, having the two sides discuss their needs and fears in turn with only clarifications and reactions permitted until both had presented. The panel decided to rotate the role of discussion chair for each morning or afternoon session, and discussed ways of keeping the sessions focused and productive. In terms of objectives for the workshop, the third party agreed to work toward an understanding of the needs and priorities of the two sides, rather than specific bargaining positions, and to facilitate productive dialogue and confrontation that would result in a unique and successful experience for the participants.

The venue for the workshop provided for optimal social and physical arrangements. The setting in a small village in the Sussex countryside was both pastoral and picturesque, and well removed from the demands of the outside world. The management conference centre provided good accommodation and excellent food facilities, with all necessary support services to provide for the workshop. In the evenings, a pub and games room was available for participants to socialize and to gain respite from the relatively formal and intense atmosphere of the discussions. The workshop sessions themselves were held in a large, airy and comfortable room with an ante room for refreshment breaks and the odd telephone call. In lieu of the preferred round table, the discussions took place at a square table with rounded corners which approximated a circular shape. Meals were taken in a residential style dining room, usually with two large tables reserved for the workshop participants. Thus, in total, the venue provided a comfortable and efficient setting that

was highly conducive to the informal and yet focused atmosphere of the workshop.

Description of the Workshop: Process and Substance

Introductions

The members of the third party panel were on site and therefore able to greet and meet the participants upon their arrival. Participants from the two communities who did not know each other took the initiative in making introductions and a warm atmosphere began developing. All delegates arrived on schedule and the formal activities began with a reception and welcoming dinner in a private dining room. Participants were welcomed to the workshop by Ron Fisher on behalf of the Institute and the Faculty of Social Sciences at Carleton University which had provided supplementary funding for the project. Individual introductions then followed in which participants and third party panel members indicated their interest in the project and their personal involvement and connections with Cyprus and the conflict. These experiences indicated the wealth and breadth of human resources that were available to the workshop process.

An overview of the project and the workshop format was then provided by Ron Fisher who stressed the need for mutuality and creativity in achieving meaningful dialogue and problem solving. Herbert Kelman outlined the groundrules for the workshop sessions with an emphasis on strict confidentiality, partly defined by a shared understanding not to make attributions of statements to any individuals following the workshop. Other guidelines included a focus on analyzing the conflict rather than debate or negotiation, flexible expectations regarding agenda and outcomes, and an acceptance of the third party panel as facilitators rather than an audience to be convinced of one's position. An additional guideline requested participants not to bring documents or books into the meeting room, since these are often referred to in a legalistic or debating manner to buttress points or positions that are being put forward.

There followed some questions and discussions on the nature of the sessions, and participants were asked to think about their individual perspectives on the conflict, which would be the lead off topic for the next morning. The evening ended as it had begun, on a positive and friendly note which augured well for the discussions.

Individual Perspectives of Major Issues (Morning of Day One)

In opening the first session, the third party chair again welcomed the participants and invited analytical discussion on the main points of the agenda and the constructive confrontation of differences. The participants were supportive of the agenda items as given in the outline and as presented with some modifications by the third party panel. There was some discussion and change of the meeting times and some clarification of other administrative items. In terms of seating arrangements, the four members of the third party panel had chosen to sit two at each corner of the square table with rounded corners, in order to be able to see each other directly. The participants spontaneously sat in an alternating order, that is interspersed around the table, rather than Greek Cypriots on one side and Turkish Cypriots on the other. This indicated to the third party that the participants had indeed come with expectations of a dialogue rather than a debate or negotiation.

The first agenda item was to invite each participant to share his individual perspective on the major issues that are sustaining the conflict. This was generally done with each person providing some rationale, background information and clarification of his perspective in response to questions and comments. The atmosphere of this first session was generally constructive, although initially fragile, in that some potentially provocative questions and challenges were brought forward through a debating style of discussion. However, in general the group resisted moving into an adversarial approach, and with third party assistance was able to generally maintain an analytic

stance of mutual diagnosis, that is, the sharing and understanding of perspectives even though these involved significant differences.

The issues brought forward demonstrated considerable variety and a strong sense of validity. No attempt was made to build a systematic or exhaustive list of issues, but simply to acknowledge the complexity of these basic concerns. Turkish Cypriots strongly made the point that they wish to be treated as a partner in a joint homeland rather than as a minority. They want equality, and hold a primary concern that there is a lack of a shared conception of partnership on the part of the Greek Cypriots. They saw the importance of recognizing the two distinct communities on Cyprus, and were concerned about the use of international pressure to force a solution on them.

Greek Cypriots expressed a strong concern about Turkish influence in Cyprus and about the presence of Turkish settlers in the North. Their primary concern was the need for a just territorial division in any settlement, and this was linked to an issue regarding the rights of Greek Cypriot refugees. A concern was also expressed over small confidence building measures that might become part of the status quo and in the absence of an overall agreement would then be a loss to the Greek Cypriots.

Both sides expressed the issue about outside interests negatively influencing the situation, and about the presence of foreign troops on the island. They noted the lack of confidence in the relationship, as well as a lack of empathy and a common objective language for communicating with each other. In addition, both panels perceived a lack of motivation on the part of both sides for a solution, and decried the confrontational approach in which common ground is seldom seen or acknowledged. There was consensus that not only are the two communities being pushed farther apart, but that they are being pushed toward outside actors for support and ultimately for their survival. The critical question raised at the end of the session by the third party was how the two sides could undertake confidence building measures without threatening the side that was making

concessions.

In general, the session on issues provided for some very valuable exchange of information, including the rationale and priority of major concerns. In addition, there was some useful clarification on specific concerns, such as an explanation of the Turkish settler issue from the Turkish Cypriot point of view, and a description of the presence of Greek troops in the South by the Greek Cypriot panel. The primary function of the third party was to facilitate this exchange and clarification of information, and to underscore common issues. The tone was generally a constructive one in which the parties worked to present and clarify their perceptions and to understand those of the other side.

Underlying Concerns: Fears and Needs (Afternoon of Day One and Morning of Day Two)

The third party chair opened the session on underlying concerns by asking what the fears and needs of the two communities are, including those interests that might not be represented in the two panels. The Greek Cypriot panel spoke of their community's fear of Turkish influence and expansionism in the sense that Turkey dominates Turkish Cypriot policy-making now and could possibly continue to do so in a renewed federation. Looking to the future, it was feared that if a new federation failed, this could with Turkish influence result in two separate and internationally recognized states. The Turkish Cypriot reaction was an attempt to counter what they saw as the exaggerated misperception of Turkish expansionism and domination, and to stress that the Turkish Cypriots determine Turkish policy on Cyprus rather than vice-versa. Further, they feared that the Greek Cypriot emphasis on Turkey was leaving the Turkish Cypriots out of the picture when in fact they are central. The third party commented that over the period of recent history, both communities seem to fear the influence and the expansionism of the mother country of the other side.

On economic matters, Turkish Cypriots fear domination by the Greek Cypriot community, and therefore want support to develop their economy through the lifting of embargos, the creation of joint enterprises and the implementation of future controls. However, Greek Cypriots fear cooperation since it might work to consolidate the status quo. Greek Cypriots also fear the economic integration of the North with Turkey. The Turkish Cypriot response was that they seemed to have little choice, but given choice would prefer to be an economic partner of the Greek Cypriots rather than an economic province of Turkey. The Turkish Cypriot panel also provided clarification which countered the Greek Cypriot concern that the economy in the North is already highly integrated with that of Turkey. The issue of application to the European Economic Community provided an illustration of how a lack of cooperation between the two communities may ultimately be costly for both. This led the third party to raise the question as to how each side could provide reassurances to the other without jeopardizing its own position.

In general, the tone of the session was positive, with constructive attempts by all to explain and understand perceptions and positions. Again, there were some interchanges that reflected a debating style, but for the most part, participants were able to maintain analysis and dialogue. The outcome was a deeper understanding and appreciation on both sides of the central fears of the other in both political and economic terms.

During a planning session at the end of the first day, the third party panel ascertained that the discussion so far seemed to indicate that the status quo appears to be better than any other conceivable alternatives. This seems to be due to the catastrophic fears that each party holds: the Turkish Cypriot fears of domination, and the Greek Cypriot fears of the Turkish Cypriots gaining recognition one way or another. To put it simply, fear of losses dominates the desire for gains.

Therefore, at the beginning of the morning session on day two, the third party chair questioned whether on both sides the status quo, while not ideal, was seen as better than any new

relationship that might emerge and that could be lost. The third party suggested that the fear of potential losses is stronger than the attraction of any possible gains, and therefore there is mutual avoidance of an agreement. It was thereby suggested that the participants might want to look at positive needs that could be better met through the development of a new relationship.

The Turkish Cypriot panel brought forward a number of basic needs including the control of territory through bizonality, political equality, recognition of separate and distinct identity, and security. In response to Greek Cypriot questions, a number of useful clarifications and elaborations were brought forward. For example, control over territory need not involve borders, but local administration with initial restrictions on movement and a transition period that would move toward the operationalization of the three freedoms within a reasonable period.

On the question of recognition, the Greek Cypriot panel did not see recognition of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus as a realistic possibility, since it essentially meant the dissolution of the Republic of Cyprus. The Turkish Cypriot panel stressed the need for recognition and respect as an equal partner with a separate administration. The third party suggested there was a need for some form of recognition between implicit recognition and political recognition, perhaps sociological recognition, and a further suggestion brought forward the concept of "interlocuteur valeur" which entails not full diplomatic recognition but recognition of the moral and political validity of a party and respect in relation to third parties.

The Greek Cypriot panel articulated a number of important needs including that of security, the right to territory and residence, and equality within the context of a strong federal system. The security of the two communities and of Cyprus as a whole should be guaranteed against the intervention of any outside powers. It was also emphasized that without a settlement, there is no security for either community at present. A call was made for a respect for diversity and the fostering of an island-wide identity that would include both Greek and Turkish Cypriots. Turkish

Cypriots again stressed the importance of equality and distinctness in all aspects of the relationship.

In light of the discussion so far, the third party asked what benefits a renewed relationship could bring to both communities? This led to the creation of a joint list which included balanced economic development and prosperity, freedom from foreign intervention, the benefits of European association, cultural enrichment, freedom of movement and interaction, positive effects on relations between Turkey and Greece, a positive rather than negative direction of energy, and the avoidance of future violent conflict. This led the third party to conclude that there was an interest in changing the status quo and that the primary motivators for doing so were economic well being, quality of life, longterm security, and greater independence. However, these attractions are currently overpowered by the fears discussed earlier, and therefore the parties are reluctant to move forward in negotiations that jeopardize any current advantages.

Therefore, the critical question becomes what short and longterm assurances can be provided by the parties to each other? In particular, how can Turkish Cypriots be assured of equality and respect, and how can Greek Cypriots be assured that their sense of justice and fairness will be addressed? It was also noted that the parties need to decouple themselves from the past, and that one way of doing this is to acknowledge the sense of hurt—physical, moral, psychological—that each carries. Reciprocal acknowledgment of hurt would take account of a tragic history, and more importantly, not allow it to determine the future.

Assurances and Acknowledgements (Early Afternoon of Day Two)

The session was opened by the third party chair calling for each side to articulate the assurances and acknowledgements that it could give the other side as a means of responding to their fears and needs and to prepare for moving toward a renewed and mutually acceptable relationship. In the ensuing discussion, each side gave some assurances and acknowledgements, but also ask for

some from the other party. The third party intervened on occasion to clarify communication and to call for a mutual and balanced process of both asking for and giving assurances.

The Turkish Cypriot panel acknowledged that undesirable acts were carried out in 1974, and acknowledged the plight of the Greek Cypriot refugees. They also acknowledged the security concerns of the Greek Cypriots and the fear which that community has of the Turkish army. In relation to this, the Turkish Cypriots also acknowledged the importance of dealing with the territorial issue and the implementation of the three freedoms. They indicated that the latter would need to be carried out in accord with the principles of the 1977 high level agreement and would need to be phased in as trust developed. For their part, the Turkish Cypriot panel ask for an assurance that enosis was dead, and for an acknowledgement by the Greek Cypriot side of the Turkish Cypriot fear of domination. They also saw the need for an acknowledgement that integration cannot be forced on their community, an assurance of balanced economic development, and a realization that a Turkish guarantee of any settlement is necessary for the vast majority of Turkish Cypriots.

The Greek Cypriot panel acknowledged that nationalism and violence in the past were counterproductive and gave an assurance that Turkish Cypriots would be directly involved in the state building process in the future. It was pointed out that enosis has been officially withdrawn by parliamentary decree. The importance of reducing the subjective and biased interpretation of history was acknowledged as was the importance of developing empathy between the two communities. It was acknowledged that Turkish Cypriots have exactly the same rights as Greek Cypriots, and that a federal system was the best way to proceed, even though some Greek Cypriot opinion is against this. Greek Cypriots also acknowledged the importance of joint economic activity in a renewed relationship. For their part, the Greek Cypriot panel ask for an acknowledgement that the events of 1974 were retrogressive, an assurance of nonintervention on the part of Turkey,

and an assurance that the Turkish Cypriot side is willing to compromise in reaching a settlement.

The session thereby resulted in a useful exchange of opinions and ideas that touched on some very sensitive issues for both parties. In that way, it laid the groundwork for moving to a consideration of the kind of relationship the parties wish to re-establish.

Principles and Qualities of a Renewed Relationship (Late Afternoon and Evening of Day Two, Early Morning of Day Three)

For the second half of the afternoon, the third party chair opened the session with the question of what kind of renewed relationship would deal with the fears and the needs that had been articulated. The third party also suggested that participants think in terms of principles rather than labels (e.g., bizonal—what does it mean?), and realize that there needed to be a longterm process of building expectations of normal behaviour. The third party facilitated the discussion by developing a list of principles and qualities after some points had been made and adding to this list as discussion proceeded.

There was generally wide agreement on the qualities that would be necessary in a renewed relationship. These included mutual respect, trust and reciprocal empathy. Good neighbourliness would take into account both the self-interest of each community as well as the wider interests of both communities. The relationship would be flexible, in the sense of give and take over a range of related issues, and evolving, in the sense of moving through confidence building to the implementation of full human rights for all. In addition, the relationship would entail mutual and balanced economic benefits for both communities.

In terms of principles and in line with past understandings, the relationship would be legitimated in a federal, bizonal and bicomunal republic. Within the relationship, there would be mutual self-determination with certain qualifications and conditions to be agreed upon,

particularly on the right of secession. It would be essential to remove any sense of grievance and to agree on a fair adjustment of territory. The relationship would involve political equality between the two communities, and full assurances for human rights. Each community would agree to no future union with any other country, and there should be minimal outside interference in Cyprus. Any settlement would need to be supported by outside guarantees, but there was no agreement on the nature and source of these.

Running through the discussion alongside the development of the list of principles and qualities, there was some expression of differences and attempts to clarify a number of contentious issues. There were differences of opinion on having a strong central government in the new republic versus giving maximum freedom to the constituent states. The distribution of resources among the levels of government was also uncertain. The question of self-determination was particularly sensitive, and while much useful discussion and some agreement took place, there was not consensus on the nature of the conditions that would satisfy both sides. Finally, the most contentious issue revolved around the question of security guarantees for the two communities and for Cyprus as a whole.

On the question of guarantees, the Greek Cypriots could not understand why only a Turkish guarantee would satisfy the Turkish Cypriots. The response in part was that only Turkey was seen by Turkish Cypriots as providing a potentially effective and serious guarantee. The Turkish guarantee was also necessary due to the lack of trust engendered by the events of 1974 and previously, as well as to the uncertainty about federation among Greek Cypriots. The Turkish Cypriot panel asked why the Greek Cypriot side feared the Turkish guarantee. The response was that given the events of 1974, the Greek Cypriots cannot accept the same army that waged war against them as a guarantor of a settlement. In addition, there are fears that the Turkish guarantee backs up exorbitant demands by the Turkish Cypriots, which if agreed to, would produce an

imbalanced and unstable settlement. There is also a fear that the Turkish army might be used against the renewed federation in some illegitimate way. It was pointed out that some of these concerns could be dealt with in the conditions that were placed on the implementation of any guarantees. The Turkish Cypriots stressed the need to build trust before relinquishing the Turkish guarantee. The Greek Cypriots indicated that it was difficult to build trust on a fear of the Turkish army.

The issue of security thus provided a clear dilemma that is typical of protracted conflicts: the arrangements which one party sees as essential for its security are seen by the other party as threatening its security. Thus in the current situation, each side sees certain conditions as necessary and these are unacceptable to the other side. In ending the discussion, there was a note of optimism in that the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee was seen as providing a possible framework or at least a starting point. The Turkish Cypriots thought that the arrangements should be the same as in the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, while the Greek Cypriots wanted to see no unilateral right of intervention by any guarantor and would prefer not to have either the Turkish or the Greek military as a potential actor in the guarantees. In addition to emphasizing the intractable nature of the security dilemma, the third party underscored the principle that only the two communities can really guarantee the security of the other.

Peacebuilding Activities, Resistances and Constraints (Late Morning of Day Three, Morning and Early Afternoon of Day Four)

Following the intensive discussion of relationship qualities and the issues embedded within these, the workshop turned directly to a consideration of potential peacebuilding activities. The third party suggested that a discussion of the resistances and constraints impeding movement toward resolution would occur within this context of discussing concrete actions to de-escalate the conflict.

This discussion began later in the morning of day three, the afternoon and evening of which were devoted to recreational and social activities. The discussion then continued on day four up to mid-afternoon at which point evaluation and closing comments began.

The third party chair opened the session with very practical questions about what needs to be done, how should it be done, and what activities could be carried out by the workshop participants? An immediate comment supported by all participants was that the workshop itself was demonstrating how useful it is for the two sides to talk in order to understand each other and the causes of the conflict. There then ensued a mutual generation of possible areas of joint cooperation, with acknowledgement of realistic constraints, and an understanding that any activities must be carried out without prejudice to a final settlement.

In the area of economics, a call was made for joint business ventures involving entrepreneurs from the two communities which would serve needs on both sides. Mixed committees of businesspeople could come together to plan and develop cooperative activities and to prepare the business sector to face the challenges of European competition and interaction. Trade between the two communities could be opened up, especially on products where each community can provide an advantage to the other. Internationally, the two communities should cooperate and participate in meetings wherever possible, such as is now occurring in the International Chamber of Commerce.

In the area of social research and policy, there was consensus on the need for common projects focusing on various aspects of the Cyprus problem. These projects would be carried out by joint teams and could be initiated through existing research centres. In addition, research seminars could be held on topics of common interest, such as federalism or the relationship between Cyprus and Europe. Dialogue meetings should also be held to bring together influential individuals from the two communities to increase understanding and trust. All of these sessions should be held on both sides of the Green Line.

In the area of education, a strong need for the revision of curricula was identified in order to stop the enmity between the two communities that partly starts in the schools. A joint committee with outside experts was proposed that would examine and revise existing textbooks to remove erroneous and prejudiced material. Suggestions were also made for moving toward bilingual education in both communities.

A number of other areas of potential cooperation were identified. The water supply on the island was seen as an urgent matter, and a strong call for joint water projects was made. A relaxation of restrictions in the sports field and the initiation of both intercommunal and international sports activities were suggested. Television programming that would bring the culture of each community to the other would be valuable. In terms of conflict de-escalation, a call for further deconfrontation on the Green Line by UNFICYP was brought forward.

The third party was generally very supportive of the creative and cumulative discussion that took place. Its main function was to clarify points and to keep the discussion focused on one initiative at a time, which was not an easy task given the high degree of creative energy that was flowing. However, the third party also brought forward a number of cautions, in addition to those previously mentioned. It was pointed out that initial peacebuilding activities should bypass or minimize any political ramifications. Any activities that were seen as consolidating the status quo or providing recognition or advantage to either side would likely be doomed to failure. It was especially important in the early going to avoid failure if at all possible.

The voicing of these cautions led to some very useful discussion of the requirements and principles by which successful peacebuilding activities could be carried out. These included equality of status of individuals or organizations in the interaction, a focus on issues that are compelling and not politically sensitive, neutrality in relation to an ultimate solution, mutual benefit to the two communities, and involvement of a third party and outside resources. These realistic ideas showed

a great deal of similarity to the conditions for constructive intergroup contact which have been identified through research in social science.

In starting the morning session of day four, the third party chair outlined and gave examples of three broad categories of conflict de-escalation and peacebuilding. Unilateral initiatives which are significant and dramatic can sometimes achieve a breakthrough where smaller, incremental moves will simply be discounted. Joint problem solving acknowledges the fears and hopes of all parties and requires a mutual involvement in all stages of the process from identification of difficulties to the creation and implementation of solutions. Coordinated action or parallelism is useful in relationships where the parties have a great deal of knowledge of what each other is doing and can plan separate but complementary actions accordingly. The third party then invited the participants to apply the ideas on peacebuilding to the Cyprus problem, partly by drawing on suggestions already made.

The participants first acknowledged the mixed situation in which Cypriots find themselves. On the one hand, joint peacebuilding activities are attractive for dealing with many shared issues and causes. On the other hand, almost any intercommunal activity is subject to the constraints and resistances identified earlier. The key is to attempt to work within the constraints and plan in a way that deals with resistances.

In this light, a number of possible joint activities were identified and discussed. One proposed project was a joint exhibition of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot artists that would be attended by members of both communities. There was detailed discussion of this proposal at different points throughout the session and this served to illustrate both the difficulties and the strategies that needed to be considered for success to be achieved. Another suggestion was made to form a contact group to coordinate joint activities between the communities. It was further proposed that the participants in the workshop themselves should form a joint coordinating

committee to plan and facilitate intercommunal activities. It was also suggested that parallel organizations and associations should be encouraged to organize joint activities. Television interviews on both sides of the Green Line with members of the other community were seen as one way of increasing understanding. A final concrete proposal was to establish a joint research centre focusing on the Cyprus problem and the prospects for peacebuilding. The centre would have branches on both sides of the Green Line and would start its activities with common projects designed to attract outside resources.

One question that ran throughout the discussion focused on the numerical representation of the two communities in joint activities and the implications of this for perceived equality. The third party pointed out that two separate principles appeared to underlie the discussion and some misunderstanding within it: collective equality and proportional representation. These two principles are separate and need to be applied differentially depending on the situation. The former is an important principle in the overall relationship, while the latter is often important in distributing resources or opportunities. Collective equality does not translate to proportional equality in all interactions, while a lack of equal numbers in any particular situation does not imply collective inequality. However, many forms of interaction, such as workshops, are of maximum benefit when there is a roughly equal number of participants from each community.

The third party provided a summary and an integration of much of the discussion in terms of the potential and the pitfalls of cooperative peacebuilding activities using the proposal for a joint art exhibition as an example. It was emphasized that cooperative activities are extremely difficult to initiate and complete since any act has political implications (e.g., in terms of recognition, equality, legitimacy) and either side may try to take advantage. It is also feared by both sides that any step that improves the situation of the other side might consolidate the status quo. Thus, the same obstacles that hamper political agreement are also the constraints that stop peacebuilding

activities from breaking through to the political level. Unfortunately, failed efforts confirm original stereotypes, reduce trust and produce self-fulfilling prophecies. The way to prevent this is first through mutual sensitization of each side by the other of the political constraints that operate on its side. Second, it is essential to identify areas and forms of cooperation that minimally arouse political concerns and that are not typically where either side tries to score political points. Thus, it is important to have an intensive, joint review of all ideas to find hidden snags. The third party also identified the high degree of mutual positive motivation that the discussion had demonstrated, but advised caution, especially with quick proposals that may be subject to all the constraints and pitfalls. Any attempts to move ahead too quickly may be self-defeating.

Evaluation and Closure (Late Afternoon Day Four)

The last session of the workshop was initiated with the participants and the third party panel members completing a post workshop questionnaire. The questionnaire included ratings on satisfaction, usefulness and level of tension of the workshop, and asked open-ended questions on how well the workshop met expectations and how it could be improved, on the third party role and possible improvements, and on any learnings gained from the workshop. The questionnaire served as a useful summary evaluation and also stimulated the respondents toward closing comments.

The third party drew attention to a number of concluding understandings about the workshop. In line with the ground rules on confidentiality and non-attribution of comments, it was stressed that any notes or photographs taken during the workshop were for personal use only and not for any publication or media usage. The third party also outlined the procedure for producing a draft report for comment and revision and a final report which would be available as a public document. The third party also ask that there be no other reports or publicity on the workshop until the final report was available.

The closing comments by participants yielded a number of common themes. The workshop was seen as a rare opportunity for informal interaction, open discussion and constructive dialogue which resulted in a great deal of mutual learning. A clear need for present and future cooperation was identified, but this needed to be realistic and within constraints. There was also some very useful ideas brought forward for unilateral initiatives and some concluding clarifications on certain issues. In general, there was a strong sense of commitment to the dialogue process including the need to develop a common, nonprovocative language.

Closing comments by members of the third party panel yielded generally positive acknowledgements with some qualifications and concerns. Participants had achieved a degree of sensitivity to each other and had learned to use some of the same language. Participants had also made good use of the opportunity to learn from each other, but the potential to move toward a future relationship through joint interaction had been limited and would continue to be very difficult. Both sides had a positive vision of the future that is better than the status quo, but this is overwhelmed by fears that the traumas of the past will reassert themselves. Thus, the key question is how can each party reduce the other's fears of the future? The risks of moving toward a full settlement lead the parties to be hesitant and to accept a relatively comfortable present situation. Thus, even though the prize of a resolution is great, there is no compelling urge to secure it when the present is comfortable and the price of failure seriously threatens the existing sense of well-being.

The third party chair concluded the session by expressing appreciation to the participants for respecting the norms of the workshop. There had been a great deal of useful information exchange and considerable motivation to acknowledge and understand the problems, but no strong new realizations. The discussions on peacebuilding underscored the importance of developing a language of reassurance and of moving cautiously on cooperative activities so that a "thousand

traps" and a "hundred locks" could be avoided. In the final analysis, the relationship between the parties is critical, and it is therefore of paramount importance to understand and show respect for the other side.

On the final evening, the workshop gathered for a reception and a farewell dinner with no formal agenda. Everyone enjoyed the opportunity for informal closing interaction, and the participants departed later that evening or the next morning. The third party panel departed on the next afternoon, after having a chance to discuss their final reactions to the workshop in terms of the discussion process and the third party role. In their minds, the workshop was a clear success within the context of its objectives, much to the credit of the participants, but the conflict itself continues to be very difficult if not intractable.

Evaluation of the Workshop

The post workshop evaluation questionnaire mirrored and elaborated many of the closing comments made on the last afternoon. Members of the Turkish and Greek Cypriot panels were very satisfied with the workshop, producing an average rating of 4.5 on a five-point scale. The predominant theme in comments about satisfaction was how much the discussions had helped the participants understand and learn about the other community. The third party panel also rated satisfaction highly with an average of 4.2, commenting that information exchange and mutual learning had been excellent, but that more intense conflict analysis and problem solving would have been additive.

In terms of usefulness, the average rating of participants was 4.4 on a five-point scale, and a number of comments were made. One participant indicated that the workshop showed the prospect of better understanding, while another commented that the real test of usefulness will be application of ideas following the workshop. The third party provided an average rating of 4.0 and

noted that effective communication had induced greater sensitivity of the two sides to each other's concerns and had led to new insights into the complexity of the issues. While the discussion of coordinated back-home activities was useful, the participants probably needed to spend more time on generating ideas for removing constraints in the two communities so that such activities could be successful.

On the rating of tension level in the workshop, participants and the third party panel each gave average ratings of 4.5 on a five-point scale from 1 being very tense to 5 being very comfortable. Comments supported this high level of comfortableness, with participants indicating that they found it easy to express their views in a climate of mutual respect and flexibility. The third party noted that while there were moments of tension, a generally comfortable atmosphere prevailed in which the participants showed respect for the third party and the workshop agenda.

When asked how well the workshop met expectations, most participants indicated that these had been met or exceeded. Specific areas mentioned were the understanding, learning and exchange of views between the two sides. For the third party panel, the workshop met expectations for improving communication and establishing dialogue, and exceeded expectations for constructive and respectful interaction, especially given that there was not a complete consensus on the future. Higher expectations for a deeper analysis of conflict processes and dilemmas, and for breakthroughs on key issues were not met.

In commenting on the third party role, the participants were quite complimentary, seeing it as very helpful and contributive. Their sense was that the third party had established a useful framework, facilitated the flow of the discussion, added some new ideas, and allowed the participants to address the more difficult issues in the conflict. The third party panel saw their role in similar ways, essentially as an active facilitator and moderator of discussion who maintained the agenda and at times noted misinterpretations or blindspots and controlled disruptive interchanges.

In terms of improving the third party role in future workshops, the participants mainly looked for more substantive input, particularly on constitutional matters pertaining to different forms of federalism in other countries. In viewing its own functioning, the third party panel produced a variety of specific comments, for example, that there might have been more highlighting of how interaction between the two panels in the workshop reflected broader relations and issues between the two communities.

When asked how the workshop could be improved, participants made a number of useful suggestions such as focusing on specific issues in more detail and inviting individuals with more divergent views. The third party panel echoed the latter suggestion, and also called for a longer workshop to allow for more sustained problem solving and to be able to take a day off in the middle. In line with a participant suggestion, this day could be used for a short trip to some site of interest to the group.

When asked regarding learnings about the conflict or about either side in the conflict, the predominant theme was again increased understanding and knowledge of each side for the other. Greek Cypriots noted how much better they could now see how Turkish Cypriots were approaching the problem, how they perceived reality, and what rationale underlies their surface arguments on key issues. Turkish Cypriots indicated a realization of Greek Cypriot's sensitivity to issues such as recognition of the North and the Turkish guarantee, and now understood better the depth of their concern regarding territory. One comment noted how misinformed both sides are of each other, and how misconceptions can be changed through information exchange and discussion.

Third party panel members noted a number of learnings about the conflict, including the relative saliency of particular issues. One member noted that the Turkish Cypriots appear to be caught in a dilemma the same as the Greek Cypriots regarding ultimate resolution. They want to remain in the relationship and yet feel driven toward separation or incorporation with Turkey, which

is not their first choice. Another panel member commented that both sides have a genuine interest in establishing a new, more unified relationship, but are overwhelmed by the fear of losing their present advantages. Finally, in a practical sense, one member of the third party commented that almost every positive initiative succumbs to some resistance or constraint, and that in holding everything hostage to the conflict, the parties entrap both themselves and their future.

Conclusion

The workshop clearly demonstrates the utility of this form of dialogue as an initial peacebuilding mechanism. The constructive exchange and clarification of information on key topics lays the basis for considering positive joint activities directed toward conflict de-escalation. Both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot panels outlined their high priority issues in the conflict and the needs and fears that underlie these. Each provided acknowledgements and assurances to the other that prepared the way to discuss the type of renewed relationship that would be mutually desirable. And both contributed to the creation of a number of constructive ideas for peacebuilding activities that would take account of existing constraints and resistances in a mutual search for a better future for both communities.

The workshop thus provided a rare opportunity for sustained dialogue, increased understanding and joint learning that provided for some new insights on old issues. In addition, it led to some innovative and cooperative thinking on peacebuilding and a desired future for Cyprus. However, deep fears based on the traumas of the past continue to overwhelm any vision of the future. Thus, almost every positive initiative is likely to be stopped or rendered ineffective by some perceived linkage to the overall political situation. In this situation, it is difficult to see how people of good will can make progress toward a just and lasting peace on the island.

The participants and the third party panel were generally very satisfied with the workshop

and saw it as quite useful. The workshop met or exceeded everyone's expectations for communication and dialogue, thus indicating the unique potential of this methodology for conflict analysis and ultimately resolution. There were strong calls for more workshops of a similar nature and of a somewhat longer duration. Given this sense of support, it is incumbent upon the project team to continue to explore the possibilities and to seek funding for a broader series of workshops involving an ever widening network of committed and influential individuals from the two communities.

References

- Fisher, R.J. (1991). *Conflict analysis workshop on Cyprus, Nov. 30–Dec. 2, 1990. Final workshop report.* Ottawa: Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security.
- Lafreniere, F. and Mitchell, R. (1990). *Cyprus: Visions for the future.* Ottawa: Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security, Working Paper No. 21.
- Mitchell, R. (1988). *Peacekeeping and peacemaking in Cyprus.* Ottawa: Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security, Background Paper No. 23.
- Salem, N. (ed.). (1992). *Cyprus: A regional conflict and its resolution.* London: Macmillan.