



CRiSSMA

CENTRO DI RICERCHE SUL SISTEMA SUD E IL MEDITERRANEO ALLARGATO
RESEARCH CENTRE ON THE SOUTHERN SYSTEM AND WIDER MEDITERRANEAN

IOANNIS THEODOR MAZIS



THE MEDITERRANEAN
GEOPOLITICAL STRUCTURE

*and the Matter of Resolving the Cyprus Issue
in Accordance with the Annan Plan*

*with an essay on The New Geopolitical Reality
and its Ideological Requirements*

CRiSSMA WORKING PAPER

FACOLTÀ DI SCIENZE POLITICHE

N. 2 - 2004



Pubblicazioni dell'I.S.U. Università Cattolica

WORKING PAPERS

CRiSSMA

CENTRO DI RICERCHE SUL SISTEMA SUD E IL MEDITERRANEO ALLARGATO
RESEARCH CENTRE ON THE SOUTHERN SYSTEM AND WIDER MEDITERRANEAN

THE MEDITERRANEAN GEOPOLITICAL STRUCTURE

*and the Matter of Resolving the Cyprus Issue
in Accordance with the Annan Plan
with an essay on The New Geopolitical Reality
and its Ideological Requirements*

IOANNIS THEODOR MAZIS

CRiSSMA WORKING PAPER
FACOLTÀ DI SCIENZE POLITICHE
N. 2 – 2004

Milano 2004

© 2004 I.S.U. Università Cattolica – Largo Gemelli, 1 – Milano
<http://www.unicatt.it/librario>
ISBN 88-8311-289-X

SUMMARY

The Mediterranean Geopolitical Structure and the Matter of Resolving the Cyprus Issue in Accordance with the Annan Plan Facts on the wider Greece-Turkey-Cyprus geographical complex within the framework of the South-East Mediterranean.

<i>Introduction-abstract</i>	7
1. Description of the Mediterranean Geopolitical Complex Joints/Centres: Key features.....	9
2. Geographical Analysis of the Mediterranean Joints/Centres	10
3. Axes of Geopolitical Influence	12
4. Incorporating the Cyprus Issue to the abovementioned geopolitical framework in the light of the Annan Plan proposal.....	17

The New Geopolitical Reality and its Ideological Requirements
An essay on the new necessities of ideological production

<i>Introduction</i>	33
A.1. The past nation-centred, bipolar geopolitical Paradigm and its political conscience.	34
A.2. The new chaotic and supranational international political reality	36
A.3. Why survival of the cold war political semiotics would be off-beam, inopportune and dangerous.....	40
A.4. The role of the EU, Greece and the “Special Relationship” countries in the creation of a new global political perception.	46

**The Mediterranean Geopolitical Structure
and the Matter of Resolving the Cyprus
Issue in Accordance with the Annan Plan**

*Facts on the wider Greece-Turkey-Cyprus
geographical complex within the framework of the
South-East Mediterranean.*

INTRODUCTION-ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the question of discovering the keystone of the South-East (SE) Mediterranean geopolitical shell which is located on the crucial security problem faced by the state of Israel as well as on the question of how the Greek and Greek-Cypriot sides will cope with the impetuously immediate resolution of the Cyprus Issue in accordance with the Annan Plan on “a Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem”¹ which creates a new strategic image for Cyprus with significant medium and short term repercussions for the entire SE Mediterranean geopolitical complex – and the Greco-Turkish & Turk-Cypriot relations. This paper’s conclusion is the proposal to politically handle all negotiations, namely to actually negotiate in principle – so that the Greek-Cypriot side shall not be held responsible for an a priori dismissal of the Annan Plan – but it is the author’s estimate that the Greek and Greek Cypriot sides should not have accepted

¹ The Plan was delivered by the UNO General Secretary, Mr. Kofi Annan to both sides (Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot) following nine months of direct consultations between Messrs. Clerides & Denktash and 58 meetings in the presence of the Special Adviser to the UN Secretary-General on Cyprus Mr Alvaro de Soto.

the said plan on 12/12/2002 unless it has incorporated the modifications suggested herein.

Ioannis Theodor Mazis is Professor of Economic Geography/Geopolitics, and Director of the Laboratory of Geocultural Analysis, Ionian University, Greece

1. Description of the Mediterranean Geopolitical Complex Joints/Centres: Key features.*

The Mediterranean plexus joints are defined on the basis of the following characteristics:

- a) their role as dominant communications nodes,
- b) their role as places of energy deposits, natural reserves and resources,
- c) their role either as points of arms force accumulation as well as of political power concentration and dispersal or as secondary/sub-metropolitan centres of transference and imposition of hegemonic (metropolitan) power.

This metropolitan power is transferred or imposed via these Mediterranean geopolitical system joints either through the direct relations of the submetropolitan Centre/Joint in question with the Metropolis or through the influences and the interactions that are exerted on the Joint/Centre within the framework of the mechanisms of the International or Regional Collective Security Systems to which the specific Centre/Joint belongs.

* This paper has been translated into English by Theodore C. Buchelos, MA, Associate Teaching Staff, Department of Foreign Languages, Translation and Interpreting, Ionian University, Greece.

2. Geographical Analysis of the Mediterranean Joints/Centres

2.1. The areas that fall under category (a) are: i) Gibraltar, ii) Malta, iii) the Gulf of Sidra, iv) the island of Crete, v) Cyprus, vi) Suez, vii) the Bosphorus strait, viii) the Dardanelles, ix) the Greek Eastern Aegean Sea including its insular complexes as the continuation of the Dardanelles' trade and military channel, x) the port of Thessalonica, xi) the Port of Volos and x) the Otranto-Corfu strait.

In conclusion, one can observe the significant difference in the density of such Centres between Eastern and Western Mediterranean, as well as the advantageous position of the Eastern Mediterranean basin.

2.2. Category (b) includes i) the Caspian Sea region, ii) the Eastern Aegean Sea region, iii) the Otranto-Corfu region, iv) the region off the shores of Cyprus-Alexandretta-Syria-Lebanon-Israel, v) the Gulf of Sidra [Libya], vi) Algiers and vii) Morocco.

In conclusion, one tends to – once again – underline the increased geopolitical importance of the Eastern Mediterranean basin by observing the accumulation of the geographical zones above.

2.3. Category (c) includes zones such as i) Southern Italy [NATO bases], ii) Northern and North-western Greece

[NATO bases], iii) the island of Crete [US-NATO bases], iv) Cyprus [British and US bases], v) Malta, vi) Gibraltar [British sovereignty], vii) Israel [of western geopolitical influence with substantial internal problems due to the burning Palestinian issue, viii) Iraq [pole of US geopolitical influence dispute and an active ally of Middle East Islamist movements] ix) Syria [ambivalent pole of US geopolitical influence dispute with an ambiguous stance towards the international Islamist movement], x) Lebanon [ambivalent pole of US geopolitical influence dispute as instrument of Syrian influence], xi) Egypt [of western geopolitical influence with elements of instability due to the region's powerful Islamist movement which has a remarkable historical relation with the country itself], xii) that of Maghreb [zone of unstable western geopolitical influence with a powerful and active Islamist movement], xiii) Iran [zone of intense US geopolitical influence dispute], xiv) Turkey [zone of western-oriented influence with political-social instability factors of Islamist and Kurdish origin as well as with significant problems concerning issues of political freedom and human rights].

- i) The conclusion drawn from this brief overview of the above zones and their position is identical to those of 2.1. and 2.2.: the density of geopolitically significant Joints is much greater in the Eastern part of the Mediterranean basin than in the Western one.

- ii) Another conclusion is that the hub of instability, conflicts and ideological-cultural as well as racial contradictions (Islamist movement, Kurdish and Palestinian issues) are focused mainly in the South-eastern and Southern Mediterranean.

3. Axes of Geopolitical Influence

In the Mediterranean basin, according to the analysis above, one can identify:

- a) A horizontal zone of Anglo-Saxon geopolitical influence between the 33rd and 36th parallels, which is defined by points of established strategic Anglo-Saxon power in the form of military facilities, such as:
 - i) The Northern and Southern Iraq 'No Fly Zones' (above the 36th and below the 33rd parallel respectively);
 - ii) The US-Turkish military base of Lefkoniko on the Northern (occupied by the Turks) part of Cyprus, which the American side wishes to convert to a NATO one, in an attempt to transfer there several of the activities and facilities it enjoys at the Turkish base of Incirlik. The latter is considered by the US as strategically complementary to the one of Lefkoniko in safeguarding its interests in the Middle East. It should also be mentioned that the

- Lefkoniko base currently commands state-of-the-art anti-submarine equipment;
- iii) The British bases of Dhekelia and Akrotiri on the Southern (free) part of Cyprus;
 - iv) The US and NATO bases of Crete;
 - v) Malta and
 - vi) The British bases in Gibraltar.

This Anglo-American zone of geopolitical influence, which divides the Mediterranean basin horizontally (North-South), may yield strategic control in case of nuclear or electronic warfare. On the other hand, it could also play an electronic espionage role in a region extending from the zone of Maghreb to the Crimean area with reference to ballistic nuclear defence. At the same time, it could add to the US-British Echelon network services, the range of which is global.

- a.1.) It is, of course, well known from the Makarios-Gromyko 'Gentlemen's Agreement' that – since 1974 – British installations on Cyprus have been serving as centre and base of operations for US U-2 unmanned spy aircraft. Besides, two out of the 5 or 7 places in the world selected by the US NSA as bases of operations for the U-2 are Cyprus and Gibraltar. It is rather significant to stress that the latest U-2 can operate for 10 hours non-stop at an altitude of 70,000 ft. and is fully capable of exceptionally sophisticated electronic warfare. The extremely high altitudes at which it flies,

renders the U-2 virtually invulnerable to modern anti-aircraft systems as was manifestly proven by the conflicts in Iraq and the other Middle Eastern crises. These aircraft, like all the British military ones, use Episkopi as their primary air corridor whereas the one of Dhekelia may be used by smaller aircraft as well as the C-130 transports which can also carry Scorpion tracked vehicles, armed with 76mm guns. These vehicles (perfectly suitable in cases of chemical or nuclear warfare) are tremendously useful in the Middle East, especially against chemical and biological arsenal equipped states – such as Iraq.

Equally well known is the British intention – as was expressed approximately 18 months ago – to install two electronic warfare and information gathering antennas at the British base in Akrotiri, which alarmed the Cyprus government. At the same time, Israel (through its ambassador in Nicosia, Mr. Michael Elikal) declared that it does not oppose the installation of the said antennas.

- a.2.) The second most powerful (from the point of view defence and strategy) joint in the horizontal zone of Anglo-Saxon geopolitical influence is the US base of Suda, NW Crete, east of Hania. According to US sources, this is the largest and most importance American base of its kind in the Eastern

Mediterranean. Inside the bay of Suda exists a permanent moorage that can host the entire 6th Fleet, while the surrounding area is equipped with a large variety of both ground and underground installations of all kinds². This complex operates in conformity to the top-secret US-Greek Agreements of 1959 (Suda Bay Agreements, 13/7/1959 on the airfield and 30/12/1959 on the nuclear weapons) and serves primarily the US Navy as its major support centre in the region and secondarily NATO member-states. More specifically, it comprises the following installations: i) a warship refuelling base in the area of Akrotiri, Hania; ii) a base at the port of Suda, equipped with a special pier from the Paliosuda islet for unloading and storing war material at the Marathi area of Suda, which is the location of fuel, arms, and ammunition depots. It is a storage place for nuclear weapons (shells, torpedoes, bombs and mines) for the US Navy and Navy Air Force weapons systems. This ammunition is labelled “Nuclear and Conventional War Reserve Material, WRM” and is always ready for emergency use; iii) an airbase used as an advanced station for aeronautical co-operation flights and Navy air reconnaissance operations as well as an alternative

² See Ch. Z. Sazanidis, “*Xenoi, vaseis kai pyrenika stin Ellada*” (*Foreigners, Bases and Nuclear Weapons in Greece*), vol. II, Thessalonica, 1985 pp. 373-375.

airstrip for aircraft carrier planes. It is where the P-3C Orion navy co-operation aircraft operate from, some of which belong to the MARAIR-MED allied command, their mission being to observe and monitor all surface and submersible craft in the Eastern Mediterranean and iv) Navy communications detachment for linking the complex with all other US bases and 6th fleet craft in the Mediterranean. The operational capabilities of this base are perfectly clear, especially should the need arise for deployment in the Middle East.

One can also identify:

- b) A zone perpendicular to the aforementioned one, linking
 - i) Port Said at the Suez Canal [wherefrom passes approximately 30% of the Middle Eastern crude oil on its way to NW European markets and the ones overseas through Gibraltar] with ii) the port of Thessalonica – and subsequently the port of Rotterdam, the largest spot oil market in the world.
- c) A diagonal zone to the previously described horizontal one of Anglo-Saxon influence, which connects the Dardanelles with Gibraltar.

Both of these zones are characterised by hydrocarbon transports and are fully controlled by NATO (especially Anglo-Saxon) defence mechanisms.

4. Incorporating the Cyprus Issue to the abovementioned geopolitical framework in the light of the Annan Plan proposal.

4.1. Geopolitical reality, as is currently understood by the USA, has the following features:

4.1.a) Cyprus controls a most crucial part of the Mediterranean, which:

- 1.) is the end point of all oil pipelines from Mosul and Kirkuk through Yumurtaalik and – eventually – the port of Alexandretta;
- 2.) will be the end point of the Baku-Ceyhan oil pipe upon completion;
- 3.) is the end point of the Syrian coastline (Latakia) oil pipelines as well as of the Lebanon ones (Sidon);
- 4.) is the Eastern Mediterranean end point – through the Suez canal – of all trade routes for Persian Gulf oil, directed towards the Western markets.

4.1.b) The 100 km-wide air space between the apex of Cape St. Andrew and Latakia (Syria) can be fully controlled by air forces stationed on Cyprus and co-operating – defensively – with Damascus. That would also be the case for Syrian air forces, were they co-operating with Nicosia.

Tel-Aviv is, as can be expected, most cautious towards such an eventuality, given that no one could endure Israeli officials

that such an agreement would not end up yielding negative repercussions on the country's national interests.

As an example thereof, one could mention the Defence Agreement between Israel and Turkey [the latter having rather tense relations with Syria due to the Euphrates river waters dispute], which aims, *inter alia*, at creating "strategic depth" for the Israeli Air Force in case Syria attacks Israel. The said aim would be annulled should the aforementioned co-operation between Nicosia and Damascus become a reality, with incalculable implications for Israeli security.

Moreover, the possibility of a unified and sovereign Cyprus having a pro-Arab stance in the defence sector, is interpreted by Tel-Aviv as the ultimate threat to its national security because on the one hand it would cut be off from all air & sea routes for defence or attack operations against Arab territory and on the other hand it could provide a base for similar offensive activities against it.

According to the Israeli understanding of security, the sole guarantee is full Anglo-Saxon military control over the Cypriot state, which would never allow the Republic of Cyprus to make such a pro-Arab turn – especially at the present conjuncture, i.e. the imminent US operation in Iraq.

As a final point, one can most easily reach the conclusion that any decision pertaining to the solution of the Cyprus Issue, compatible with the interests of Hellenism, must under no circumstances be reached before completion of the Anglo-

American (and their allies') intervention in Iraq for the disarmament and/or the overthrowing of Damascus' Baath regime. All the more so, given that the change in Baghdad's regime, which will be the result of this (mainly) Anglo-Saxon intervention, will yield new a new balance in the Middle East and will undoubtedly create all the prerequisites considered by Israel as necessary for the consolidation of its security.

4.1.c) The zone between the 35th and 36th parallels, which includes – to the east – Cyprus (Episkopi, Akrotiri, Larnaca and Lefkoniko), Crete (Suda) and – to the west – Malta and Gibraltar, constitutes a particularly significant assortment of geostrategic supports for the Anglo-Saxon sea forces that control through this geostrategic axis the entire Mediterranean from end to end – i.e. the tumultuous Maghreb. The axis in question is the egress for all Persian Gulf and Caspian basin oil deposits en route to the Atlantic via Gibraltar.

An independent, bi-communal and bi-zonal Cyprus with an autonomous, powerful and single state personality, which would be capable of overcoming any artificial hindrances that are – and will still be – placed on behalf of Ankara, and which would be capable of becoming a full member of the European Union in the form described above, would definitely force Brussels to deal seriously with the security issues of this part of the Eastern Mediterranean.

This means that the constant high pressure from Turkey on the Greek Cypriot side creates conditions of instability in this

strategic area but mainly in the Northeastern part of this hypothetically enlarged European Union, to the extent that such a pressure (of Turkish origin) would have the expected destabilising impact at both a political and national level in Athens. This version could mean two things for Brussels: either the EU, no longer able – more obviously now than ever – to give Athens (as well as the European public opinion) a plausible excuse, *de facto* waives all rights to the protection of its interests in its – most significant – North-eastern part and annuls itself by admitting to the “mythical element” of European integration (which presupposes the implementation of the CFSP); or it decides to strenuously confront the source of these destabilising pressures (namely Turkey).

It is a dilemma that Brussels must be prepared to face, especially in view of the Greek Cypriot side and Athens adopting the Annan Plan *Appendix E, Article 4*.

In order to clarify things, let us make some remarks on the Annan Plan and the existing geopolitical imperatives:

I. Remark on Israel’s security

From the above analysis, one can deduce that an already safe Israel (that is to say before any “solution” of the Cyprus Issue) denotes a downgrading of Turkey’s strategic importance, its geopolitical preferences and choices in the region and accordingly its choices in the resolution of the Cyprus Issue

that would lead to an upgrade of the Greek Cypriot and Greek negotiating position *a propos* the said question.

II. Remark on the role of the Dardanelles-Aegean Sea-Cyprus geopolitical complex

The role of the Dardanelles-Aegean Sea channel and Cyprus' position with reference to it and its function is indeed fundamental in the case under examination³.

Taking into consideration the gambling odds⁴ of distributing the Dardanelles geopolitical control among the CIS, Turkey and the NATO, the geostrategic value of the Aegean Sea-Cyprus geopolitical complex is greatly enhanced.

Compliance, insecurity and inertness on behalf of the Greek side with regard to the issue of co-producing weapons systems with Israel and promoting similar defence-technological collaboration with Tel-Aviv, will undoubtedly be the result of the thus far negligence displayed in the promotion of Greco-

³ I. Th. Mazis, "Geopolitical Analysis of the Dardanelles-Aegean Sea Trade Channel", O.P. 97. 19, ELIAMEP, 1997, pp.: 16 onwards.

⁴ This term implies the case in which American manipulation of the Islamic phenomenon in Turkey, Afghanistan and most recently the attempt against Khatami's Iran, shall lose control of the situation for the benefit of the extreme, radical and political Islam. All the more so today, at a time when geopolitical volatility in NE Mediterranean, Middle East, the Arab-Persian Gulf and the Balkans have turned NATO's Southern Wing to a *par excellence* front of direct confrontations, characterised by varying strategic interdependencies, political-ideological contradictions and widening defence fissures.

Israeli relations. Furthermore, it shall lead to the relegation of Greece's importance in the geostrategic components of Anglo-Saxon geopolitical considerations, while the country's strategic gap in the Aegean and Mediterranean region will be fulfilled by the plethoric presence of the neighbouring Turkey, our "friend" and "ally". The consequences shall be well known and the responsibilities grave.

III. Remark on the Annan Plan

Article 4 of Annex E is particularly dangerous for the quality of the "common state" of Cyprus relations with the European Security and Defence Policy given that the former introduces to the latter's framework the Provisions of the Guarantor and Alliance Treaties along with all additional Protocols thereof (Zurich-London). Through these it also introduces the decisive role of Turkey in European Defence and Security issues through its role as "*guarantor power*" of the said Agreements. Besides, it is well known that, following the 1974 Turkish invasion, the Greek Cypriot side stated many a time that it would never consent to a solution, which would renew this right of unilateral intervention, because geographically (as well as geopolitically) the sole national-state actor in the region capable of actually using it, is Turkey.

Conclusion drawn from I), II) and III): Adoption of the Annan Plan by the Greek and Greek-Cypriot side prior to any development in the disarmament of Damascus' Baath regime would precariously increase Turkey's negotiating power in

issues relating to the European Policy of Defence and Security in the Middle East and would render it a more valuable strategic ally of Israel with reference to the latter's flaming security and defence issues. This attribute of Turkey in relation to Israel will cause the latter to take Turkey's side on numerous issues, which will not necessarily be to the best interest of the Greek and Greek Cypriot side in Cyprus, Eastern Mediterranean and the Aegean Sea in particular, with multiple negative effects for all of Hellenism in the NE Mediterranean.

IV. Remark on the European stance with regard to the matter of resolving the political issue of Cyprus, before the latter's accession to the European Union (*Attachment 2 of the Annan Plan*)

In view of what is analysed above, one should also re-evaluate the (up till recently) fervour of Greece's European partners to resolve the Cyprus Issue ahead of the Cypriot Republic's formal accession to the EU in April 2003: it was all about the European countries' – and their Union's – fear not to open the door to an existing and perpetuating problem that could be able to protractedly hinder EU institutional functions pertaining to the total of European countries.

However, this new "*solution*", as proposed by Mr. Annan⁵, intensifies and renders the ramming of the European Union's

⁵ Allow me the euphemism of "*Mr. Annan having drawn up the Plan*", despite the fact that it is well known by all contracting parties that 2/3 of the

institutional operation by Turkey (a non member state) a “*constitutional and fixed*” reality. All the more so due to the Provisions concerning the Turkish Cypriot side’s function in the constitutional plane, which may be used by Ankara and particularly as to the function of this provision within the framework of the EU as described in *Attachment 2* of the Annan Plan.

So, one can clearly see and identify the Anglo-Saxon interest in turning the “*single state of Cyprus*” into a battering-ram of all EU actions, especially those that have to do with issues of Common Foreign, Security and Defence Policy, at both London’s and Washington’s command – due to the existing “*special relationship*” between the two aforementioned capitals.

Conclusion drawn from IV): The question that must be put at this point by Greece (the EU member state) at both a geopolitical and a political level is what does the European Union – at long last – want!

Is it a permanent vacillation, blunder and dysfunction – due to the controlled interventions of a non-member state, namely Turkey – especially subsequent to its enlargement through the addition of another ten (10) countries or is it its successful and efficient function to the benefit of ALL contracting parties?

Plan were actually drawn up by Sir David Hannay (the British representative) and the remainder by the USA, which are not a part of the EU.

V. Remark on the substantial abolishment of the “*acquis communautaire*”, with respect to the Greek Cypriot side (Points of “*internal citizenship*” and “*return of refugees*”)

V.1.) The “*acquis communautaire*” is in no way satisfied and I refer to the points on “*internal citizenship*” that, *inter alia*, fully enhance the national-state elements of the Turkish Cypriot pseudo-state, which is not recognised by any UNO member. Besides, Mr. Ecevit himself stated on 13 November that “*for the first time, the possibility of an equitable presence of both sides is ensured by the United Nations*”(!), characterising the Annan Plan as “*a pleasant development*”(!). Furthermore, the adoption of this “*internal citizenship*” aims secondarily at institutionally abolishing the “*acquis communautaire*” by impeding the free settling and – naturally – acquisition of wealth on behalf of the Greek Cypriots in the Turkish Cypriot confederate state. In addition, one should think hard about the Annan Plan provision which considers that no “*component state*” law is weaker than “*common state*” one and, of course, about the fact that the “*component confederate states*” may have Trade and Cultural relations with other countries independently of one another as well as to co-operate with the “*common state*” of Cyprus on all issues, including those pertaining to the latter’s foreign relations. I do not believe this applies in the case of the Swiss cantons or in that of Belgium!

V.2.) Moreover, the problem of the refugees’ return to their homes is particularly knotty as pertains the acceptance of the

“*acquis communautaire*” on behalf of the suggested solution. Two (2) decades later, 20% of the refugees will have returned to their homes. After these twenty (20) years, the percentage of repatriated Greek Cypriot refugees shall not exceed 33% in total, as well as per Municipality and Community of the Island! In what respect is served the freedom of movement, settlement or wealth acquisition, as *sine qua non* European prerequisites?

How many refugees will still be alive in order to return home after twenty year-long negotiations, combined with the provisions relative to the rights of sovereignty and citizenship of each “*component state*”?

VI. The problem of the Supreme Court’s “supra-governmental” capabilities and competences (Article 6 of the Foundation Agreement, Appendix A of the Annan Plan)

It is obvious that paragraph 3 of the above article attributes “*supra-governmental*” capabilities and competences to the Supreme Court which – by the way – has neither democratic ratification nor a precise personality. The term “*non-Cypriot*”, employed to describe the determinant minority group of judges does not inspire the utmost confidence concerning the impartiality of the said body and exposes both the EU and the Greek Cypriot side to the danger of reaching decisions which may be dictated by EU members of highly “*heretical*” behaviour (the UK) or non-members of the European Union (Turkey, the USA).

Final conclusion – Political Strategy Proposal (based on I, II, III, IV, V and VI)

A) Consequently, in order to better serve and protect European and national interests, the Annan Plan *Foundation Agreement* (pp. 1-37 and 117-138) must not be signed before the Copenhagen Summit Meeting, so as not to be included in the relevant decision thereof. On the contrary, any retreat or attempt to disengage from this plan will be tantamount to the invalidation of Cyprus' European Union accession process.

This is something that needs to be taken seriously under advisement, combined with the most important fact that the remainder of the text (pp. 38-50 and 52-116) constitutes the object of negotiation only by name, given that – in case of disagreement between Messrs. Clerides and Denktash – the General Secretary of the UNO, Mr. Annan, will impose the will of the “*United Nations Organisation*” in a decisive and binding way.

B) In any case, the Greek and Greek Cypriot side must formulate and submit to Turkey a specific political proposal, the main elements of which should be on the following axes:

- 1st) An increase of the Presidents' tenure to four (4) years;
- 2nd) A change in the special majorities of the Upper House (Senate);

- 3rd) The Upper House (Senate) shall be composed at a ratio of 7:3 and
- 4th) The Supreme Court “*supra-governmental*” competences shall be abolished even if it retains the structure proposed (the participation, by 1/3, of some “*international factor*” of unknown form and origin). This body can, under no circumstances, be the decisive element for the resolution – and within ten (10) days at that – of the “*deadlocks*” faced by the two sides – the source thereof being all too familiar – given that such a fact would cancel the political procedure and the power of politics itself, rendering the “*common state*” of Cyprus “*a problematic state under court supervision*” as pertains its relations with the international community but also a battering-ram against European decisions and planning.

Should this proposal not be accepted, negotiations may resume even after 12/12/2002 – albeit without the two sides having signed Mr. Annan’s *Foundation Agreement*.

With respect to the case of Greek and Greek Cypriot political opposition forces in Greece and Cyprus respectively, the author hereof estimates that they will most probably not associate their positions with similar gruesome and nationally deleterious prospective decisions of the Greek Cypriot side. He, furthermore, estimates that (in this instance) the Greek

major opposition party has the ability to forestall the Greek government from signing – until 12/12/2002 – the Annan Plan’s *Foundation Agreement*, by stating directly and publicly its objections and by clearly dissociating itself.

It will, thus, both offer the utmost service to Hellenism and safeguard its dignity.

The New Geopolitical Reality and its Ideological Requirements

*An essay on the new necessities of
ideological production*

INTRODUCTION*

Geopolitical and political reality as well as its proper reading were, are and will always be a challenge for all social and spiritual leaders. Today's reality is characterised by the end of traditional hermeneutic systems, i.e. those stochastic examples from which the lot of social, political, economic and philosophical issues drew their "safe" and lucid answers. These traditional, holistic examples that were also used in the cases of individual national social formations as well as groups of national social formations were – roughly – the following two: the Socialist one and the Liberal one. The two conflicting worlds, the Eastern and Western ones respectively, rallied ideologically and geopolitically around these two axes. The government elites of the National Social Formations (NSF's) that used to comprise these two worlds concur with this Procrustean division. The same phenomenon also characterised for nearly fifty years the respective political cultures and

* Translated into English by *Theo Buchelos* MA, Interpreter and Teaching Staff, Department of Foreign Languages, Translation and Interpreting, Ionian University, Corfu, GREECE

dominant ideologies as well as the geopolitical approaches of the said National Social Formations.

A.1. The past nation-centred, bipolar geopolitical Paradigm and its political conscience.

Naturally, this division is rather rudimentary and mainly grounded on the – ideologically based⁶ – self-definition of the said National Social Formations (NSF's⁷) or of their groups and incorporations.

A careful analyst would discover on the one hand a multitude of “by definition” socialist-type features in social formations which defined themselves as liberal ones, while, on the other, several “by definition” liberalistic elements in those social formations that would place themselves in the “socialist” camp.

This Procrustean division, however, lacked a pragmatist foundation, save in the way of the society's administration and economic organisation. In liberal social formations there was no central planning for a medium-to-large percentage of the economic activity, while there was a solid pluralist – from an

⁶ The term “ideologically based self-definition” signifies what the author hereof refers to as “fixatory self-definition”. Use of the term's analytical form is employed for the benefit of the less specialised reader.

⁷ For practical reasons, which for the most part agree with reality, one could replace the term National Formation with the terms “country/countries/states”. In cases of sub-national entities, the term NSF is maintained.

ideological-philosophical point of view – citizen participation in the administration of the said social formations. The exact opposite was to be observed – *mutatis mutandis* – in the case of social formations that defined themselves as “socialist” ones.

It should be stressed that, ideo-geographically, the ensemble of liberal NSF’s, constituted that political-geographical entity which is known as “The West”, while the “socialist” ones formed the so-called “Eastern Block”, with the well-known power competitions between the TWO blocks.

The crude hermeneutic of this political-ideological holism collapsed – officially as well – in November 1988, along with its most powerful symbol: the Berlin Wall.

Ever since, many (“convenient” for the international political-economic-social establishment) fixatory situations of a most serious socioeconomic bearing came to an end. The social, political and intellectual forces constantly and anxiously pursued a new method of government as well as a system of hermeneutic codes for the new reality. The then political forces together with their *passé* ideological mandarins suddenly became conscious that they now found themselves at the rear of History, realised that the myth of the cold war ideological holism had expired, accompanied by their usual practices of the time; together with their – until then – political certainties; together with the – until then – bipolar system of “hot peace”, together with the – until then internationally valid – ideological, political and cultural illusions.

A.2. The new chaotic and supranational international political reality

Referring to geographical units and the instability factors that characterise them, would not really constitute an innovation – things in this field are (more or less) understandable. Our intent is to demonstrate the theoretical void that characterises the modern “showcase” of metropolitan elites, as pertains to the tools used in deciphering the causes for international stability. It is a void that leads metropolitan political elites to a perpetual wandering and an unstable oscillation between the already dead holistic hermeneutic systems of the past and timid eclecticistic explorations that are, however, lacking both clear orientation and a new model (or various new ones, for that matter).

The first thing that metropolitan elites are required to realise is the social, economic and cultural model, within the framework of which they are seeking to locate the structural elements of the New Paradigm – if, of course, that is what they actually seek. This is a point that needs to be underlined, given that even if these quests do bear fruit, their result will not be something necessarily transplantable in a different social, economic and cultural framework; this endeavour will have a fatal outcome for such a hybridous functional system.

Conversely, an unsuccessful transplantation of the metropolitan model in regional-type, socio-political and cultural environments that fall under the influence of

metropolitan political-economic elites creates more instability and intensifies the international system's chaotic tendency. It deepens the differences in potential as pertains to sectors of political, social and cultural development between the Metropolitan NSF's and their Regional equivalents, thus creating new and stronger prerequisites for hot rifts.

On the contrary, Metropolises themselves have to deal with a peculiar situation in their interior: in the framework of economic internationalisation and continuous international-scale integrations, their national small – and medium-sized economic units discover that their productive, technological, and overall competitive scales do not suffice so as to cope with the respective colossal scales of the new, ever-integrating and self-internationalising market.

The new international horizontal forms of economic unit concentration and centralisation create a new order of small and medium “neo-proletarians” of the productive and financial process, the emergence of which destabilises fully the internal political-economic and cultural system of metropolitan formations. This “neo-proletariat” is characterised by the high educational standard of its neo-proletarians, hence it constitutes a new, socially – and therefore analytically as well – novel social entity, the behaviour of which cannot be classified under any of the hitherto known Marxist decoding models.

In such cases, the reckless as well as agonising response of the political-economic Metropolitan elite is to “export” their

domestic problem and to violently extract resources and profits (international surplus value) from the vital space made up by the social formations of their immediate geopolitical sphere of influence. The objective of this reaction is to secure the necessary resources that will sustain the high economic and consumption level of metropolitan societies so as to preclude any instances of social rifts and subversions. Obviously, should the NSF's of each metropolitan sphere of influence be deficient in the necessary resource and profit reserves in order to satisfy the internal social and economic problems of the interested metropolises, the metropolitan economic-political elites endeavour the enlargement of their own geopolitical spheres of influence by violently incorporating new NSF's therein.

It is, however, obvious that the international system is in no condition to withstand at length these new methods of economic, political and cultural hegemonism.

The issue of extracting international surplus value in the – more or less – “mild” manner that used to characterise even western social democracy (not to mention the formerly cold-war soviet “*imperium*”) has now evolved into a system of “hot” rifts and violent supranational integrations.

Nonetheless, in the present historical conjuncture, metropolitan societies also face intense subversive challenges and volatile situations. The internationalised market in the industrially developed world leaves no room for misinterpretation: the electronic velocity of the “Third Wave”

proletarianises equally fast the masses of workers in these societies and at the same time it radicalises them socio-politically.

The aim of these marginalised masses of supranational origin has now become the metropolitan hegemon himself! Not to any further extent as a political and economic structure but as nation, as culture, as ideologematic scapegoat, as the “hell” of all that is decadent and wretched, as an “antinational” totem of hatred. This demonising attitude leads to such dejective occurrences as racism and the diachronically and dia-historically persistent nationalistic hate. The confrontation quality between Regional and Metropolitan NSF’s ceases to be rational. It is transformed into a metaphysical “demonomachy” which unquestionably leads to all sorts of international and binational atrocities, such as – for instance – religious or political terrorism!

The circle closes! The new-type supranational integrations must decide on the form and quality of their content; the form and quality of their integration process; the form and quality of the relations amongst themselves. This is precisely where the metropolitan political-economic elites will have to answer at a theoretical level.

A.3. Why survival of the cold war political semiotics would be off-beam, inopportune and dangerous

If we suppose that the Left-Right ideological dipole actually had a reason of existence, political usefulness and relevant content at the time of the two power pole conflicts (Eastern vs. Western), the abovementioned analysis creates serious doubts – at least as far as the new essence of the terms' content is concerned; their new meaning; and consequently their semantic and useful survival within the framework of modern political and geopolitical demands.

Even if one were to accept that their use by each local political-economic and social elites or nomenclatures was undertaken under the purest of intentions, their use – let alone their abuse – today can only yield destructive and retrogressive results.

The new (under construction) supranational structures and incorporations require analogous worldviews that will be in a position to provide solutions to modern compelling issues; issues such as Ecology, Energy, Labour and International & Domestic Security.

The result of the 21st century historical distiller is a particularly pellucid philtre: it is the end of fixations; the end of ideologemes; the end of mass fantasies. The main point is whether, by whom, and when this elixir shall be sampled.

The new paradigm that derives as the fragrance of this historic distillate is called *Synthesis!* It is a synthesis of

economic and political methods; a synthesis of social views; a synthesis of cultures. It is a synthesis that will come following careful qualitative and quantitative analysis of international political, economic, cultural and defensive data; that is to say, following careful geopolitical analysis.

It is a synthesis that can only aim at human prosperity and international justice: elements ensuring – them alone – International Security.

So, in this historical conjuncture, the infrastructure of this Synthesis is – again and always – economic. It is the free economy, moving carefully and wisely towards the said direction, notwithstanding of the observed presence of transitional situations (i.e. China).

However, developments in the information sector do not pertain only to the movement of money and investments – either true or fictitious. They also pertain to and affect cultural osmosis between various National Social Formations, as well as all sorts (Defensive, Economic, Political or Cultural) of incorporations thereof. This osmotic process, if channelled in a methodical and decisive way through these incorporations, not only will it be greatly accelerated but it will also allow the creation of new, common political base supranational incorporations (for instance the European Union).

These new incorporations will have accepted the rationale of a joint economic effort for the common benefit and they will have eradicated such cultural differences that were – by their

nature – of the confrontational type. Of course, incorporations of different cultural basis will continue to overlap. This is precisely the feature that will become the bridge for the new osmotic processes between already unified geo-cultural complexes. These new, second level and of twin nature (economic and cultural) osmotic processes lead to the ultimate level: the creation of a planetary conscience that can only be governed – as per its formation process – by the principles of justice, acceptance, peace, security and order.

The prerequisites for an effortless development of this economic and cultural infrastructure's constituents as well as the necessary elements for its technically and socio-politically safe functioning may be summarised as follows:

- 1) Control of Corruption and Interweaving (political money);
- 2) Control and safeguarding of the free competition terms;
- 3) Free movement of ideas and mandatory Education for all citizens;
- 4) Human rights protection;
- 5) Protection of Political and Cultural freedoms in the framework of respect and peaceful coexistence among human societies;
- 6) Protection of Natural Resources, Natural Reserves and the Environment;

- 7) Control and eradication of both Organised and Common crime as well as of (religious and/or political) Terrorism.

All of the above should be attempted in an international, supranational environment, the components of which (i.e. the individual states) will have to cooperate harmoniously with one another. So, the first requirement for the success of the said plan is the creation of a supranational legal framework that, albeit departing from existing international law manifestations, will be regarded as a form of International Community “Internal Law”. This suggests that it will be provided with a commonly and internationally accepted repression system as well as relevant subsystems capable of enforcing the callings of the new Internal Law of International Level.

In this case, the aims of the International Community – if it indeed wishes to be rightfully called so – should be two:

- 1) The combination of the existing Justice-serving Systems (International Courts of Law) and the creation of a globally accepted International System of Judicial Power; and
- 2) The combination of the existing Collective Security Systems and the afresh creation of a New International Collective Security System.

International community efforts towards the achievement of the above aims shall be both protracted and at multiple levels.

However, the antiquated and retrogressive divisions between “Left” and “Right” – alluding to 1789 and the French Revolution – have no place whatsoever alongside these efforts. The stakes are now global and its components that need to be resolved are numerous and of paramount importance; in contrast, they are of a higher level, with much rougher features.

The contribution of “Leftist” thought in the evolution of mankind is in no way reduced in this context; nor is the contribution of “Liberal” thought in the economic, political and cultural arrangement and operation of the hitherto National Social Formations.

We stress, though, that “Leftist thought” is not necessarily the privilege of “Leftist” parties and movements, just as the quality of “Liberal intellect” does not automatically characterise “conservative” partisan carriers.

Some brilliant examples can be drawn from the Greek reality. The first post-dictatorship governments of the New Democracy party under K. Karamanlis, implemented such measures in 1974-1980 (publicisation of mass transport, nationalisation of banking institutions) that when their equivalents were employed by the French socialist government, they were regarded as and consolidation of President F. Mitterrand’s socialist inspiration, tendency and ideology. Of equal significance is the withdrawal of Greece from NATO’s military aspect when that same “Right” government was in power.

Respectively, in spite of their anti-American and anti-Right rhetoric, the thus far governments of the “socialist/ Leftist/ of Marxist origin/ nation-liberating” PASOK movement never touched the US bases in Greece in any way; quite the contrary, they provided NATO and US forces with all the facilities they required during their intervention in former Yugoslavia and Afghanistan, the Gulf War against Iraq and – quite recently – during the (deprived of any sense of international law basis) American-British intervention in Iraq! In addition, the same “socialist” governments exhibited an extraordinary ability to function, fully accept and outstandingly “come to terms” with the European institutions, at a time when the latter – according to PASOK’s political chanting slogans⁸ – were one and the same with the “capitalist-imperialist” and “belligerent” NATO formation!

Let us not fool ourselves! The issue preoccupying international reality in this crucial turn of the 21st century is neither the validity (or not) of the Tenth Thesis on Feuerbach, nor – exclusively – the essence of Gramsci’s “functional intellectual” notion. The issue for mankind is not to be located in “casting out the evil” based on specific methods of “political theology” and “anti-right” or “anti-left” anathemas. The issue for mankind consists on the one hand of making full use of the historical distillate that is extracted from the hitherto

⁸ Translator’s note: The motto in question may be loosely translated as “EU and NATO belong to the same ghetto”.

ideological, political and philosophical struggles and confrontations that crystallise in the aforementioned seven points; and on the other hand – following a synthetical approach – the resolution of an enormous, burning and pressing international predicament: mankind’s own deliverance from decadence, decay and ultimate self-annulment. In other words, mankind should organise itself in a new, international manner.

A.4. The role of the EU, Greece and the “Special Relationship” countries⁹ in the creation of a new global political perception.

Examples of supranational incorporation applications may be found in: the largest part of UNO human activity sectors; NATO’s defence sector; the sum of EU political, social, cultural and – hopefully – defence activities; as well as at a level of international powerful and special relations with the USA and the UK.

The 21st century demands that metropolitan NSF politicians make use of this existing reality and plot respective internal policy courses, so as to render the “use” of such entities feasible and to the benefit of humanity. It must be made clear that, in essence, internal policy is not planned in the offices of heads of state – including the President of the US. The recent resolution adopted by the UN Security Council (21-22 May 2003) to lift sanctions against Iraq (and more precisely the “Oil for Food”

⁹ The USA and the UK.

programme” with 14 votes in favor and 0 against, proves that the economic infrastructure and its callings prevail even in cases of vigorous conflicts and crises in the framework of the same cultural complex – in our case, the western cultural space.

This being a phenomenon that occurs at a time when the two mighty European powers in terms of defence and economy (France and Germany respectively) are moving towards the creation of a common European Constitution as well as a common system of Collective Security within the framework of the EU.

These facts suffice to convince us that the mutual support – both cultural and economic – between the EU & the UK and the UK & the USA played the role of a bridging element, which lead to the convergence anew of the EU and USA supranational incorporations that are of a common cultural basis. On the other hand, the recently observed close relationship among France, Germany and Russia cushioned the of late slightly disturbed relations between the USA and Russia.

One can discover a multitude of analogous – and of equal importance – cases in the international scene. Nevertheless, what such international realities reveal is that it is necessary to immediately deal with the international (*ergo* internal) policy, which should be the object of a realistic approach, free of

ideologematic fixations of the “Left-Right” type as well as of metaphysical-type nationalistic burdens¹⁰.

Greece is to play an important – as well as practical – role in this new political landscape of global dimensions. Its inherently ecumenical, linguistic, political and intellectual civilization may serve as a potential channel for the ecumenical spirit that is this necessary global Humanism. The Byzantine link between Christianity and Hellenism, as well as the respective one of the Western Roman state, may function as a perfectly potent positive catalyst in the creation process of this new global Humanism. It is a continuous request that the Greek political elites realize these “*exquisite airs/ the secret troupe’s invisible instruments*”¹¹ that are drawing nigh... This realization in itself sets, defines and clarifies the ideological approaches that must characterize the said elites and that must give meaning to their political Praxis and Practice.

The classical Greek spirit, moisturized by Christian spirituality, functioning within the roman legal construct and assisted by the Judaic pragmatist cosmopolitanism, can constitute a solid bridge between the Eastern and Western

¹⁰ For the record, it should be noted that the author hereof was meticulous in the use of “nationalistic” versus “national” throughout the text.

¹¹ Translator’s note: Excerpt from the poem “*God forsakes Anthony*” (1911) by K. Kavafis. It refers to the story by Plutarch about the time when Anthony was besieged in Alexandria by Octavian and heard the sounds of instruments and voices making their way through the city, and then fading out; the god Bacchus (Dionysus), Anthony's protector, was deserting him...

worlds. In this framework, atherosclerotic racist commandments and antiquated “Left-Right” schemes have no place whatsoever.

The new global civilization must rediscover its original causes, its rudimentary building blocks if humanity aspires to survive and do justice to the name of Man.

This new Greco-Roman-Judaic cultural keystone shall have to be installed by local political elites at the top of the national – and subsequently the international – socio-political shell, with Europe and the USA as its main building blocks. It shall have to *synthesize* and *connect* the elements that unite the individual cultures by negating those that divide them.

It is in this historical stage that the political national elites must rise to the occasion. Such a stance requires honesty and the utmost sincerity on their behalf¹². These are old and historically justified principles that have been, nevertheless, forgotten and buried under the dust of History and the ruins of expired Empires. Yet, now, at the Dawn of a New Global Humanist Civilisation, they surface once again and knock on the door of our Memory and Conscience. Let us show them in swiftly, letting go of all fixatory burdens of the past.

¹² “Trust”, according to F. Fukuyama and “Social Responsibility”, according to M. Rocard.

CRISSMA WORKING PAPER SERIES

- n° 1 (May 2004) *The Many Shores of the Gulf. Human Security within an Islamic Order. Education in the “Arabian Debate”*
VALERIA FIORANI PIACENTINI-ELENA MAESTRI
- n° 2 (June 2004) *The Mediterranean Geopolitical Structure and the Matter of Resolving the Cyprus Issue in Accordance with the Annan Plan. With an essay on The New Geopolitical Reality and its Ideological Requirements.*
IOANNIS THEODOR MAZIS
- Forthcoming papers:*
- n° 3 (September 2004) *The GCC Region: Political Balances and Global Dimension.*
ELENA MAESTRI
- n° 4 (September 2004) *The Baku-Ceyhan Pipeline and its Potential Impact on Turkish-Russian Relations*
TALEH ZIYADOV
- n° 5 (December 2004) *La Maîtrise des Mers face aux Défis de la Mondialisation*
RENAUD BELLAIS

THE MEDITERRANEAN
GEOPOLITICAL STRUCTURE

Pubblicazioni dell'I.S.U. Università Cattolica

ISBN 88-8311-289-X

C.Ri.S.S.M.A. (Centre of Research on the Southern System and the Wider Mediterranean) is a Research Centre of the *Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore*, which collaborates, in particular, with the Faculty of Political Science.

Scientific committee: Prof. Valeria Piacentini, Director of the C.Ri.S.S.M.A., Chair of History and Institutions of the Muslim World; Prof. Alberto Quadrio Curzio, Dean of the Faculty of Political Science, Chair of Political Economics; Prof. Massimo de Leonardis, Chair of History of International Relations and Institutions (Hon. Secretary of the Centre); Prof. Giuseppe Grampa, lecturer in Religious Philosophy.

The aims of C.Ri.S.S.M.A. are both fundamental and applied research, mainly in the historical-cultural fields, with particular emphasis being given to the political-institutional, social-economic, and strategic problems of the Mediterranean and neighbouring areas. Amongst the many activities of the Centre, we would like to recall the organisation of scientific and cultural events, bilateral forums, conferences, and seminars on "New Perspectives for international relations", now in their fifth edition.

C.Ri.S.S.M.A. publishes two series of publications. The first - with the publishing company *Il Mulino*, web site: www.mulino.it includes volumes such as: M. de Leonardis (ed.), *La nuova NATO: i membri, le strutture, i compiti*, Bologna 2001; V. Fiorani Piacentini (ed.), *Il Golfo nel XXI secolo. Le nuove logiche della conflittualità*, Bologna 2002; M. de Leonardis (ed.), *Il Mediterraneo nella politica estera italiana del secondo dopoguerra*, Bologna 2003; V. Fiorani Piacentini (ed.), *Turkey and the Wider Mediterranean. Which Stability and Co-operation?* (in press); E. Maestri, *Development and Human Security in the GCC Region* (in press). The second series is represented by "Working Papers", with the publishing company I.S.U. Università Cattolica.

C.Ri.S.S.M.A.

Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore

Largo A. Gemelli, 1 – 20123 MILANO

Tel. 02.7234.2524 / 02.7234.2733

Fax 02.7234.3649

E-mail: centro.medall@unicatt.it