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Abstract

The field of conflict transformation has been an outcome of decades of conflict resolution theory and practice for conflict prevention. Preventive approaches towards conflict are people and solution-orientated, peace and truth-focused unlike the “old paradigm” where violence/war, propaganda, victory and elites are at the crux of the matter. A recent trend in the conflict resolution field has been increased attention to "transformational" conflict resolution approaches, which promise better results in preventing enduring rivalries and protracted conflicts than approaches based on positional negotiating. That means moving beyond symptomatic treatment of the issues to analyzing and considering the underlying root causes and patterns of relations that drive the conflicts so that change is also transformational. Visionary public leadership of complex conflicts also aim at such change that touches on deep assumptions, values, beliefs and biases. While the literature about conflict resolution emphasizes broad and generic sources of conflict at different levels of analysis and mainly “grand” theories, an exploration of the sources of conflict and creative alternatives for resolving it at each level separately is required for improving social relations at different levels of interaction, i.e., interpersonal, inter-group, and international in practice.

Since the late 1990s, the focus has been increasingly on conflicts between identity-based communities, inter-group dialogue, bi-communal development programs and citizen-based conflict intervention strategies that have served as alternative, non-governmental responses to protracted conflicts. Civil society organizations (NGO/CSO) play a critical role in sustaining peace through multiple functions both pre and post-conflict situations. Their call for a paradigm shift from reaction to prevention is recognized simultaneously with a shift from top-down to bottom-up approach. Nowadays, non-governmental organizations have begun to play a significant role in conflict prevention. Advocacy and public interest organizations, the news media, humanitarian relief providers, academia, or private actors may initiate unofficial interventions. A typical initiative by a NGO would be the convening of meetings between unofficial representatives of disputing parties to build confidence between sides, a process often referred to as “track two” diplomacy because it works just below the official, or "track one" level. Often, only NGOs are able to convene such parties and create such a "space for dialogue," because of the politically sensitive nature of such meetings.

The role of “value” leadership in preventing or reducing identity group conflicts across differences and challenges of exclusive group identities demands building trust, reflexivity and empathy through constructive vision and commitment in such a vision within and between groups. My hypothesis in this paper is that conflict transformation and leadership overlap significantly since they both focus at transformational change, learning and “debiasing” through reframing so that a common value base is grounded. In understanding intractable conflicts, documentary films may help us put the social aspects of conflict processes in perspective and raise the level of our awareness and reflexivity so that track two level leadership will blend with experiential learning of real life experiences.

As a consequence to the global challenge of escalating conflicts, citizen-based approaches play decisive roles in transforming these on-going intractable conflicts towards achieving sustainable intercommunal reconciliation. Practitioners and scholars have been exploring the impact of citizen dialogue in bicommmunal talks in the Israel-Palestinian conflict, Northern Ireland and in Cyprus. The significance of such peace-building efforts for potential transformation of long term intractable conflicts also call attention to the role of women and youth as peacemakers at grassroots levels. They are both positioned with power asymmetry and underrepresented everywhere; thus, they need new role models. I have employed Cyprus as a case study of conflict transformation through civil initiatives and I have chosen one documentary film that analyzes the
conflict and outlines many examples of experiences of citizens committed to such bi-communal projects in order to disclose what is going on.

1. **Introduction: The Content of Conflict Transformation**

The Cyprus conflict has made the two communities see themselves as victims of each other, each other’s motherlands with different perspectives on the island’s history reflect two sides of the same issue. Although Cyprus as an island is small, protracted conflict between the Turkish and Greek Cypriots and the instability affects the Eastern Mediterranean region. Besides, the dividing line and the buffer zone, which has kept the two communities apart over thirty years, have made Cyprus an interesting case of conflict prevention and resolution. The framework in relation to this unusual case might help us explain, if not understand conflicts that stem from “in-group/out-group feelings” at the intra group level.

When recounting the recent history of the island, members of each group tend to mention only their own glories and sufferings, and blame the other side and to refer to the other group only as victimizer. Both sides have suffered injustices and massive deaths in their past which have become a living part of the present problem. The two sides have been divided both politically and economically. The Turkish Cypriots have isolated from the rest of the world for about four decades. Any durable solution should accommodate to the needs of both communities and their respective motherlands and regard the widely agreed upon norms of the international law and the realities on the ground in Cyprus equally important.

The United Nation Mediation has released several reports and prepared plans to promote peace—the final draft plan was the Annan Plan. Conciliation and prevention seemed to have paved the way for later stages of the mediation process. Having kept peace for years, now it was the time to go further: making peace and later building peace so that once disputed issues were resolved, then relations would be easier to develop. With the opening of the buffer zone and simultaneous referenda scheduled for each side of the island of Cyprus on April 24, the UN-sponsored Cyprus peace process had seemingly entered a new phase. At that time, goals and political aspirations with sharp differences had seemed to converge, reframe and become ‘conflicts over procedures’ of the Annan Plan. It was seen as a hope for peaceful reunification, then. Yet, increased contact between the two communities has not created reconciliation by itself. The two major ethnic groups on the island, Greeks and Turks, have been physically separated since 1963, with each part having its own “government.” Further, an entire generation on each side has grown up on the divided island with a ‘border psychology’ and external influences. In the first part of the paper, I will summarize the theoretical background. In the second part, I will demonstrate the barriers to peace building in Cyprus through a depiction of conflict sensitive narrative documentary—particularly for the youth and women.

The theoretical framework I have employed in this paper can be used by “track two diplomacy” on issues concerning civil society of both sides. Track two level works at interpersonal and intergroup levels to build trust and create a “space for dialogue” for politically sensitive issues below the official “track one” between top and grass roots levels of leadership. Such a middle-range level is the interface whereby a number of institutions such as non-governmental organizations, network of experts, activists and scientists diffuse norms about universal human rights. The complementary framework of conflict transformation and public leadership gives support to one’s comprehension of transformation processes, since leadership focuses more on contextual factors, while conflict transformation emphasizes content such as issues and relationships.

2. **Theoretical Framework: Intergenerational Perspective**

My brief overview of large group comparisons is largely guided by Vanuk Volkan’s theory on the psychology of neighbors and social identity theory to a limited extent. Volkan states that when neighboring large groups are in conflict, most of their political, social, economic and “real-world” issues are distorted with psychological emotions. He explains the determinants of large group regression and analyzes the inhibiting role of guilt and/or victimization along with ways to overcome them.

Each community sees itself as “the mirror image” of the other. One can infer that each group must be in some sense quite similar to other. Therefore, there appears to be another psychological factor, besides the substantial cultural differences and important similarities that influence intergroup relations: “The rituals or the narcissism of minor differences”. These differences are observed in cases of intergroup conflict where the two opposing groups may seem alike but they have minor differences. According to Volkan, these rituals are for maintaining these differences; thus, keeping a psychological gulf between the opposing groups, they absorb the flow of aggression and keep them from killing each other. Violence occasionally may erupt “when playful ritualization of the preoccupation with minor differences is no longer maintained.”

According to the theory of Volkan, when neighboring communities are in protracted conflict, most of their “real world” concerns are contaminated with psychological issues of their inner world and they are ill
framed. People have a deep-rooted psychological need to have a “core identity” through which they simplify and establish enemies and allies after their “chosen glories and traumas”. This phenomenon happens on individual and group levels. This is an unconscious process, which feeds conscious relationships in our group lives. This often plays an important role in forming ethnic or national self and group identities.

During the primary and secondary socialization one creates his/her social identity in order to simplify the external relations. One often dichotomizes in learning about objects and people. There is a need to categorize and attribute good qualities to the “in-group” (the group we belong to because of our ethnicity, nationality, sect, religion, etc) and negative qualities to the “out-group” or the “other”. Attributing good qualities to the “in-group” is related to the need for positive self-image and self worth. The positive images are usually retained for our own groups, while the negative images are reserved for the “out-groups” or enemies. This process allows us to focus hate towards external groups. Attributing negative qualities to the “out-groups” could take the form of demonisation, i.e., dehumanization of the “other”. By dehumanizing the other and the enemy, one would justify the use of violence and employing inhuman and cruel treatment of the “enemy”.

Such binary oppositions and creating “in-groups” and “out-groups” would not lead to conflict unless there is perceived illegitimacy in the system due to (perceived) injustice, concern about security or grievances. There are intervening variables and psychological mechanisms that play a role in generating conflict. According to Volkan, victimhood is a state from which all groups or individuals need to recover. Victimhood is not only a perception of self, but of self in a system of relationships. Acknowledging victimization as a problem is the first step toward recovery. Part of the healing process for victims is regaining self-esteem and relearning that the "other" is also human and that this "other" has suffered as well. This process allows the groups to begin to transform the system in which victimization was made possible into something much more positive. Necessary elements for healing from the trauma of victimization include safety, space, and time for the group to go through a process of mourning, empowerment, and eventual reconciliation with the enemy. In order to heal, the group has to begin feeling safe from the possibility of any further unjustified aggression. Once safety becomes less of a concern, victims can begin to heal through a remembrance and mourning process.

Vamik Volkan’s therapeutic approach is especially based on the concept of "Chosen Trauma and Chosen Glories", i.e. on the subjective perception of participants' own (collective) identity. These ideas play a major role in ethno-political conflicts as they often block constructive approaches to conflict transformation. The purpose of Volkan's workshop methodology is to explore these patterns of perception consciously and thus open them up to discussion. His psychodynamic approach also rests on in part on the application of psychoanalytic defense mechanisms such as externalization, projection, and identification that individuals are used to protect themselves from perceived psychological threat.

Victimized groups do not see beyond their own pain and anguish without their own wounds being healed. These groups do not take responsibility for victims created by their own actions out of revenge or feel guilt about the violence committed in the past. The egoism of victimization is "the incapacity of an ethno-national group, as a direct result of its own traumas of war history, to empathize with the suffering of another group". Another intervening variable, which makes out-groups more susceptible to aggression and conflict, is appropriate targets of externalization. The images are stored in the subconscious through these targets such as national flag colors, ethnic food, music, costumes or dances. These targets act as cultural amplifiers reinforced mainly by education and broadcasting. They send out messages about who we are and they are the building blocks of our collective identity. The positive images are usually retained for our own groups, while the negative images are reserved for the out-groups or enemies. That way, hate and frustration onto external groups may be projected.

The last psychological mechanism is the inability to mourn according to Volkan. He describes mourning as the reaction to real or threatened loss or change. There are uncomplicated and complicated types of mourning. Uncomplicated mourning is when a group comes to terms with what was lost and they learn to cope with their grief and sorrow. They have confronted the reality and accepted the ‘reality as it is’; thus they learnt coping with uncertainty, anxiety, unfairness and remorse. Complicated mourning is when groups are under threat and cannot let go of their losses and they cannot accept the reality as it is. They live in a ‘fantasized reality to be’ and such groups often try to regain what was lost, especially territory. Groups that suffer from complicated mourning tend to perpetuate conflicts because they can neither cope with the reality nor can they face giving up what was lost.

"How do you help people overcome their version of the past and work toward a future they can share now?" Volkan asks. "They must create a vision of the future that takes into account the needs of both communities" is the answer. While they cannot forget the past, they cannot dwell upon it, either. People in Cyprus have to recognize that the past is a huge burden and they must confront the reality and then find ways to move beyond it according to Volkan. He opts for reconciliation programs that allow a society to face its
tragedies openly, healing the psychological wounds of the conflict rather than denying it through various defense mechanisms.\textsuperscript{8}

Such significant issues involve long time horizons and demand visions since they have implications for future generations whose interests and priorities are not often aligned with those of the past. Uncertainty about the consequences and lack of trust enhances the psychological distance, while reducing the intergenerational beneficence. The proverb “a bird in hand is worth two in a bush” reveals this perception. 

“Egocentric interpretations of fairness” are often biased due to subjective perceptions of people, who are involved in a situation or committed to an inspiration, and thus hindsight and short term action is generally preferred to foresight and vision. “Vision without appropriate action is daydream; action without any vision is nightmare” and “quid pro quo” perspective may only be overcome by looking at the larger picture for the prospects of future rather than immediacy of direct reciprocity that often escalates the conflict.

By and large, the above theoretical frameworks are often used in practice by "track two diplomacy" that works at interpersonal and intergroup levels to build trust and create a “space for dialogue” for politically sensitive issues below the official “track one” between top and grass roots levels of leadership. Such a middle-range level is the interface whereby a number of institutions such as non-governmental organizations, network of experts, activists and scientists diffuse norms about universal human rights.\textsuperscript{11}

Self-reflexivity and affinity with future generations and empathizing with the youth instead of regarding them as future others might be the first step to initiate other-oriented behaviors and then feelings and understanding within the group. The literature on social identity, identification and self-categorization might also enrich the intergenerational as well as inter-gender understanding. “Framing” of the problem is often the starting point for making both parties see the bigger picture and realize it does not have to end in a zero sum game. It used to mean the process of describing and interpreting an event to focus attention in conflict resolution just like framing in a film or a painting. It is a cognitive road map that enables people to process information in patterns. It helps the parties understand and interpret what the conflict is about--what is going on and what they should do about it. The way one frames a conflict is based on many factors beyond what “actually” happened.

The way one interprets or frames a conflict is based on both their cognitive and discursive frames: what has happened to that person (or group of people) in the past, what needs and values are important to them, and whether they see the situation as a threat or a potential benefit. Therefore, what is at stake, how should one respond and why and when the conflict has started differs between two sides. Since accumulated experiences shape how any particular event is interpreted or “framed,” how one should cope often diverge between two parties. One may handle the conflict by tracing these different maps and reframing the conflict or coexistence through value-based public leadership. For any resolution aiming at mutual benefits through joint problem solving, the existing frames of the two parties have to be taken into account and reformulated to come out of the impasse.\textsuperscript{13} The processes of "problem-solving conflict resolution workshops” or “therapeutic diagnostic dialogues” have been applied at various settings including Cyprus.

3. The Context of Conflict Transformation:

Which Cyprus? is a documentary film from an independent and peace journalist standpoint. The documentary is a series of in-depth face-to-face interviews with numerous people for probing “the truth” to understand the conflict. Contrary to the “old paradigm” where war, propaganda, victory and official figures, national interests are at the crux of the matter, it is “people-focused” from different angles. The aim is to present the human side and reveal both peace efforts and various opposing views in a balanced and fair manner. Batum is not trying to be right but he is trying to match the opposite narratives both of the two sides across the border and within the Turkish Cypriots.

Unlike mainstream films with the stamp of patriotism and propaganda, which exploit and steer the uncertainties, insecurities and needs of the people, this documentary aims at giving information for analysis by authentic experiences and real life stories of narrators in its full diversity. The interviewer tries to mirror the internal dilemmas of the North, while he is informing the audience about the climate in the North Cyprus between the parliamentary elections of December 14, 2003 up until the referendum for the Annan Plan. Internal critique of regime and self-stereotyping examples reveal different opinions from various angles. Batum also points at the corruption and monolithic power of the prior regime and its ageing supporters who had witnessed the war and massacres, who are blamed for waging a campaign against Denktas’s opponents, including the jailed journalists and editors whose paper were bombed, human rights campaigners. The director admits that ten years ago a film with such severe criticisms could never be imagined in Turkey. Despite the strong allegations made against him, however, Denktas is not given a chance to reply - a decision Batum says was made because: "We have already heard enough from him... we already all know what he would say. Most Turks have no idea what has gone on there now.”
The overall tone of this documentary, however, is rather pessimistic; yet it is neither cynical nor unrealistically hopeful. This might stem from the fact that he had interviewed with people who are criticizing the mainstream official line and that the film overall is in an oppositional style. Yet, Batum has included various perspectives of the political spectrum with even handed probing questions during his semi-structured interviews. He did not limit his narrators to ordinary people who had crossed over the border but he had to include academicians, representatives of media, politicians, peace activists and various civil groups at various ages. His focus is diagnostic and penetrating on the fault lines which have been censored from the people in Turkey; therefore, his fact-finding approach may be read also as fault-finding as a consequence of his commitment “to unveil the other side of the story” to inform the Turkish people about the expectations of Turkish Cypriots. Although the political and military issues play a significant role in the conflict as displayed in this film, psychological and historical barriers coming from the past and violation of individual human rights along with current economic issues are also emphasized in the picture. The film also suggests as to how some of the conflicts displayed might be tackled by a better understanding of current social lives and interactions of young generation.

Batum makes the audience wonder as to what will happen to the Anatolian peasants who had migrated to the island after 1974. The Greeks say that they need to just go away, and some Turkish Cypriots have similar feelings. Yet, some are into their second generation on the island - so are they now any less Cypriot than the rest? While most of them are angry at the ease with which the passports are given to these “settlers”, there are also numerous native Turkish Cypriots who carry two, three or even four passports due to their various citizenship rights. Hence, both identity and cultural integration are complex issues as is the case elsewhere.

In Batum’s documentary, the stories of Greek Cypriots traveling to the Turkish side on April 23rd, were also interviewed with questions like the possibility to co-habit again, the missing people, the legal solutions to the property issue, the wounds of the immigrants, nationalist propaganda, and the manner in which past may be healed. On the checkpoints of the Green line that divides the island the audience sees slogans such as “We needs hands of peace—not war” and “End Cinderella Time” by Hands Across the Divide (HAD) and other women organizations. Meanwhile, over 9,000 people pass the line for daily work and at the five university campuses in the Northern Cyprus, there are approximately 27,000 students-mostly coming from Turkey. About 3,000 students are either Cypriots or foreign students. Most of the interviews with young students delineate the fact they want peace, employment and freedom to travel and citizenship rights.

People in the films along with scholars have argued that forgiveness is not forgetting, but is rather an acknowledgment of the shared past and a willingness to move on in a new way for the benefit of both sides. This is superior to revenge since revenge only continues the pain, prolongs the conflict and enhances the divide. People from both communities have suggested that a bi-communal peace monument for the people who had suffered the pain of loss might be a big step forward to overcome the legacy of both war and socialization of animosity in their past. They stated that they have an obligation to build and to teach others what they know and to give a meaning to their future lives. Such a symbolic reminder of their history that draws lessons from the past and highlights a shared sense of suffering might lead to acceptance of truth as well as a belated apology to the innocent people who have suffered in both sides of the island. Thus, it may influence and give momentum for procuring social needs of safety, identity, recognition, development, respect and fairness while creating more space for empathic dialogue. Unfortunately, hope and long-term reconciliation efforts have to be born form the tragedies of the past so that we can move on, people say in the film.

Batum’s film reflects the Cyprus issue along with efforts for a solution objectively with a critical angle, mostly from the Turkish Cypriot side. In Cyprus, freedom for one group has often been purchased at the expense of the other’s freedom as depicted in the documentary. As Isaiah Berlin has stated: “If the liberty of myself or my class or nation depends on the misery of a number of other human beings, the system which promotes this is unjust and immoral.” With the initiative of their Greek Cypriot classmates, the class of 1974, who were separated, and the Turkish Cypriot classmates who had not been able to graduate reunite on the campus in the South of an American high school and join the graduation ceremony in 2003. Despite the ironic overall tone, it is also a rousing documentary which ends with hope; with a Turkish and Greek Cypriot holding their hands up together in victory—singing in a chorus of young people.

4. Concluding Remarks: The Role of Women and Youth in Conflict Transformation

As the recent developments show, the conflict transformations are mostly in the direction for a peaceful transition still with sporadic events in Cyprus. The pace of change might accelerate if ‘multiple track diplomacy’ works effectively during the bi-communal rapprochement process. Are Cypriots of both sides sufficiently prepared with respect to their capabilities for a more flexible border with a different mind-set of development? Transition and transformation is a long run process; change and uncertainty are permanent conditions. Thus, the
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ultimate goal in transforming conflictual relations into cooperative and shared relations through leadership is to develop a “safe learning environment” so that reflecting upon significant issues of future generations will be possible.

What role do documentaries play in de-escalating behavior? How can workshops among women and youth aid in increasing intergenerational and intercommunal beneficence and decreasing power asymmetry in decision-making? According to Lederach, initiating collaborative learning and building dialogue with the implicit but constructive images and assumptions present in the culture helps bring to the surface the question of cultural universality of conflict resolution and mediation practices. What we should seek is freedom that starts with the responsibility to others rather than the security of ourselves and ends with an effective universal discourse of human rights. In that regard, the quality of leadership at all levels will determine the state of the world that future generations will inherit. However, as Lederach delineates grass-roots level and middle-range level leadership by NGOs are of particular importance. Thus, NGO representatives and the academicians working as either practitioners or as trainers need to examine challenges in order to create a healthy dialogue between communities, which is essential in the resolution of the all sorts of inter-ethnic conflicts and peace efforts.

Peace journalism or broadcasting for building dialogue is not always about being right or presenting accurately events and developments. It is also about matching the opposite narratives of the two sides. Hence, conflict transformation and research methods based on the principles of therapeutic practice along with making use of narrative documentary films might enhance the quality of training for conflict transformation by encouraging practitioners to reflect on their work more rigorously as a result of promoting interdisciplinary understanding and research awareness. Consequently, hopes for a federation based on a viable settlement where two neighbor groups, unfamiliar with their similarities and separated from each other, will be ready and willing to fight, but deterred only by the UN peacekeeping force, and the balance of power between the two sections and the continual but not continuous rapprochement between two ‘mother countries’. Cypriots having been deprived of their mobility and communication by the line have bridged the “hostility gap” by shared values and increasing trust-building endeavors. Probing into the nature of citizenship within the framework of global discourses of human rights and identity, i.e., “personhood and membership” and “post-national” models are other relevant basic needs issues to be further studied perhaps in near future. Although the efforts in conflict analysis and transformation remind one more of Sisyphus, we might hold on to the essence of hope by seeing new options and possibilities, however remote they may seem.

Finally, the question of women's role in conflict resolution has attracted attention within the last decades with increasing role of women groups in promoting peace. Joint female efforts to resolve conflict in various parts of the world including, Turkey and Greece show that women are eager to resolve conflict, but they are largely excluded from the decision-making mechanism at the national, regional and international levels. They ran practical community projects while rising awareness, building trust, and changing attitudes in favor of peace. That is why there is a campaign to promote the role of women in peace building. The international organizations endorse a larger participation of women in conflict resolution not solely as informal groups but as official actors and decision-makers. Many governments support the initiative and its call for a more systematic and coherent European development policy that puts women at the heart of development and support the call for an EU Resolution on Women and Peace-building.

Women and youth should be integral to conflict resolution and preventing process since they are at the crux of the conflicts as sufferers. First, more and more women have been the direct and deliberate victims of battering and rape. They are also indirect victims of warfare, economic violence or isolation. Often, domestic violence and sexual harassment increase during conflict. Second, conflict often alters gender roles to the advantage of women. In conflict areas where women have lost their husband, brother and father, they often become the heads of household and take active part in community development. Third, studies show that women are more responsive to the basic needs and they have a better understanding of fulfilling these needs. Further, they respond to the common needs rather than concentrating on divergences with an aim of playing power game. In conflict situations, recognition of the vital needs of the other party and finding a solution that meets the needs of the conflicting parties is important. Fourth, women are the major socializers of the next generation- their children. They would play a role in forming violence or they could prevent conflict by socializing their children into a culture of peace. For instance, the way a mother narrates history, myths and folk stories; how she treats her own children and how she presents the “other” to the children by telling stories may be changed. Likewise, the youth also has a long term perspective and they also enhance common needs and
interests. Fifth, given the increased participation of women in civil society and NGOs, they would contribute to multi-track diplomacy.

Yet, there are also challenges to these positive contributions of women to conflict prevention and peace building efforts. First, women might provoke men to take revenge and to kill the "enemy" in the name of demonstrating their manhood or protecting custom. Second, women may form alliance with soldiers and other men in power out of the fear of rape, starvation and harassment. Third, ethnic and religious causes often move women and turn them into passionate militants of clandestine groups. They are often auxiliary to men who lead the uprising or war and they are excluded from the decision-making after the political settlement in the post-conflict era. Fourth, women are often used as political instrument by their national governments to promote a national cause at the expense of violating peace. Fifth, the rise of religious revivalism and ethno-nationalism and women’s mobilization by the extreme groups might prevent women's contribution to peace. These extreme political currents have negative implications for the progress of democratic culture, gender equality and peace building and they nourish patriarchal values and radicalism. Nevertheless, women as well as the educated youth may pave the way for future peace particularly at the grass-roots level.

On the whole, the relationship between women, youth, leadership, development, fairness and conflict transformation is a critical one. In setting the priorities in a democratic and sustainable country, policies should reflect the needs and potentials of all the people, including women and youth. Mainstreaming of gender equality and intergenerational beneficence in decision-making should be a priority. This means that the focus should not be on increasing participation of women and the youth, it should also transform the mainstream agenda and mainstream activities in order to appeal to women's and youngsters’ potential, their comparative advantages and their contribution to sustainable development of the country as whole. In order to enable women to play a constructive role in peace building, one can highlight the following recommendations that are already in the agenda of many voluntary organizations such as:

- Increase the participation of women in peacemaking and peace-building as decision-makers, negotiators, mediators and trainers and train the youth;
- Put women and youth at the heart of post-conflict rehabilitation and reconciliation programs;
- Strengthen the protection and representation of women and youngsters;
- Give organizations of both women and youth the support and resources they need to build peace;
- Give more space and put more weight on the voice of women & youth in the media for promoting peace efforts.

ENDNOTES

ii See the details of the UN or the Annan Plan on Cyprus at www.mfa.gov.tr/grupa/ad/annan.doc.
iii There was no consensus within the media about the Annan Plan. For instance, only two channels Genç TV and Kıbrıs TV were in favor of the plan, while the other three major channels were supportive of the government parties and their official line. Likewise, the newspapers represented a variety of views and they were divided between Yes and No votes. Different Cyprus newspapers such as Cyprus Today, Yeni Düzen, Afrika, Halkan Sesi, Volkan, Cumhuriyet, Ortam, Yurtsever Kıbrıs, Kıbrıs on 23-25th of April 2004 reveal divergent views on the Plan and the results of the Referendum. The Turkish newspapers also had a wide coverage with different views. However, 65 % of yes votes on the Turkish side and 76 % of no votes have again made the settlement postponed.
iv For an overall examination of how different and how similar these two cultures are See (Salih,1978:25 ) (Doob, 1986: 390-391). The differences in each are briefly: (1) Physical Appearance- none (2) Name (3) Language (4) History (5) Religion (6) Nationality. The two cultures of the island are different enough to be considered two distinct ethnic groups with separate identities and histories, but they are similar enough to be able to understand and communicate with each other. As for the similarities that are subtler to an outsider: they are about traditions, values and customs (1) Almost all Cypriots have affection for their native land. (2) Even though the Turks of the island speak Turkish and the Greeks Greek, they both speak the Cypriot dialect of their respective languages. (3) Despite the fact that Greeks are Orthodox Christians and Turks are Muslims, both communities are less religious in an orthodox sense or in practice and more secular in outlook, when compared to their mother countries. (4) The Cypriots believe that they themselves are socially and politically less conservative than motherlands. (5) Again, compared to the Turks and Greeks in the motherlands, they generally are better educated (6) Their folk music and dancing, their cuisine, and other folkloric elements are very similar. (7) Both Greek and Turkish Cypriots have been strongly affected by Great Britain. (8) Both communities’ people concern deeply about face-saving within their communities. (9) A large number of Cypriots, both Greek and Turkish, in pursuit of better economic and other opportunities had to migrate overseas, particularly to London, where today the number of the Cypriot community has exceeded the population of the island’s capital. (10) Finally, members of both communities believe that in the past, intercommunal relations were not so negatively affected by the intense hostility toward the other nation, a feeling which accompanies mainland nationalism respectively, and international but that they were relatively friendly. (Yagioglu, 1996).

v Volkan, 1993: 10, (It is a term first used by Freud stemming from the notion of his concept of narcissistic ego: the divided self and the mediation of self-identity by others). Volkan and his colleagues have developed a series of problem-solving exercises facilitated by a neutral third party who acts as a 'participant-observer'.
vi Volkan, 1988: 103-107. There is either clarity in rhetoric based on difference or the commonalities are unclear. Diverging discourses of identity or ‘cognitive dissonance’ and ‘ambiguous emotions’ are often the outcomes.

vii Volkan, 1979, pp.x-xxi.
x Therapeutic interventions are “preventive medicine” tool for traumatized societies according to Volkan.
x\footnote{Cunningham, 21-23. It is also referred as citizen diplomacy. Volkan’s approach is at mid-range and grass roots level.}
x\footnote{Needs and fairness-based framing are examples of integrative forms of framing.}
x\footnote{Since, participants watch and speak as individuals, from their own (self) or other unique experiences, instead of speaking as representatives of groups the confrontation with actual issues is constructive.}

xii Gali, 1999; p. 131. in “Leadership and Global Governance” ed. by. Adel Safty.
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