

of goodwill in Cyprus who wish to promote a negotiated settlement: escaping the unnecessary debate about federation and confederation, and the need for a bold step to break the long-standing deadlock.

Professor Watts presented in great detail, at both meetings, the variations, hybrids and complexities of various federal arrangements in the world (and in history). Do not, he urged, get hung up in the false debates about “federation” and “confederation”, the “tyranny of terminology”. As Canadians well know, federal arrangements of “living together” are the tools to implement the political will and public desire to accommodate diversity in society.

That accommodation must include majority-minority relations that are based on a majority’s willingness to recognize minority claims as reasonable, even when those claims are not in the interests of the majority. This is key to understanding the success of diverse societies like Canada (where, for example, the federal Prime Minister has come from Quebec, with 24 per cent of the population, for 32 of the past 34 years and where there are times when nearly all of the highest posts of state are occupied by “minority” French-speaking Canadians: Governor General, Prime Minister, Speakers of Parliament, Chief of Defence Staff, Justices of the Supreme Court). The leadership of the Greek majority in Cyprus must, at some point, recognize the inherent reasonableness of the Turkish Cypriot view that they, as a minority, cannot accept a solution that would leave them trapped in a permanent minority situation in all affairs, all the time. Whether called “federation”, “confederation” or “chopped liver”, a settlement must include majority accommodation of some minority needs. Recycling references to international law about the 1974 invasion does nothing to address this. The leaders of Northern Cyprus must also accommodate the insecurities of Greek Cypriots (who view themselves as a minority “in the region”) by signalling their willingness to end their formal attachment and dependence upon Turkey starting with reduction of the Turkish military presence. Movement by the Turkish Cypriots in favour of withdrawal of the Turkish army and an end to immigration from Turkey would help address Greek Cypriot insecurities (even if Turkey itself didn’t respond cooperatively right away). Harking back to the 1974 coup and attempted annexation to Greece does nothing to move into the future as a united island. Accommodation of insecurities is needed by both sides if either side is to move toward a made-in-Cyprus settlement.

Finally, in Banff and Larnaca, Professor Watts and others explored the idea of a step that would shift the environment for negotiations and create a new climate and circumstances. This could be a symbolic gesture: Willy Brandt as German Chancellor kneeling in the Warsaw Ghetto in December 1970 to the memory of the victims of German fascism. This could be a substantive move: Nixon to China, Anwar Sadat to Tel Aviv. Or it could be a step that actually creates the conditions for change and a settlement: President F.W. De Clerk’s freeing of Nelson Mandela from South African prison. There is a challenge to present and future leaders and civil society in both communities in Cyprus to take a step that would change the climate and conditions.

I would like to thank all those who participated in these discussions. All of the discussions were valuable learning experiences for everyone. I am especially grateful to Tariq Ismael at the