Abstract
Individual property rights have played a significant role in the Cyprus problem since the decision of the European Court of Human Rights in the Loizidou case. Therefore, it should be noted that the lawsuits concerning property rights have a political function, even though they seem, at first, to be only about defending the rights of individuals. The political function of these lawsuits may vary, depending on the timing, and the intentions of the plaintiffs or those who guide the plaintiffs. The lawsuits, the defense, and the decisions at those lawsuits indicate, in some cases, that the status quo in Cyprus is unsustainable, and they therefore lead to conclusions that motivate the involved parties towards a comprehensive settlement. Some other cases, however, weaken the belief that the two communities can live together in peace.

In this article, it will be argued that the strategy that aims to maintain the status quo by not providing a defense or providing a minimal defense in these lawsuits, and not filing any countersuits, must be abandoned. The new strategy should focus on underlining, by means of defense methods and countersuits, the ideas that both communities suffer significantly from violations of their human rights due to the extraordinary situation in the country, that this situation is unsustainable, and that violations of human rights can be avoided only through a comprehensive settlement. In a context where the law is clearly being used as an instrument, such a strategy would be one that uses the law as an instrument for peace, not for war.
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