

ПОЛІТИЧНІ НАУКИ

UDC 321.7:35.08(043.3)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2024.54.16>

THE COLLECTIVE SENSE OF OWNERSHIP AND ITS INFLUENCE IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GREECE AND TURKEY

Sampson M. Nathanailidis

*Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv,
Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Political Science,
Volodymyrska str., 60, 01033, Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8610-510X>*

Collective ownership refers to the idea that groups of people have a shared sense of ownership or connection to a common good, such as land, a place, or even an ideology. This concept is particularly important in areas where there are conflicts between different countries claiming different rights or links to a common estate. However, this collective sense of ownership can also be a source of conflict, as political leaders can exploit this concept to bolster their support, shape their political agendas, and justify actions that lead to conflict. Consequently, understanding how the collective sense of ownership can be manipulated to promote conflict is critical to developing effective dispute resolution mechanisms and preventing future conflict.

The idea of ownership functions as both a personal “mine” and a collective “ours” aspect. A group of people identified as “we” may develop or own a common property. The nature and significance of a shared sense of ownership, based on the idea of “ours”, has not, however, been extensively studied. Subject matter experts may find collective psychological ownership of interest as an important source of inter-organizational conflict. Furthermore, it has implications for future social-psychological studies and can be investigated by integrating ideas and research from other social science.

Nowadays, the theory of psychological ownership is developing and evolving rapidly. Collective ownership in group dynamics, however, has been shown to be traditionally viewed by researchers as a socio-psychological phenomenon based on the innate need for ownership, the satisfaction of which is closely related to personality development and group functioning. Collective consciousness both at the local community level and at the national or supranational level.

Key words: Collective Sense of Ownership, Greece-Turkey Relationship, Politicians’ Motives, Geopolitics, International Conflict, Conflict Resolution, Ethnic Tensions, Populism, Democracy, Violence, Political Conflict.

Introduction. The sense of group ownership and belonging to collective objects is known as collective sense of ownership and can be quantified at the individual or group level. This sense encompasses the common understanding that an object is “ours” and belongs to the group. These processes show how human behavior is internally regulated, reflecting the nature and importance of the state as a proprietary entity. Property rights must be distinguished from property sentiment, which is a personal feeling of attachment to certain objects of property even in the absence of social or legal recognition. Property rights are a framework linked to the social relations between individuals and communities regarding the property object.

The so-called “territorial instinct”, which underpins the common sense of ownership, is characterized by social acceptance and recognition. Property issues are deeply embedded in the functioning of societies, and people’s behavior is strongly influenced by their collective

sense of ownership. Social interactions are regulated, providing moral rights, advantages, and obligations, and experience helps structure the social and natural world. For a state, the ownership experience can have a significant impact. Gradually, a distinct sense of ownership begins to emerge, and its association with terms such as “value”, “justice”, “money”, “social inequality”, and so on appears. The perception of fairness in the sharing of assets and liabilities is critical to understanding the collective sense of ownership. The perception of justice determines the behavior of citizens and affects many aspects of their lives and their interaction with the social environment [1, pp. 1021–1039].

The word “ours” refers to the feeling of joint ownership or collective ownership of an object, area, or even an idea by a group of people. When a group refers to “ours”, it often means that something belongs to the group as a whole, or that the group has some kind of right or authority over that particular object or concept. The most common type of psychological ownership occurs when someone feels they have the right to decide how to use an object. Claims of group ownership are common in a wide range of contexts, including groups belonging to the same institutions, organizations, communities, governments, and nations. Collective psychological ownership can promote social isolation and conflict between members of the same group or between groups and is one of the main drivers of criminal gang activity. It is also used to support nationalist claims to territorial and cultural ownership [2, pp. 84–107].

Disputes over land or territory can erupt when a group feels a strong connection to a particular area. This sense of ownership can be linked to history, traditions or a sense of belonging. If a group feels its claim is ignored or its way of life threatened by outsiders, tensions can rise. Similarly, changes in politics or society that appear to undermine a group’s position or interests may spark protests. The concept of “us vs. them” often fuels these passionate conflicts, where deep feelings are attached to what one group considers “theirs”.

Citizens can consider their ownership either in their community, region, country or even the world. Nationally, this might sound like, “this is our place!” or “We must take back what belongs to us!” It can also be expressed as “We decide our future” or “We will not let outsiders rule us”. These views of ownership, especially at the national level, can have serious consequences. They have the potential to cause conflicts within a society as well as problems in international relations. A sense of national identity is often associated with citizens’ feelings about their country and things like a common language, flags, customs and way of life, as well as the country’s government and leader [2, pp. 84–107].

Analysis of the problem and the importance of research. The notion of “us” and “ours” emerges from common events and acts that are collectively acknowledged by a group of individuals who identify as “us”. This emotion may unify individuals and direct their actions toward a common objective. Although the notion of “ours” is critical in intergroup connections, it is rarely addressed in social psychology. At the national and ethnic levels, a communal feeling of ownership and belonging is a compelling rationale for territorial and nationalist sovereignty, and disagreements over the ownership of items, cultural artifacts, and territory are widespread and sometimes develop into intergroup violence [3, pp. 24–45] [4, pp. 1–25]. Simultaneously, the communal sense of ownership leads to the marginalization of various minority while also resisting unification. When something that you feel belongs to you is taken away from you or you lose control over it, you develop a sense of ownership that makes you act protectively and restores your ownership claims [5].

The sense of ownership, including the collective, is not a static and inert formation that takes shape once and for all. There is a continuous process of shaping, reconstructing, updating, reducing or increasing value, etc., depending on the specific social conditions, internal processes

of groups and related threats. A number of sociopsychological elements, such as the feeling of shared communal emotions, realistic, symbolic, and proprietary threats from both the outside and the within, the reconstruction of political identity, and the individual's relationship to the community, may all influence how one feels about ownership. The fear of losing control or ownership, whether real or perceived, plays a significant role in ownership recycling. Citizens tend to aggressively defend the communal feeling of ownership, defending and marking it fiercely, which can even show itself in hostile behaviour and contemptuous treatment of "others" [6, pp. 439–459].

The importance of the concept of property, both individual and collective, in the functioning of societies and in the behavior of people is great as it organizes the social and natural environment, regulates social interactions and entails normative and moral rights, privileges and obligations. Property is essential to how people relate to resources, objects and goods, it simplifies their relationship with each other and helps to understand and predict behaviour. Ownership is broken down into three main rights: the right to use, the right to transfer and the right to exclude.

Possession and ownership represent different but related socio-psychological concepts. Possession is about subjective, personal feelings about tangible and intangible objects, while ownership requires social activation and the assertion of a subjective sense of control and authority over things. Property, with the right of exclusion it offers, provides a legal reason to prevent unwanted intrusion and exclusion by others. Even young children observe this right of social exclusion, often expressing it through the phrase "that's mine". In addition, ownership helps to develop a sense of control over an object and to satisfy the need for autonomy. Also important is the fact that the concept of ownership is closely related to the individual's self, as people tend to associate the objects they own with themselves. This close relationship between the concept of "I" and "mine" is a basic element of human psychology and affects the perception and behavior of the individual in relation to the objects he owns [7, pp. 72–87].

People recognize possession on a personal level, so they can also feel collective possession as a member of a group or community. Self-categorization theory (SCT) posits that people self-categorize at different levels of abstractness, some of which are the personal "I" and the social or collective "we". The process of depersonalization changes our perception of ourselves from the personal level to the group level, with the group becoming the (temporary) unit of measurement of things and values that determine our behavior.

Collective ownership by developing group identity can help define group identity, a sense of home, purpose and direction in life, a sense of power and strength, and a sense of collective continuity. Those who identify with their group are more likely to have a sense of collective ownership. The claim of collective possession by groups seeking their identity through things like luxury goods reflects the need for a sense of control that possession serves, as well as the need for identity and recognition that group identity provides [8, pp. 210–226].

It is critical to acknowledge the person or community's right to this psychological possession, or the psychological legitimization of ownership of the object of ownership, in order for the communal feeling of ownership to be successfully realized. This can be accomplished via non-intervention, verbal agreements, and legal rights as well as by other means. As a result, a significant but mainly unstudied phenomena and component in intergroup interactions is collective feeling of ownership.

The collective sense of ownership is also a source of unity among like-minded people who form a group within the country. However, at the same time, it can strengthen conflicts, either within the country (if the political identity and a common national ideal have not been formed), or with the representatives of other countries on the international stage [6, pp. 439–459].

The principles to determine possession so that claims are understandable and legitimate in the eyes of others are:

a) the principle of first possession which originates from political theory and refers to the right to a piece of land due to first possession. According to this principle, the first user of a natural resource, such as a piece of land, did not displace or displace anyone else to obtain possession of it. This principle has applications at various levels, such as in international law where the first nation that discovers an unoccupied territory is allowed to acquire it;

b) the labor and investment principle which refers to the right of possession due to the labor and investment made in an object or resource. For example, one who has worked and invested in a piece of land will be considered the beneficiary of its possession. This principle is linked to the ideas of the philosopher John Locke and the sociologist Durkheim. According to Locke, first possession is a transitory basis for possession, but it is equally important that the condition of cultivation or use of the land also exist. Durkheim also pointed out that when someone creates an object, then it belongs to him to the same extent that it belongs to himself. Research among children and adults has shown that decisions about possession are based on creative work, whether it is the possession of objects or the possession of ideas. The perception of possession is transferred from the owner of the raw materials to the person who invests effort in creating a new object. This phenomenon has been observed in many studies, even when controlling for other factors commonly associated with possession, such as physical possession;

c) the principle of formation which refers to the right of possession because an object or resource has been formed by someone. For example, the creator of a work of art or a building is entitled to its possession because of his creative contribution to its formation. The principle of formation also refers to the concept of “historical right”, which refers not only to the first possession of a territory, but also to the formative significance of that territory for collective identity. This principle is used to justify claims of possession in various contexts, as a group’s historical identity is closely linked to territory or territory [1, pp. 1021–1039].

Marking as a form of possessive behavior is a way of communicating and demonstrating our possession at a social level. Socially recognized and accepted occupation regulates social interactions and prevents or reduces conflict. Essentially, when it is clear what belongs to whom, disputes over rights and responsibilities are less likely. Marking can serve two main purposes, control, and identity. Control states to outgroup members that a particular object or territory is “ours” and that therefore “we” have the right to control access or use of the object as opposed to “others”. On the other hand, identity-oriented branding expresses and affirms the group’s social identity, as it shows internal and external members who we are and what distinguishes us. It is important to analytically distinguish between control-oriented branding and identity-oriented branding, as this allows for an examination of these dynamics in the context of empirical research [9, pp. 1–5].

Essentially there are three forms of threat related to possession and lack thereof, as well as their effects on interpersonal relationships. Specifically, the realistic fear, the symbolic fear and the fear of possession are recorded. Realistic fear relates to the fear of losing economic resources or privileges due to the presence or influence of other groups. Symbolic fear concerns the fear of losing or weakening one’s social or cultural identity due to the presence or influence of other groups. Fear of possession refers to the fear of losing possession or control of an object or territory to other groups. These three forms of threat may combine and affect interpersonal relationships at various levels. For example, in the case of European integration, far-right political officials simultaneously exploit the three different concerns of citizens, their economic interests, their cultural identity and their national sovereignty. Fear of possession is distinct from other

forms of threat and contributes to understanding negative attitudes towards outgroups. Fear of possession is associated with a sense of closeness and loss of control from the group, which can lead to negative reactions and discrimination against out-groups. In addition, dealing with it can bring about different reactions in different cultures and social contexts, as well as affect the perception and attitude of in-groups towards out-groups [10, pp. 120–121].

Owning an object not only implies the right to change it or leave it as it is, but also implies a social and moral responsibility to take care of it. The sense of responsibility can precede the sense of possession of an object, and it can also be a result of it. The experience of ownership can evoke a sense of responsibility and action to care for and improve the object. Therefore, the sense of “ours” may lead to an investment of time and energy in efforts to maintain and improve the object of possession. This sense of collective responsibility usually has positive intra-group consequences, such as enhancing cohesion, increasing commitment, promoting collective action, and recognizing collective responsibilities. One economic strategy that helps communities is cooperative ownership, which not only provides sufficient capital but also fosters a sense of accountability and ownership. Furthermore, a feeling of social duty might deter actions that hurt “ours” and provide group members the incentive to rein in their destructive conduct [11, pp. 79–89].

Why does a leader create conflicting points based on a collective sense of ownership?

A politician’s motivations to create conflict can be varied and are often linked to his political interests and goals. Some politicians may seek to bolster their domestic support by taking advantage of the appearance of an external enemy or the existence of national conflicts. Creating a shared sense of threat can unite the population behind their leader. Through the use of rhetoric and behaviors that emphasize the danger they face from external enemies, politicians can ignite pride and nationalist fervor across the country. In order to strengthen the support of their constituents, political leaders can impose strict red lines on bilateral negotiations between the two countries or maintain an intransigent attitude towards the country’s external enemies. This move may also consist of increased border protection or military reinforcement of border protection forces. Political leaders also use external enemies as a tool to create a common sense of cohesion across the country. A united and strong society can help for more decisive actions against external threats [12].

Some politicians may also seek to increase their political prestige or maintain their electoral power by seeking conflict with the other country. Communicating using the concept of “enemy” for the neighboring country can beautify their political presence to the public. Presenting the neighboring country as an external enemy can create an experience of urgency and need for cohesion. Politicians can take advantage of this example to build public support for their policies. Furthermore, by offering the external enemy as a threat, politicians may additionally try to distract the public from internal crises or from grievances in their governance. The appearance of a leader who can face external threats can increase his recognition and make him more competitive in his political actions. However, using the enemy for political purposes can lead to destabilization and strengthening of authoritarian tendencies, thereby reducing democracy and creating issues of cooperation with other neighboring nations.

Some politicians may also seek territorial expansion of their country’s borders through war. Bellicosity can be justified by taking advantage of the sense of local ownership that citizens have. Politicians may also use the idea of the nation’s unity and one territorial flow to defend incursions or assaults in various areas. Gaining control over territory may elicit strong feelings of accomplishment and security. The employment of these strategies may result in a rise in nationalist sentiment, a decline in dialectical and productive discussion, and a decline in

democratic involvement as people adopt nationalist discourse endorsing intervention as a means of bolstering the authority and influence of the state.

To bring out the collective sense of ownership of territories to lead to political conflicts political leaders use the history, culture and identity of a country to strengthen the feeling of pride and ownership over specific territories. Leaders can seek negotiations and agreements with other countries or groups to recognize or confirm ownership of a territory. This may include border negotiations, peace agreements or international recognition agreements. They can also campaign to create a sense of community or solidarity for a particular region, using the media, propaganda and public relations [13].

Citizens can protect themselves from the influence of political rhetoric that forces them into conflict by using critical thinking and critically examining the arguments and proposals put forward by politicians. In addition, being informed through reliable sources and researching the topics being discussed can help citizens resist unwanted influence. In addition, by demonstrating active participation in dialogues and discussions with each other on political issues and engaging in open communication with other citizens they help to exchange views and highlight different perspectives on national issues. Citizens should avoid taking extreme positions and seek the middle line. Criticizing overly divisive rhetoric and trying to find common ground between different groups can help reduce conflict. Additionally, they should keep their cool and be aware when exposed to political rhetoric. Responding calmly to provocative or divisive statements can help reduce tensions and conflicts.

Analysis of the collective sense of ownership in the two countries. Property claims at the neighborhood, regional or country level are an important part of political dialogue. Collective property claims can have effects that go so far as to threaten social cohesion and international relations. Different areas of collective sense of ownership such as language and culture play an important role in collective sense of ownership [14, pp. 415–432].

Citizens are emotionally attached to their language and traditions, regarding them as their own and strengthening the cohesion of their community through them. In Turkey, language and culture are often interpreted as a legacy of the Ottoman Empire and its greatness. Language is a powerful factor in connecting Turks, fostering a sense of collective identity and belonging. In Greece too, language and culture are fundamental factors of national identity. The Greek language and culture have deep roots in the ancient Greek culture and perceive it as a heritage.

Multicultural society can lead to more diverse perceptions of the collective sense of ownership. Different national and cultural groups may have different understandings of what constitutes their common property, while the multicultural nature of society may also create more complex structures and dynamics in social institutions.

In Turkey, territorial ownership is important because of its geopolitical location and its history as a crossroads between East and West. The sense of ownership over a territory like Cyprus has strong nationalist aspects. In Greece, land and territorial ownership are closely linked to national identity and the spirit of Greek culture. Greek land has great symbolic importance, while territorial integrity is a subject that provokes intense nationalist reactions [15].

In terms of a leader's ability to create conflicting points, this can happen through the exploitation of the above areas. To unite voters behind a political program, for instance, a leader might leverage linguistic and cultural identity. However, the politician can also take use of social groups and political institutions to further their own political beliefs, which will lead to the creation of contradictions. Conflict and inconsistency between the political signals sent by the leader may result from this. The multicultural variety of their populace may also be used by political leaders as a tool for personal gain. A leader in Turkey can focus on a sense of territorial

ownership to unite the people behind a political agenda or distract from domestic problems. In Greece, a leader can focus on language and culture to strengthen national identity and unite the people behind a national approach. But conflict can arise when leaders use these differences to advance opposing political agendas or use nationalist perceptions to distract from economic or social issues [1].

The historical and contemporary claims between Greece and Turkey. The historical and contemporary claims between Greece and Turkey highlight complexity and significant differences between the two countries. The two countries have a rich historical past and conflicting interests. Historical events, such as the Greek Revolution of 1821 and the Asia Minor Campaign that led to the destruction and expulsion of the Greek element from the Asia Minor coast and Smyrna, are treated differently by the two sides, which affects claims for historical truth.

Turkey and Greece also have different approaches to the Cyprus issue. Turkey supports the internationally unrecognized Turkish Cypriot Republic of Northern Cyprus, while Greece supports the Republic of Cyprus as a single administrative structure for the island. The territorial sense of ownership such as the Cypriot occupation by the Turks contributes to the worsening of the confrontations. Turkey and Greece have been drawn into conflict over Cyprus due to the difference in the interpretation of territorial ownership. The Greek Cypriot community in Cyprus and the Turkish Cypriot community have been embroiled in conflict, which their leaders often exploit to bolster the nationalist sentiment of their people (Mfa.Gr).

The two countries also have disputes over the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) in the Eastern Mediterranean and the exploitation of its natural resources. There are also differences over the demilitarization of islands in the Aegean, as well as disputes from Turkey over sea and air control zones. The collective sense of ownership over geostrategically important areas, such as the energy resources in the Mediterranean or the Greek islands, aggravates the confrontations between the two countries. Leaders may exploit this feeling to encourage nationalist backlash and claim more power. Nationalism which is mainly exploited by Erdogan (there is an increase in the Turkish leader's nationalist rhetoric usually during pre-election periods, mainly to garner votes from Turkish nationalist citizen groups) can strengthen the collective sense of ownership and cause controversy (Mfa.Gr).

As far as Turkey is concerned, the strengthening of the variety of Turkey's external political orientations is due to the fact that, alongside the Turkish national majority, there are several other large national communities. The tensions between them can be closely linked to the folding of national identity and collective sense of ownership. Creating citizens' collective sense of ownership of their country includes ensuring the integration, unity and interconnectedness of society and developing self-awareness as a responsible citizen of a multicultural society. The creation of a responsible citizen as one of the main factors in the development of a democratic society, essentially raises the level of the collective sense of ownership of the citizens against the individual or private, regarding their country but also in their attitude towards the various national minorities.

At the same time, however, excessive negative promotion of the collective sense of ownership can lead to the deterioration of relations between ethnic minorities within the country, to the increase in the formalization of migrants and internally displaced persons, as well as to the weakening and even subversion of the fulfillment strategies of the national idea.

Finally, Greece and Turkey have different cultural and religious values, which affects their claims for land and influence. These claims and differences reflect the complexity and sensitivity of relations between Greece and Turkey and shape the framework for negotiations, conflicts and cooperation. Moreover, the collective sense of ownership makes it more difficult to conduct

diplomatic negotiations on international issues, as citizens expect their leaders to defend their interests with courage and determination [16].

Examples of crises that led to conflicts highlighting the collective sense of ownership between the two countries are the Crisis in 1974 that arose after the coup in Cyprus and the invasion of Turkish forces in the northern part of the island, causing Greece to react by sending military forces to its response, the Aegean Crisis in 1987 that arose when Turkey violated the airspace and disputed Greek sovereignty over the Aegean islands, the Imia Crisis in 1996 that arose when Turkey disputed Greek sovereignty over the Imia Islands. This led to a serious crisis between the two countries and threatened armed conflict and other less intense events such as violations of Greek sea and airspace by Turkish vessels. Citizen reactions and political responses to these crises have shaped perceptions of lands and their ownership. In the above examples, the collective sense of ownership was significantly affected due to the tensions and crises that arose between Greece and Turkey. The violation of Greek territorial waters and the sovereignty of Greece over the Aegean islands, the invasions of Cyprus and the attempts to challenge the sovereignty of Greek islands such as Imia resulted in the strengthening of the sense of ownership on both sides [17, pp. 95–115].

Conflict resolution mechanisms between Greece and Turkey. An approach emphasizing the resolution of the Cyprus problem as a key step in resolving the differences between Greece and Turkey was expressed by Greek leaders Konstantinos Mitsotakis and Andreas Papandreou, as well as Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan. This approach focuses on dealing with the Cyprus issue as a precondition for the resolution of other disputes. Some are skeptical of this approach, pointing out that a solution to the Cyprus problem may not be achieved anytime soon. They argue that Greece and Turkey must learn to live with a divided Cyprus and not allow their relations to deteriorate over this issue. Another approach suggests disconnecting the Greek-Turkish rivalry from the Cyprus issue and resolving the differences between the two countries without depending on it. Each approach has its advantages and disadvantages, but the choice depends on the political priorities of the leaders and their communities. In the second approach, leaders deal directly with the various outstanding issues, such as that of the Aegean dispute. This approach recognizes the importance of resolving the Aegean dispute as a step towards improving relations between Greece and Turkey. He also points out that tackling the problem is not impossible and that there are previous efforts that show agreement on basic principles for a fair resolution [18].

All efforts have failed so far because the differences between Greece and Turkey are only the tip of the iceberg. The main problem is the weight of history and the chosen collective identities, which are based on national narratives. Only if this aspect of the conflict is fully addressed will Greece and Turkey be able to resolve their differences and begin a process of mutually constructive reconciliation [19, pp. 31–109].

In addition, third countries and international organizations such as the UN can act as mediators to resolve disputes between Greece and Turkey. When bilateral talks fail to produce a resolution, the two nations may resort to international arbitrators or arbitration bodies to settle their differences. Through NATO, Greece and Turkey have the possibility to cooperate on common initiatives, communicate and face common challenges in the region. Also, cooperation within the framework of the UN (United Nations Organization) can contribute to the resolution of differences between the two countries through negotiations and diplomatic efforts at the global level. Participation in international organizations and initiatives promotes peaceful cooperation and dispute resolution through dialogue and diplomacy, enhancing trust between countries and promoting stability in the region [20, pp. 24–48].

Cooperation also in economic and trade matters has led to a reduction in tension and conflict between the two countries. Economic cooperation, tourism and extensive interaction on low-policy issues can lead to mutual trust and make the Aegean dispute and other outstanding bilateral disputes more resilient to resolution. But several argue that economic cooperation and other transactions are not always “win-wins” and may worsen in some areas. Moreover, they question whether economic cooperation can influence high politics based on the logic of rapprochement, provoking an approachable dialogue or acting as a safety net against retreat. A collective sense of ownership can enrich these conflict resolution mechanisms with valuable actionable elements. For example, an approach that reinforces the idea of common heritage and cooperation on cultural and environmental issues can help create a peaceful and constructive framework for resolving differences between the two countries. Also, enhancing communication between the citizens of the two countries and promoting understanding and mutual understanding can reduce tensions and promote peaceful coexistence [21].

Every action by political leaders and every method of conflict resolution can affect the value of democracy. For example, an action that enhances democratic participation is when cross-functional cooperation and dialogue between political groups and citizens. This strengthens democracy because it promotes participation and the exchange of ideas, while enhancing the credibility of the political system. The use of transparency and open governance where politicians make decisions based on open dialogue and cooperation with citizens, not in internal and limited circles strengthens the democratic resolution of disputes. The fight against corruption and impunity also strengthens democracy because it ensures equal application of the law and justice for all citizens.

On the other side, activities such as political leaders restricting press freedom damage democracy by reducing openness and citizens’ access to information. Anti-democratic actions such as electoral fraud, harassment of political dissidents, and violations of minority rights all represent a danger to democracy [22].

Collective ownership can improve conflict resolution processes and provide useful evidence to persuade political leaders to pursue peaceful solutions by creating a culture of harmony and cooperation between the people of the two nations. Highlighting the humanitarian aspect of conflict by highlighting its impact on the lives of citizens can also increase people’s knowledge and understanding, as well as lead to more humanitarian efforts to resolve conflicts. The populations of the two countries were able to understand the suffering caused by the hostilities thanks to the humanitarian approach. Moreover, in disasters such as earthquakes or floods, the two peoples supported each other, putting aside any ethnic differences.

Conclusions. In this article, it has been demonstrated that the collective sense of ownership in Greek-Turkish relations is crucial as it influences the attitude and action of people and organizations on both sides of the conflict, and considering that Greece and Turkey have a long history of rivalry, such as, in modern times, the tensions as a result of incidents like the Imia crisis in 1996 and the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974, which fueled the idea that each nation “owns” a portion of the other’s history. It’s been determined that leaders on both sides can manipulate public opinion, playing on the sense of ownership to get people behind their policies and turn them against the other country. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that the ongoing confrontation between Greece and Turkey generates the need for an in-depth proactive approach where the collective sense of ownership positively affects the relations between the two countries. The sense of common ownership can play significant role in a potential conflict as it can be used by citizens as a perception of the nation’s shared history and by political leaders as a bridge to promote friendly and peaceful relationships.

The two countries have tried various ways to settle their differences, including talks between diplomats, international courts, and economic cooperation or cooperation in solving global issues. The talks have not yet resolved anything important because both sides want different things and are not so willing to compromise. International courts could offer a more neutral way to decide who is right, but they have not been used so far. Participating in global forums jointly through organizations such as the UN or NATO could also push them to resolve bilateral issues. Trade and other economic ties can also support a long amicable relationship, as long as both sides benefit. A stronger sense of shared history and culture, would create the foundation of what would constitute a long-lasting peace.

References

1. Verkuyten, M., Martinovic, B. Collective psychological ownership and intergroup relations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science: A Journal of the Association for Psychological Science*, 12(6). 2017. P. 1021–1039. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617706514>
2. Pierce, Jon L., Kostova, T., Dirks, K.T. The state of psychological ownership: Integrating and extending a century of research. *Review of General Psychology: Journal of Division 1, of the American Psychological Association*, 7(1). 2003. P. 84–107. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.7.1.84>
3. Brylka, A., Mähönen, T. A., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. National identification and intergroup attitudes among members of the national majority and immigrants: Preliminary evidence for the mediational role of psychological ownership of a country. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3(1). 2015. P. 24–45.
4. Nijs, T., Martinovic, B., Verkuyten, M., Sedikides, K. “This country is OURS”: The exclusionary potential of collective psychological ownership. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 2020. P. 1–25.
5. Pierce, J. L., Jussila, I. Psychological ownership and the organizational context: Theory, research evidence, and application. Edward Elgar. 2011.
6. Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior: PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 25(4). 2004. P. 439–459. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.249>
7. Ye, Y., Gawronski, B. When possessions become part of the self: Ownership and implicit self-object linking. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 64. 2016. P. 72–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2016.01.012>
8. Vandewalle, D., Van Dyne, L., Kostova, T. Psychological Ownership: An Empirical Examination of its Consequences. *Group & Organization Management*, 20(2). 1995. P. 210–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601195202008>
9. Rudmin, F. W. To have possessions: a handbook on ownership and property. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 6(6). 1991. P. 1–5.
10. Sadowsky, J. Private property and collective ownership. In T. Machan (Ed.), *The libertarian alternative*. Nelson Hall. 1974. P. 120–121
11. Stead, V. Homeland, territory, property: Contesting land, state, and nation in urban Timor-Leste. *Political Geography*, 45. 2015. P. 79–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2014.05.002>
12. Dinas, E., Martínez, S., Valentim, V. *Social norm change, political symbols, and expression of stigmatized preferences*. 2022.
13. Baturu, A., Tolstrup, J. Strategic communication in dictatorships: Performance, patriotism, and intimidation. *The Journal of Politics*, 86. 2024.

14. Aydingün, A., Aydingün, İ. The role of language in the formation of Turkish national identity and turkishness. *Nationalism & Ethnic Politics*, 10(3). 2004. P. 415–432. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537110490518264>
15. Dalay, G. Turkey, Europe, and the Eastern Mediterranean: Charting a way out of the current deadlock. 2021.
16. Heraclides, A. The Greek-Turkish conflict in the Aegean: Imagined enemies (2010th ed.). *Palgrave Macmillan*. 2010.
17. Moustakis, F., Sheehan, M. Greek security policy after the cold war. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 21(3). 2000. P. 95–115.
18. Heraclides, A. The essence of the Greek-Turkish rivalry: National Narrative and Identity. *Hellenic Observatory European Institute*. 2011.
19. Aksu, F. Confidence building, negotiation and economic cooperation efforts in Turkish-Greek relations (1990-2004). *Turkish Review of Balkan Studies*, 9. 2004. P. 31–109.
20. Blank, S. The Mediterranean and its security agenda. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 11. 2000. P. 24–48.
21. Executive, I. Greece and Turkey Sign Commitment To Friendly Relations. 2023.
22. Yilmaz, H. Two Pillars of Nationalist Euroscepticism in Turkey: The Tanizimat and Sèvres Syndromes. In I. Karlsson & A. Strom Melin (Eds.), *Turkey, Sweden and the European Union: Experiences and Expectations*. 2006.
23. (N.d.). Mfa.Gr. Retrieved May 14, 2024, from <https://www.mfa.gr/en/issues-of-greek-turkish-relations/relevant-documents/turkish-claims-regarding-the-demilitarization-of-islands-in-the-aegean-sea.html>

КОЛЕКТИВНЕ ПОЧУТТЯ ВЛАСНОСТІ ТА ЙОГО ВПЛИВ НА ВІДНОСИНИ МІЖ ГРЕЦІЄЮ ТА ТУРЕЧЧИНОЮ

Семпсон М. Натанайлідіс

Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка,

філософський факультет, кафедра політології

вул. Володимирська, 60, 01033, м. Київ, Україна

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8610-510X>

Колективна власність означає ідею, що групи людей мають спільне почуття власності або зв'язок зі спільним благом, таким як земля, місце або навіть ідеологія. Ця концепція особливо важлива там, де існують конфлікти між різними країнами, які претендують на різні права або зв'язки зі спільним майном. Однак це колективне почуття власності може також бути джерелом конфлікту, оскільки політичні лідери можуть використовувати цю концепцію для посилення своєї підтримки, формування політичного порядку денного та виправдання дій, що призводять до конфлікту. Отже, розуміння того, як колективним почуттям власності можна маніпулювати для розпалювання конфлікту, має вирішальне значення для розробки ефективних механізмів вирішення спорів і запобігання майбутнім конфліктам.

Ідея власності функціонує як в особистому «моє», так і в колективному «наше» аспекті. Група людей, яка ідентифікує себе як «ми», може розвивати або володіти спільною власністю. Однак природа і значення спільного почуття власності, заснованого на ідеї «нашого», не були широко вивчені. Фахівці можуть вважати колективну психологічну власність на інтереси важливим джерелом міжорганізаційних конфліктів. Крім того, вона має значення для майбутніх соціально-психологічних досліджень і може бути вивчена шляхом інтеграції ідей та досліджень з інших соціальних наук.

Сьогодні теорія психологічної власності розвивається та еволюціонує швидкими темпами. Колективна власність у груповій динаміці, як було показано, традиційно розглядається дослідниками

як соціально-психологічний феномен, в основі якого лежить вроджена потреба у причетності, задоволення якої тісно пов'язане з розвитком особистості та функціонуванням групи. Колективна свідомість як на рівні місцевої громади, так і на національному чи наднаціональному рівні.

Ключові слова: колективне почуття власності, грецько-турецькі відносини, мотиви політиків, геополітика, міжнародний конфлікт, врегулювання конфліктів, етнічна напруженість, популізм, демократія, насильство, політичний конфлікт.