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‘Forced Migration hurts. But how badly it hurts, what heals those hurts, or what keeps them septic, depend on many things ...’ (Loizos, 2008, p. 1). These opening, rather enigmatic phrases of Peter Loizos’ last major writing offer a wonderfully fitting epitaph for his life’s work exploring the complex, evolving, and often contradictory and unsettling experience of forced displacement and exile. And these phrases capture, as he himself did in a vividly personal way, the essence of his anthropological insight into the emotional, social and cognitive disruption and ambiguity of what he termed refugee half-lives – a poignant and perceptive metaphor evoking a ‘power that goes on being active for many years but slowly loses its force’ (1999, p. 238). The shadow of the half-life infuses his writing and perhaps his own positionality as both an insider and an outsider of the people he studied.

Of the many themes that permeate Peter’s often eclectic and unconventional take on, and tools of, anthropology, four stand out – his substantive concerns with politics, Cypriot society, refugees and, fourth, the role of the researcher. In each of these themes, the subject-specific value of his contribution is remarkable. However, through the conjuncture of these themes and through the sharp focus given by the ‘exceptional’ lens of forced displacement and social turmoil, Peter’s work transcends the immediacy of his subject matter to provide a distinctive and unique body of research on social transformation, the management of memory, and the role of the ‘engaged’ anthropologist.

The arena where he practiced his undeniable skills was Cyprus; his subject, accidental at first but a preoccupation for over 35 years, was refugees; and his focus was the inhabitants of his paternal village – Argaki near Morphou – many of whom were his relations.

Political Anthropology

Peter started his academic life as a social anthropologist. But, if such a field of study as political anthropology exists, then Peter Loizos was one of its founders and certainly a leading exponent. His work on political anthropology operated at different scales, it had distinctive roles and varied processes. It could be localised in the everyday encounters and discourses of communities and social groups – as in his first book The Greek Gift: Politics in a Cypriot Village (1975), or his paper Politics and Patronage in a Cypriot village, 1920–1970 (1977): it could be distilled in national level collectivities, evident in, for example The Progress of Greek Nationalism in Cyprus 1878–1970 (1974) and Cyprus, 1878–1955: Structural Change, and its Contribution to Changing Relations
to Authority (1985); or further refined in an international setting such as Ottoman Half-lives: Long-term Perspectives on Particular Forced Migrations (1999) where he saliently observed that how refugees ‘manage their pasts does not only depend on the personal social constructions, but is greatly influenced ... by the political attention they receive in their new situations ...’ (1999, p. 260) (emphasis added).

The analytical lens of his political anthropology could be explicit, as in the title of a collection of some of his papers in Unofficial Views – Cyprus Society and Politics (2001) in his paper Politics and Patronage in a Cypriot Village, 1920–1970 (1977) and chapter 8 in The Heart Grown Bitter (1981), boldly titled ‘Politics’: more usually it was implicit in a dozen or so papers, for example, Cyprus, 1878–1955: Structural Change, and its Contribution to Changing Relations to Authority (1985), Intercommunal Killings in Cyprus (1988) and his last (jointly edited) photographic essay Re-envisioning Cyprus (2010).

Although Peter frequently invoked the realpolitik of power – communists, the geo-political machinations of the USA, Russia and the UK, the regional powerbrokers Greece and Turkey, competing nationalisms in Cyprus, all figured in his analyses as inevitably they must in Cyprus – this was only a means to an end. For him the purpose of his political anthropology was on the one hand, to demonstrate how the internal dynamics of social groups and the way ordinary individuals identified with these dynamics enabled different values to be accommodated and often consolidated, although often with malign outcomes. On the other hand, the dominant theme of his work was to highlight the selective political language by which groups define their norms and values which are then appropriated to emphasise difference, cultural cleavage and a political consciousness. He elaborated this process of ‘Abstraction and Generalization’ and ‘invasive ethnicity’ in a highly nuanced and perceptive way in How Might Turkish and Greek Cypriots See Each Other More Clearly (1998, pp. 37, 40). Whilst Peter showed how affiliation to ‘Obsessive Ethnic Nationalism’ (ibid., p. 40) was most dramatically demarcated in the mutual distrust and ‘distancing’ of Greek and Turkish Cypriots – for example in Aspects of Pluralism in Cyprus (1972) and Intercommunal Killings in Cyprus (1988) – they were also deployed with equally great effect to understand how the politics of class, marital customs and gender in Argaki mediated social relations and changing value systems – for example in Changes in Property Transfer among Greek Cypriot Villagers (1975a) and, of course, The Greek Gift: Politics in a Cypriot Village (1975).

Peter’s political anthropology was intricately engaged with its subject matter but despite the ambiguity of his position as an ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ in the Greek-Cypriot community, it was never partisan and rarely did it project the voice of advocacy. Indeed, the title of his collection of essays, on what might be termed a political anthropology of Cyprus, Unofficial Views (2001) is revealing. Peter was very independently minded and deeply sceptical – provocatively so at times; but, despite this, the title and the essays speak not simply to his wish to articulate an alternative or independent view out of the conventional mainstream. Rather, they signal that, as an ‘insider’, he
was distancing himself from the everyday politics of the Greek-Cypriot community, and declaring himself an ‘outsider’ of the phenomena he sought to explain. Adopting the objective, analytical lens of the researcher as an ‘outsider’, he was able to demonstrate how the selected values and cultural norms were misappropriated to produce politicised spaces of mistrust. And his political anthropology speaks to his frustration with, and a passionate distrust of, the way political ideologies, often drawing on this selective misrepresentation of the past, became institutionalised (or ‘officialised’) both within and between the Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot communities with such destructive force. Revealingly, in the ‘manifesto’ (Peter wrote that it was not a manifesto!) for the volume of photographs in *Re-envisioning Cyprus* (2010), Peter stated, with the other two joint editors that they wished ‘to see Cyprus with our own eyes … and with our own minds rather than through officialising lenses, or narratives’ (2010, p. 7).

To the extent that Peter used his analytical evidence in advocacy, this was rare; but again, it only ever reinforced his position – an ‘outsider’ not a spokesperson for the Greek-Cypriot community. For example, his paper on *Aspects of Pluralism in Cyprus* (1972) was a telling warning to the Greek Cypriots of the impending disaster and the danger of making negative stereotypes. He was never, in his writing at least, sympathetic to the complex and often contradictory politics of his Greek-Cypriot heritage; and he was notably hostile to the selfishness of their political beliefs, especially the extreme nationalistic tendencies which he blamed for the breakdown of inter-communal relations and the debacle of 1974. Uncompromisingly, in *Grace in Exile* (2003, p. 20/p. 17) he dismissively described the ‘hot politics’ of ‘misguided men’ and summarised their role as ‘Nationalists, or How to Wreck a State’.

Nevertheless, this must have been a desperately difficult line for him to tread with his relatives and wider circle of Greek-Cypriot friends in Argaki. Something of the animosity he experienced and the private discomfort and pain his independence caused him is revealingly described in the third chapter of *The Heart Grown Bitter* (1981), a chapter which, in its self-deprecating humour, is as much an exploration of his contradictory positionality as academic researcher and family member as it is a study of the subject population. Yet, though unsympathetic to political ideology and its practical manifestation, his great skill as an anthropologist was to understand, and indeed empathise with, how individuals positioned themselves in the wider framework of political discourse, values and the formal representation of party politics. Indeed, one could read the whole book if not an apologia, then a remarkably subtle and empathetic analysis of the trauma of exile which could only come from a deep understanding and personal knowledge of the people who he was researching.

For Peter, then, the value of the social anthropological lens lay in the insights it offered into how political values and, especially political ideologies, are shaped, articulated and essentialised in and through social relations, and how social relations mediate political ideas and values. The distinctive insights which political anthropology offered was to show how politics were a medium of social expression; it illuminated how social and ethnic norms, values and markers, are perceived
by different groups and how those perceptions become politicised, institutionalised, appropriated and reinvented in different political languages and for different objectives.

**Cyprus and Cypriot Society**

Book shelves are full to overflowing with texts on every conceivable political dimension of the ‘Cyprus problem’. Cypriots of all ethnicities have written on the subject and international scholars have contributed hundreds more volumes. Regrettably, domestic and international scholars have been far less interested in researching Cypriot society and the distinctive attributes of an island society and bi-communal ethnicity. Peter Loizos was one of the few who did. Every anthropologist has her/his ‘people’: for Peter this was the Greek Cypriots, and *The Greek Gift: Politics in a Cypriot Village* (1975) (and précied in the first part of *The Heart Grown Bitter* (1981)), was his major contribution to the study of Cypriot society. Although recording a now lost social order it remains, in my view, a peerless study of the social fabric of Greek-Cypriot society, unrivalled in the breadth and depth of analysis, its subtle understanding of social change, its interpretation of the intricate layers of village life and its wider application to the Greek-Cypriot community. Although following a conventional analytical formula – family and kinship, livelihoods, marriage and religion, social differentiation, and so on – the book illuminates in an entirely original way the complexity of the society it observed and above all the notion of social change which was its *leitmotif*.

It is a challenge to find other published research on Cypriot society of such quality and scope. Echoing Peter’s theme of social change, Attalides (1981) provided a valuable account of these processes in the context of the island’s rapid urbanisation in the 1970s. Peristiany (1965), Markides (1974), Attalides (1977), some essays in Calotychos (ed., 1998), for the Turkish-Cypriot community, Morvaridi (1993, 1993a), and other minorities (Varnava et al., 2009) offer specific and important insights into different aspects of Cypriot society but they do not supply the comprehensiveness of Peter’s accounts.

Given his own ethnic background and the period when he conducted most of his research it is not surprising, but nonetheless regrettable, that he never conducted cross-communal study as other, more recent, Cypriot scholars have been able to do (see e.g. Papadakis, 1998, 2005, 2006). This is not to say that his research on Greek-Cypriot society was somehow ‘introverted’. Many of his papers, discussed above, reveal his knowledge of Turkish-Cypriot society; and all his papers spoke to the need to understand and respect social difference whilst appreciating and building on shared histories and social values.

Inevitably, as we have seen, it was impossible to prevent the cross-currents of political discord and conflict between Greek and Turkish Cypriots infiltrating social research. Peter was no more immune to this process than others (see for example Attalides, 1979); but he always retained his mainstream disciplinary skill as a social anthropologist and the use of life-history methods as the base points from which to explicate social structures, values and change. It is to these challenges and issues that I now turn.
Refugees and Refugee Studies

Exploring fine grain, village level social change set in the wider context of the island’s recent social history motivated Peter’s original doctoral research in Cyprus. And this may have continued to provide a rich and enduring seam of scholarship. Yet, as I have argued, the lens of politics was all but inescapable to any anthropological study of Cypriot society. His deep understanding of this society – or at least Greek-Cypriot society – and political anthropology came together, but transcended both these building blocks to produce a remarkably humane, much more personal, but nonetheless subtly objective understanding of what it is to be a refugee.

Thus, it was in the study of refugees that Peter’s scholarship excelled and where he has made major, enduring, contributions. His work sits alongside that of two other eminent anthropologists who, like Peter, were also pioneers in this field. In parallel with Elizabeth Colson (1971, 2003), Peter’s scholarship provided a longitudinal transect of a displaced community, although in her research on the Gwembe Tonga in Zambia, displacement was induced by development not conflict. And like Barbara Harrell-Bond’s research (1986), Peter’s work transcends the immediate spatial, temporal and unique context-specific characteristics to provide original conceptual insights into the lives and social worlds of communities and households destroyed by forced exile.

Peter’s work as a refugee scholar was an accident in two senses. Without his own Cypriot ancestry, his anthropological research may well have taken him to very different locations, different ‘people’ to study, and probably not the subject of refugees. His refugee scholarship was also an accident, because he was not to know, when he started his doctoral research in the mid-1960s that, less than a decade later, the 1974 Turkish invasion and occupation, and the subsequent refugee catastrophe for the Greek Cypriots would constitute the framework for the remainder of his life’s work. As he noted in the introduction to Grace in Exile (2003, p. 10), ‘I took the pre-war [i.e. the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974] photographs with no idea that I was making images of a community soon to be dispersed’. Admitting that he ‘shared the villagers’ inability to foresee what was coming’ (ibid.), at least when he started his research in the mid-60s, his observations soon became prescient, notably in his paper Aspects of Pluralism in Cyprus (1972).

Against the post-independence backcloth which favoured the Greek Cypriots but economically and politically marginalised the soon-to-be enclaved Turkish Cypriots, he used the tools of social anthropology to describe the rapidly accelerating socio-economic division between Greek and Turkish Cypriots as ‘ominous … and a recipe for disaster’ (1972, p. 20). Reflecting, in 1981, in The Heart Grown Bitter, he elaborated his own growing awareness of ‘The Portents: 1973’ (1981, 50–72). He described the personally discomforting lesson in political awareness, learned in his home village, taught by his relatives; but, at the same time, as a detached observer and researcher, he analysed in compelling detail how extreme political values, ideological cleavages (not infrequently embedded in personal and familial differences), cross-currents of highly localised politics and international geo-political forces combined together to produce an ‘invasive ethnicity’ (1998, p. 40) and the portends of war.
Accidental or not, it was to the field of refugee studies that Peter made his unique and fundamental scholarly contribution, demarcated principally by two books, *The Heart Grown Bitter* (1981), and *Iron in the Soul: Displacement, Livelihood and Health in Cyprus* (2008), valuably supported by his matchless photographic record *Grace in Exile* (2003) and two papers with a wider view on the subject, *Ottoman Half-lives: Long-term Perspectives on Particular Forced Migrations* (1999) and *Are Refugees Social Capitalists?* (2000). Several inter-related aspects of his refugee scholarship stand out.

First, how Peter situated his analysis of the refugee crisis in Cyprus was unique at the time, but is now commonplace amongst refugee scholars. In a short paper *A Struggle for Meaning: Reactions to Disaster amongst Cypriot Refugees* (1977a), Peter sketched out his preliminary ideas for what was to become *The Heart Grown Bitter* (1981). Using the orthodox tools and methods of the social anthropologist he observed, recorded and analysed the experience of forced displacement and exile through the narratives, stories and the personal accounts of men, women, grandparents, farmers, priests, wives, landowners and so on who had fled their Argaki homes and farms in front of the advancing Turkish troops following the July invasion of 1974. These poignant, detailed narratives, collected in 1975, described the immediacy of what it is like, suddenly, to become a refugee, to experience the chaos of flight, the loss of one’s home and land, what it means to confront the destruction and the break-up of village, community and social wellbeing, and the struggle to cope with the aftermath of flight and the vacuum of exile. Documenting these themes and structuring the study of refugees in this way scarcely existed before *The Heart Grown Bitter* (1981), at least not in the systematic way that Peter approached his subject matter.

After all, it is the immediacy of expulsion and the chaos of exile which are the defining characteristics of refugees compared to voluntary migrants. Beyond the reportage of journalists in countless wars, capturing these experiences, precisely at the point of exile and social transformation in a systematic and scholarly way had not really been accomplished before Peter’s work. Collecting narratives is one thing: compassionate and sensitive though they were, Peter’s unique and lasting contribution was to work out a vocabulary and an analytical structure by which to document and make sense of the meaning of exile beyond the personal and the particular. The three parts of the book – the curt titles for each chapter, like the book title itself, signify the violence and the chaos of the experiences – provide such a framework. They delineate and describe the adjustments and social transformations in the first year of exile. One only has to read some of the chapter subtitles – ‘the moral economy of kinship’, ‘at a loss: the special pains of women’, ‘refugee marriages’, ‘identity and community’, ‘pre-occupation with loss’ – to realise how skilfully Peter created a language that gave shape and meaning to the exilic experience and reinforced the richness of his analysis: it was a significant innovation at the time although these are now familiar and well-worn themes in refugee studies.

A second innovative achievement of *The Heart Grown Bitter* (1981), somewhat a counterpoint to this first reflection, was to show that scholars should not only focus on the immediacy of expulsion or the chaos of exile – the defining characteristics of refugees compared to
voluntary migrants. Despite the implications of the book’s subtitle, A Chronicle of Cypriot War Refugees, Peter showed that we should not be blinkered by the overwhelming experience of mass flight in war and the compelling spontaneity of the narratives which describe this violent episode. Rather, we must situate our understanding within a wider frame of complex and, what we now term, ‘multi-causal’ factors. Few people anticipate becoming refugees (Kunz, 1973, 1981), but neither is the process simply impulsive and context-less. Wars and conflicts that produce refugees have a long provenance and this will differ from one situation to another (Zetter, 2011): political scientists have long been alert to this provenance (see e.g. Zolberg et al., 1989). In Cyprus, Peter’s lens of political anthropology demonstrated the importance of situating and understanding the 1974 ‘war refugees’ in the particular antecedent conditions of social and economic change and ‘invasive ethnicity’. Moving from the specific case, the more general innovation of his work was to weave anthological insight into the individual experiences of flight and exile into a more meaningful and ‘multi-causal’ explanation of the social and political milieu in which the ‘war refugees’ found themselves. Whilst Peter’s approach did not have the theoretical influence of Kunz’ work, the concept of multi-causality which we now take for granted was pioneered by Peter.

A third, critical contribution of Peter’s work was to recognise the importance of longitudinal study of social transformation and dynamics in refugee communities. Vital though this is, it was, and remains a rare, if not unique, achievement amongst refugee scholars. One might argue that he had the good fortune as a researcher, first to have documented the social fabric of a pre-displacement community in Argaki; and then, second, that almost 40 years since their exodus, the ‘refugees’ and their descendants remain in ‘exile’. Protracted exile is now the norm for a majority of the world’s refugees since unlocking protracted displacement has become an illusive aim across the world not least in Cyprus (Zetter, 2011a). Yet, diaspora, resettlement and local integration, even if not fully diluting refugee ‘identity’, they certainly make it very difficult to undertake long-term research of displaced communities and virtually impossible to retain the same ‘sample’. These outcomes did not occur in Cyprus, at least not to an extent that happens elsewhere. The refugee label remained and was, paradoxically, reinforced both by some of the refugees and their local organisations (Zetter, 1991) and the large scale refugee rehousing programme which co-opted them (Zetter, 1992).

Peter was alive to the opportunity and his good fortune, but not of course in a vicarious way: neither his professional integrity, nor his close familial identity with the exiled villagers of Argaki would allow that. Whatever the circumstances, his three monographs The Greek Gift: Politics in a Cypriot Village (1975), The Heart Grown Bitter: A Chronicle of Cypriot War Refugees (1981), and Iron in the Soul: Displacement, Livelihood and Health in Cyprus (2008), constitute an unrivalled documentation that transects refugee social change and transformation, from a pre-displacement and pre-invasion social world of prosperity, aspirations and development, through dramatic destruction and the life-changing experience of refugee flight and its immediate aftermath, and then, thirdly, into a long period of adjustment to the deeper impacts and meaning of forced displacement.
The Greek Gift: Politics in a Cypriot Village (1975), defined the ‘normal’ and, in its retrospective first part, The Heart Grown Bitter, preludes the main subject matter of war and refugees. These commence his longitudinal study. The Heart Grown Bitter, is an initial snapshot of the impacts of forced displacement in which Peter demarcates and explores critical social processes and the initial challenges to the social fabric and social values of the refugees. Remembering and managing memory were significant themes, first through processes of cultural involution and then through the myth of return as a dominant feature (Zetter, 1994, 1999). Like The Heart Grown Bitter, Iron in the Soul: Displacement, Livelihood and Health in Cyprus (2008), was ahead of its time both in providing a long-term perspective on the social adjustment of refugees and in its specific subject matter of health. On social adjustment, chapter 10, ‘A Sociology of Argaki Displacement: the Thirty Year View’, yields remarkable insights into the coping capacity, resilience and recovery processes which have transcended the pain and grievance of displacement. And on health, whilst enormous scholarly and professional attention has been paid to the medical and psychosocial needs of refugees in the early ‘crisis’ stages of refugee emergencies, where malnutrition, contagious disease and reproductive health are the main challenges, Peter’s exploration of the long-term health conditions of refugees in protracted exile is well ahead of social scientific research but nicely in tune with medical interest where the subject has recently gained increasing attention. In these situations it is the growing incidence of long-term chronic, non-communicable diseases such as cancer, diabetes, cardio-vascular failure, as well as pre-existing, enduring and emerging longer-term mental health difficulties which are a mounting concern (IFRC, 2012, pp. 96–99).

Each of the three books stands by itself as an original and valuable contribution to the field. But, re-reading the monographs for this review I realise their unique value as what is, in effect, a trilogy intersecting three critical stages and processes in the life of a community. The fact that many of the same people reappear through the three books, gives a familiar yet especially poignant quality to the analysis. Through the narratives of some of the same villagers he had interviewed before their forced displacement, in the Greek Gift, and their reflections (or their children’s reflections) decades later with ‘iron in their souls’, Peter reveals, in a way that no other researcher has been able to do, an extended social-history of a refugee community – un-mixed by forced exile, ambiguously retaining a here-and-there identity, coming to terms with an exilic process which challenges the underlying social norms which bound the community together, managing memories, drawing on enduring familial and social capital to cope with the physical, emotional and economic impacts of displacement, adapting to changing social and political affiliations.

Five papers complement and refine Peter’s unique, long-term perspectives on the social worlds of refugees: Greek Cypriot Refugees after 25 years: The Case of Argaki (2002), ‘Generations’ in Forced Migration: Towards Greater Clarity (2007a), and Hearts, as well as Minds: Wellbeing and Illness among Greek Cypriot Refugees (2007) focus on specific aspects of the Cyprus case. Ottoman Half-lives: Long-term Perspectives on Particular Forced Migrations (1999) and Are Refugees Social Capitalists? (2000), have particular value because, by transcending the specifics of
Cyprus, they provide Peter with the opportunity to test out important concepts in different contexts – the destruction and reconstruction of identity, changing social relations, the impact of reception, managing memories, the myth of return.

Ottoman Half-lives and Are Refugees Social Capitalists?, capture something of the enigmatic and dichotomous identity of refugees. The phrase ‘half-lives’ speaks to both loss and continuity, whilst ‘social capitalists’ pitches the now fashionable concept of ‘agency’ and pro-activity against a question mark which suggests uncertainty about how survival of social norms survive in exile.

What is familiar in these papers is Peter’s consummate skill in letting the voices and experiences of refugees give meaning to these concepts.

I often contemplated from where Peter’s deep understanding of, and empathy with, refugees came, because his insights are far more profound than just those of a consummate scholar. Although Peter revealed many of his thoughts in his writing, nowhere more so than in the avowedly ‘personal tone’ of The Heart Grown Bitter (1981, p. ix), he was in other respects guarded about his private thoughts and such curiosity would have altered the terms of our relationship. Yet, one might speculate on the extent to which his own father’s self-imposed exile in the 1930s, a social outcast as a founder-member of the communist party in Cyprus, might be reflected in Peter’s own insider/outside disposition.

**Researcher and Research Methods**

One cannot review the substance of Peter’s research without some reflections on his role as a researcher and the research methods he used. I have alluded to this already, but here I highlight four themes which distinguish his approach to the study of people and societies – his linguistic style, the use of narrative methods, photography and finally his positionality as an insider and outsider.

Words mattered greatly to Peter: he deployed a richly descriptive vocabulary with images and metaphors which conveyed precise meaning and yielded deep insight. His style of writing had a compelling immediacy and a sense of being ‘freshly minted’. The titles of Peter’s papers and monographs illustrate his skill in distilling the essence of the social transformations which they explore. I always found intriguing the bodily metaphors in his two main refugee books – heart and soul – though I doubt that he intended the irony that comes from their juxtaposition out of context. In The Heart Grown Bitter, the ‘heart’ captures the vulnerability of the body’s central organ in the context of violence, whilst ‘bitterness’ epitomises the immediate reaction to the harshness of the disaster and the deprivation and loss it produced. The stridency of this title contrasts with Iron in the Soul. Still a striking choice of words, but conversely this speaks to resilience, survival and the continuity of social norms and structures on the one hand, whilst the metaphor of ‘soul’ emphasises reflexivity and a philosophical coming to terms with the events and with the consequences of displacement. And the subtitles too are meaningful in the way they underscore the main titles: we shift from ‘refugees’ to the softer image of ‘displacement’ and from ‘war’ to wellbeing in ‘livelihoods and health’.
The photographic essay *Grace in Exile* (2003) introduces another complementary, descriptive image: the choice of softer words perhaps expressing Peter’s own personal reflections as well as his judgement on the outcomes for the refugees three decades after their displacement. Choosing the word ‘grace’ illustrates Peter at his most insightful and emphasises his sensitivity to the subject matter. Many authors would have automatically used the much more familiar word ‘dignity’ in the refugee context; but overuse, especially by humanitarian actors and organisations, has devalued the meaning and made it seem increasingly condescending.

Film making and especially photography were, of course, important tools in Peter’s research. One could argue that Peter used photographs precisely to escape the weight of politics in any analysis of Cypriot society. In *Re-envisioning Cyprus* (2010), Peter wrote in the introduction to his own section, ‘Cyprus through our own eyes’, that he wanted the photographs to describe a social history of Cypriots, of all ethnic communities, free from the constraints and shackles of ‘the Cyprus Problem’, concentrating instead on the ‘shapes of ordinary lives’ (2010, p. 12). And it is not without significance that 24 of the 30 photographs, and especially the associated narrative captions, in *The Heart Grown Bitter* (1981), tell the personal stories largely free from political context. These vivid, close-up portraits of his subjects capture and reinforce the sense of disorientation and uncertainty, yet there is also dignity in the faces of those who had been violently dispossessed. Symptomatic of Peter’s sensitivity and deep understanding of those whose devastated lives he sought to analyse, there is no pictorial evidence of trauma in their faces: Peter was always careful to challenge this all too easy recourse to negative stereotypes (2008, p. 184).

Some of the same photos appear in *Grace in Exile* (2003) separated from his pre-1974 portraits (and village scenes) taken in Argaki. What the juxtaposition achieves is the striking contrast between the optimism, confidence and security captured in the faces in the pre-displacement photographs and the disorientation and insecurity of exile portrayed in unsmiling anxious faces. Years later, in *Iron in the Soul*, the portraits reveal a restored sense of security yet tinged with the ambiguity of ‘grievance and transcendence’ in the title of the book’s last chapter. Peter’s photos are not just casual adjuncts to academic analysis: they are a vital part of it, carefully if discreetly posed to give rich and highly distilled meaning to his research.

Although he used participant observation, ethnographies, narrative accounts and oral history were his data and the main research methods that Peter used throughout his life’s work. Peter wrote about his methods that he was less interested in systematic data and ‘facts-and-figures’ interviewing ‘but more with the nature of refugee experiences’ (1981, p. 189) which he recorded if possible. Clearly Peter felt at ease with this classical social-anthropology method and strongly believed that the best evidence of what societies are about and how people conduct their social relations comes from people telling their own story. Of course, the challenge lies in the ‘role of the narrator and interpreter’ (1981, p. 188) and how she/he mediates the narratives. Peter excelled in presenting and analysing narrative evidence with care and sensitivity.

These observations neatly segue to my final point – Peter’s potentially complex insider-outsider role: related to some of the people who were the subject of his scholarship and linked by
family friendship to many others, yet an objective researcher of the social world of these same people. The problem was that Peter was a Cypriot and more than that a village ‘insider’ who was expected, as an anthropological researcher, to behave like an ‘outsider’.

Peter was fully aware, candid, as well as mocking and rather self-deprecating about his positionality exposed in the title of his paper Confessions of a Vampire Anthropologist (1994). Yet it was not easy for him – neither personally as an insider to detach himself from his roots and reach uncomfortable and perhaps controversial conclusions about the refugee disaster that befell his relations, nor as the objective researcher to convince other scholars of the objectivity of his analysis of the pain of acute social upheaval. That his research dealt with testimonies about the consequences of violent conflict and dispossession heightened these tensions. My own view is that his insider knowledge and the methods he used did not compromise his objectivity. Rather this worked to his benefit since much of the depth and subtleness of his insight, I would argue, could only have come from the intimate knowledge he acquired as an insider, able to set this understanding in the wider context of an outsider scholar-outsider.

Epilogue

I knew Peter well as a good colleague for almost 30 years. He was always a willing and deft advisor about my research in Cyprus and I valued the respect with which he received my comments on his work. We shared our thinking and papers on the refugees. The last time I was with Peter was in Brussels in 2010 at one of the countless bi-communal peace and confidence building conferences – this one organised by PRIO and the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS), on Property in the Cyprus Peace Process (Zetter, 2011b). As I recall, he did not give a paper but moderated one of the sessions. I sensed that he was disillusioned by the well-rehearsed and predictable positions of both sides which had scarcely changed in three decades through endless rounds of UN sponsored negotiations and as UN Special Representatives came and went. Peter was far wiser than many other academics in his reluctance to offer a view on how the ‘Cyprus problem’ could be ‘solved’. He was, in any case, sensitised more than most scholars to the ‘harassment if they voice views which run counter to the demands of invasive ethnicity’ (1998, p. 46).

Given these conditions, and not least because his work speaks mainly to a present which evolves in response to the power of exile that ‘slowly loses its force’ (1999, p. 238), it would be unfair to speculate how would he view the recent trends and future possibilities in Cyprus. Quiet voices for a two state solution are just beginning to be heard in some quarters – perhaps little more than a rationalisation of the status quo – whilst others argue that the path to a comprehensive solution has finally run into the ground and that a step-by-step, incremental path agreeing one social, economic or political building block at a time offers a more viable if painfully slow route to compromise and ‘re-unification’. I suspect that, as in the past, Peter’s position on these trends would have been enigmatic. But consistent was his role as a scholar in seeing and valuing people for what
they are, ‘refusing the pressures towards ethnic stereotyping’, increasing ‘clear understanding by not
underestimating vital differences’ and by ‘not favoring one way of seeing, of being a man, a woman,
a citizen, a people’ (1998, p. 48).

In the conclusion of the ‘half-lives’ paper he comments that ‘They [the refugees] may well
prefer to marry others like themselves and thus create communities of trust shared values, and
mutual aid which would rejoice social capital theorists’ (1999, p. 260). Setting aside the ironic
reflection or gentle pricking of grand theorists at the end of this sentence – so typical of Peter’s style
although it was rarely possible to discern which mode he was really in – here we come very close
to a summary of his views on the perhaps conservative social world of refugees.

Perhaps more fitting is to end where we began.
‘Whilst ... the Argaki refugees were exposed to events which were massively disruptive, and caused
many of them to doubt many previously taken-for-granted assumptions, most of them did not
break down and despair to the point of being unable to pick up the threads of their pre-
displacement lives ... “taleporithikame, alla imaste kala” (we have been through a very hard, painful
time but we are alright [now])’ (2008, pp. 184–187).

It was through his deep understanding of the lives and coping of refugees, and his unique
capacity to explain and represent those lives with insight, compassion, evocative metaphors, vivid
prose and the condensed images of photographs that he made his most important contributions
to scholarship.
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