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Preface:
In Memory of Peter Loizos

Peter Loizos, who passed away a year ago, was one of the most prominent figures in Cypriot studies. In a tribute in ‘Anthropology News’ republished here, Yiannis Papadakis and I strove to fit into a few words the legacy he left behind for anthropology worldwide. In opening that up in this preface, I want to acknowledge Gill Shepherd’s support for the TCR endeavour, in the form of thoughtful comments on what follows.

Peter Loizos is indisputably the founder of ‘Cypriot anthropology’. At the time of his fieldwork in the 1970s in the village of Argaki in the Morphou plains, there were only a few suggestions, (John Campbell’s work on Greece, William Wylie’s on Provence, Pitt-Rivers on Andalusia, for instance), that Europe might be a location for anthropology. Peter Loizos’ work, linking intra-village politics to the larger world, showed that European anthropology could be fully legitimised and could indeed make new contributions to the discipline.

In studying Cyprus ethnographically, Peter Loizos not only took on the task of entering an unknown field; he also entered the methodological territory later known as ‘native anthropology’.

Native anthropology became, during the decades that his career spanned, a cornerstone of postcolonial anthropology. Peter treated this, like other branches of post-modern theory, with caution. Yet it is important to stress that this was not condescension. Insights and breakthroughs in theory and practice always had a place in his teaching and research, as long as he saw in the arguments proof of ‘solid ethnography’. So even though we may now know ‘native anthropology’ through Saidian and Foucauldian questions of power, Peter Loizos’ work reminds us what the initial stakes in this ‘power’ were as ‘native anthropology’ began to appear in the ethnographic horizon. Much like the anthropology of Europe, native anthropology was about repositioning the discipline as a study of people whose thoughts and worldviews are instructive to the understanding of humanity, not because they are primitive, exotic, or inferior, but because they force ‘us’ to reconsider questions of (‘our’) science, advancement, truth, fact, morality, and justice, hitherto taken for granted, anew.

Procreation, a question that he remained interested in for a long time, is one example where assumptions about ‘native cultures’ exposed such biases of positioning. In the article we have
included in this collection, the thrust of his argument is a criticism of Delaney’s Turkish ethnography. The discussion this paper offers invigorated a much older anthropological debate about the connection between beliefs about procreation and wider cultural worldviews. Peter Loizos’ point was to argue that the politics of the nation state need to be examined contextually and not on a par with cultural perceptions as if people embraced national ideology unquestionably. The people that Peter Loizos had come to know accepted neither cultural beliefs, nor, most crucially, national ideology without criticism. And he had found that out through close observation and intimate discussions with men, women, young, and old. The ethnography of politics, he seems to argue in response to Delaney, can become entangled in the politics of ethnography, but that is to its detriment.

This close attention to the primacy of good quality data (which is where most of his caution vis-à-vis postmodernism lay) had caused a shift in focus in his early work from marriage patterns to political culture. And even though The Greek Gift has later been hailed as a ‘pre-war’ ethnography, Loizos had already noted the political rifts that played themselves out in the war that erupted just after he had left the field. This ‘pre-war’ ethnographic moment is therefore not one of blissful peace where ‘culture’ (conceived in the classic sense of ritual and life patterns) takes precedence in the everyday, but rather one where access to modernisation and resources is tied to class and the life struggles that ensue from the process of class formation and consolidation in a recently decolonised state.

The article in which he transferred this analysis to the plane of nationalist politics was published in Man in 1988, and has become influential in the anthropology of violence and war. This is so for a reason. In that article, Peter Loizos took a political stance on many levels. In terms of disciplinary politics, he showed that anthropology could and should come in to address problems that up to then, were deemed the domain of ‘harder’ sciences. In explaining the Cyprus conflict, it had hitherto fallen to the much more macro disciplines of Political Science and International Relations to explain the global cold war dynamics that had made the Greek coup and Turkish invasion possible, and to Law to justify different stances in relation to these events. Peter Loizos, alongside Michael Attalides with whom a strong professional and personal friendship developed, showed that the more micro social factors which interpreted larger-scale events were just as important.

And moving that argument forward, Peter’s work exemplified how war-time killing is not only a matter of military structures, but cultural ones too. That argument could not have been made without a positioning on Cypriot politics as well. In publicising an account of the killing of Turkish-Cypriot civilians by Greek-Cypriot militiamen in the war of 1974, Loizos was taking a stance of critique concerning the official Greek-Cypriot rhetoric that the suffering was only on one side, the gains all on the other. But on the plane of analytical politics as well, he was making the difficult argument then: that mass killing is not to be thought away as ‘psychopathic’ or ‘aberrant’ behaviour. It can have social and cultural underpinnings, which make the blame uneasily more
collective than individualisation affords. Peter struggled on all these planes of politics throughout his career. His stance was always informed by a dialogue between research and commitment – with as great a commitment to support for peace initiatives in Cyprus as to writing.

It is this which made his second monograph, The Heart Grown Bitter a major study in the anthropology of displacement and in refugee studies more generally. Closely examining the hardship that Greek-Cypriot refugees faced when forcibly moved to the south of the island in 1974, but also emphasising the resourcefulness that propelled them into prosperity again, Loizos taught students of refugee populations to look beyond the moment of displacement. He also taught them to do so with empathy, respect, and accuracy. The Heart Grown Bitter is not an account of trauma – a term which Peter used with great care – only. It is a text at times humorous, at times self-reflexive, at others greatly detailed; reminding us that refugees, just like any other subject, have multi-faceted lives. The culmination of his commitment was his 2008 Iron in the Soul, in which he explored long-term effects of displacement on the people, his family, whom he had been studying since the 1960s.

In an academic environment where ‘area studies’ designate both the box one is relegated to and the turf one protects, Peter made ‘Cyprus’ stand for a broader political reality. His expertise on Cyprus was read through the prism of the issues he was analysing: refugees, kinship, development, conflict. On these issues he sought to explore comparison beyond his Cypriot ‘field’ through research on refugees in Sri Lanka, Nepal and Bangladesh with the Refugee Studies Centre in Oxford, through fieldwork in Greece, and film-making in Bosnia. A piece on western Thrace that was never published was shared with me when I said I wanted to do research there. Reading it, I wondered how many other places he had not ‘claimed’ in publication but nevertheless analysed with the clarity and precision I had seen in that paper. This is only to show that these explorations went hand in hand with Peter’s flair as a teacher. He lent an ear to researchers the world over who were writing on Cyprus, never failing in his enthusiasm for new findings and developing points and arguments in long and thoughtful comments.

We therefore deemed it imperative for The Cyprus Review to devote this issue to Peter and his work. But we dedicate this special issue to his memory for a number of reasons that extend beyond our mandate as the flagship journal for Cyprus studies. Peter has been a supporter of the journal for many years, as a member of the international advisory board, but also contributing reviews, comments, and articles – the last of these contributions, which he entrusted for finalisation to members of the team, former students, and friends at University of Nicosia when he became too ill to work on it, is hosted in this issue. In retirement, Peter taught at the University of Nicosia with the same enthusiasm as he had introduced anthropology to a number of us in London. Indeed, while to Cypriot students of other disciplines at the LSE, Peter Loizos was the explanation for an oddly familiar image of a village priest and his wife on a donkey hanging on a wall on the way to the Seligman (‘siesta’) library, anthropology students from across UK
departments working on Cyprus knew that this image was not simply the representation of a field site. It was rather the representation of a life-long commitment to people and development in a place that was always much more than ‘a’ site.

It was also a representation of an interest in image, both still and moving, that in fact predated even his anthropological career. In celebration of that commitment, and its manifestations in text and image, we host in this issue work by scholars which touches on those three issues: imagery, development, and ethnographic analysis. Directly or indirectly, all of that work has been influenced by Peter’s studies on culture, politics, and photography in Cyprus. But conversely, his own work was also constantly informed by analyses of others, whether he directly supervised, or simply came to know of them. This is clearly visible in his own article on procreation theory, which despite being written many years ago reflects his concern to integrate up-to-date ethnography into his argumentation. Procreation is one aspect of kinship, a theme that preoccupied Peter over the years. His volume on Contested Identities, co-edited with Akis Papataxiarchis, remains a key reference on gender and kinship, over twenty years since publication.

Yet it was the work on refugees that he was most renowned for. His Greek Gift, The Heart Grown Bitter and Iron in the Soul can be read as a trilogy of war trauma and recovery representing five decades of work among Greek-Cypriot refugees. As a life-long legacy, this ‘trilogy’ represents Peter’s ethical commitment to research and the research field. Fittingly, we host two articles and two commentary pieces in this issue that speak to this legacy. The articles, by Susan Pattie and Sossie Kasbarian, negotiate questions of uprooting and resettlement through the politics of cosmopolitan worldviews and diasporic belonging respectively among Cypriot Armenians and Armenians elsewhere. In the essay section, we host Roger Zetter’s thoughts on Peter’s legacy in refugee studies, and Eral Akaturk’s findings on the resettlement of Turkish-Cypriots in the village where Peter initially conducted fieldwork.

Peter’s influence and interests extended of course beyond displacement. Political life was always at the centre of his attention. Political movements, rapprochement, the development of political consciousness post-conflict, party politics and government policies, the international-domestic relationship, were all issues he had written on, argued about, and guided younger researchers through. As political life in Cyprus veers away from ‘the conflict’ and into questions of multicultural co-existence and independence from party loyalties, marginal groups are making significant claims to space and voice. One such movement is the Occupy Buffer Zone, examined by Murat Erdal Ilican, which was consolidated just as Peter was fighting his own last battle. The article included here is a reminder of the inroads his political and ethnographic analysis made across disciplines.

Another trend taking shape on the level of post-conflict political culture is the uncomfortable negotiation between ‘forgetting’ the conflict and getting on with life as if it did not exist, and the fact that conflict politics appear to be seeping into all aspects of cultural life. Such an example is the
case of patenting halloumi cheese as a Cypriot product, which Gisela Welz insightfully analyses. Her contribution to this issue speaks not only to cultural politics, which interested Peter, but also to the negotiation between development and different understandings of ‘tradition’. This was an initial point of focus for Peter, prefiguring even his concern with refugee studies. His first documentary, Life Chances, traces the process of modernisation in Cyprus through fields as diverse as gender perceptions, technological development, and urbanisation. The sequel, Sophia’s People, picks up these issues and filters them through a much more empathetic lens to show that in displacement these processes may be upset, but they still continue. Gisela’s article takes this cue to examine how ‘tradition’ becomes a battle ground in post-modernity.

Life Chances, of course, is chiefly a token of Peter’s engagement with image. Ethnographic documentaries were, along with research methods, the main courses LSE anthropology students knew him for – especially the discussions over realism, positioning, and technique that followed the screenings. His Innovation in Ethnographic Film is testimony to this enthusiasm. And photography was a pre-occupation he shared with a number of Cypriot artists and professionals, often collaborating with them for exhibitions and publications. Nicos Philippou’s contribution draws on this experience, reminding us at the same time of the legacy of post-colonialism that has defined what ‘Cyprus’ connotes, even today, for both locals and Westerners.

Taken together then, the contributions to this issue celebrate Peter’s life and work by celebrating Cypriot anthropology, which he founded. In this issue we pause to remember the significance of those foundations, at the same time as we celebrate a good friend, a supportive mentor, a committed researcher, an unpretentious thinker, and an uncompromising scholar.

Olga Demetriou
Obituary for Peter Loizos
to Anthropology News

Yiannis Papadakis and Olga Demetriou

Peter Loizos, 74 (born 1937) Emeritus Professor of Anthropology at the London School of Economics, was a social anthropologist and documentary film-maker whose work focused on the long-term effects of conflict and displacement in Cyprus. Before turning to anthropology, he had studied English at Cambridge and Communications at Pennsylvania, and had worked as a film-maker for the BBC. His anthropological studies focused on Greek Cypriots from Argaki village, making his corpus one of remarkable long-term commitment lasting almost 50 years. During this time, he documented the disruptions of modernity, forced displacement and finally illness and ageing. His first book, The Greek Gift: Politics in a Cypriot Village (1975) documented the ambiguous benefits of the village's incorporation within a new state and the political shifts entailed. His second book, The Heart Grown Bitter: A Chronicle of Cypriot War Refugees (1981) documented the plight of the Greek Cypriot inhabitants of Argaki in 1974 when the village was bombed during a Turkish military offensive. In the resulting ethnography, Loizos gave precedence to the refugees' experiences by placing the theoretical and academic discussion in an appendix, wishing to respect the refugees' painful narratives and to allow the refugee voices to be heard in their disturbing and tragic tonalities. This subsequently rendered it one of his best-known books in anthropology and refugee studies, and it was praised for its ground-breaking writing style. The trilogy on Argaki was completed with his latest book, Iron in the Soul: Displacement, Livelihood and Health in Cyprus (2008) providing a forty-year perspective on displacement, trying to bridge the social sciences and the life sciences with a study of the long-term health effects of socially disruptive change.


Loizos was a supportive teacher, whose guidance inspired many anthropologists throughout the world and who established the foundations for Cypriot ethnography, which forty years on, is a flourishing field.

Loizos passed away on Friday, 2 March 2012, just two months short of his 75th birthday. He is survived by his wife, Gill; his children, Helena, Daniel and Hannah; and his granddaughter Margaret.
Procreation Metaphors in Rural Cyprus and Greece

PETER LOIZOS
with the assistance of
Egli Pittaka, Marios Sarris, Dimitris Theodossopoulos*

Abstract
Some social scientists have been tempted to make wide ranging comparisons of whole societies, or cultures, using key metaphors as the units of comparison. Carol Delaney in her monograph on a Turkish village and subsequent wide-ranging paper suggested that concepts of bio-social procreation could be generative of wider and deeper cosmological, theological and gender ideas, for the Abrahamic religions. This idea was ‘tested’ using data from older people in Greek Cypriot villages and in Greece who had been less exposed to medical and bio-scientific discourses during

* This paper was originally written with the assistance of the individuals mentioned. In the process of preparing it for publication in 2013, Marios Sarris and Dimitris Theodossopoulos were contacted for further assistance. In addition, Nicos Philippou, Patrick Heady and Venetia Kantsa were also consulted, while Olga Demetriou was involved in the editing. In an effort to remain as faithful as possible to the original, substantial additions made for the purposes of clarification and updates to data have been marked out as asterisked editor’s notes. All numbered notes are Peter Loizos’ own. The paper reached The Cyprus Review with a note that it was initially presented at a conference in Harvard University in 1994. Part of Peter’s plans were also to link procreation theories to nationalist thinking in a later article. In fact, in 1996 he organised a conference at LSE on the subject of procreation metaphors – in which the focus was partly on Delaney’s thesis, and partly on the broader themes raised in this paper (with a correspondingly wide geographical coverage). Many of the contributions were published in the volume Conceiving Persons (Loizos and Heady, 1999) to which Peter Loizos contributed a joint introduction. However, he did not include his own paper in that volume.

Gill Shepherd comments that:
‘The topic of procreation imagery was one Peter and I discussed a great deal, during and after the preparation of Conceiving Persons. It is hardly surprising that where agriculture is the main activity, imagery for human fertility follows that for crops. However, as Goody (1983) pointed out long ago, women’s status in gender relations is often actually a reflection of their role in production. So women enjoy some autonomy where their labour is vital in agriculture (e.g. Africa where they do nearly all of it). However, where men and animals (or machines) do the agriculture, in plough societies throughout Europe and much of Asia, the status of women is low. (They are merely the field, waiting for the sower).’

We hypothesized that in pastoral areas such as those of the Middle East and Sahel, procreation imagery, by contrast, ought to be drawn from understandings of animal-breeding, and the contribution to “good stock” of both male and female animals. Direct evidence was hard to find. However, the Koran makes frequent mention of the contribution of both man and woman to the creation of a baby, and many Middle Eastern societies place great stress on the making of endogamous marriages as a way of retaining valued assets within a tight group to which both mother and father belong.
In short, imagery about reproduction is usually drawn from the perceived realities of production.*
higher education. The findings were both suggestive, of similarities, but also did not support Delaney's wider and wilder imaginative constructions. This paper suggests we need to work closer to specific regions and identifiable social cohorts, and that we need to pay more attention to successive folkloric texts, rather than theology to understand these issues empirically.

**Keywords:** Carol Delaney, key metaphors, procreation beliefs, Geertz

This paper has the aim of exploring some Greek Cypriot and Greek data on concepts of procreation, in order that this interesting field starts to be flagged on the Greek ethnographic map. This has been stimulated by reading a particular study from Turkey. Later, a second aim will be introduced, in terms of the strategic levels of social thought and social practice at which it might be profitable to explore commonalities and differences between the two nation states.

Anthropologists have for a long time paid systematic attention to procreation theories because of the way they link up with other ideas about cosmos and the gendered person. There was a debate at the turn of the century, which was carried on with renewed energy in the sixties by Leach (1969) and Spiro (1968) as to whether there were peoples ‘ignorant of physiological paternity’? It seemed that there were such peoples, and some denied the power of maternity, too. This debate opened up questions about how far thinking about the extent to which these biological processes are embedded in cultural assumptions. It directed us to a careful consideration of social contexts of discourses, and problems of interpretation. Which statements were intended as religious dogmas and which as descriptive facts? How could we tell what was intended at any particular time?

Evans-Pritchard's classic paper on Azande procreation ideas did not raise explicitly issues about the distribution of knowledge, because he had already made a great deal of this in his book on Azande witchcraft. His procreation beliefs paper was a model of ethnographic detail, and other Oxford trained scholars such as Ott (1979), and Pina-Cabral (1986) have followed his lead. Later, Aijmer (1992) and MacCormack (1982, 1994) produced valuable comparative collections. However, ethnographers of Greece have said little on the topic. Greek folklorists and gynaecologists have collected suggestive data, and anthropological research by Venetia Kantsa* is in train in Athens on the new reproductive technologies and their implications.

If we look back some fifty years in Greece and Cyprus before rates of both infant mortality and completed family started to fall dramatically (McNeill, 1978, p. 237) we can readily appreciate that social continuity normally involved the desire to produce healthy children in sufficient numbers both to ensure a degree of comfort in old age, and to see one's self and one's substance (blood, name, soi [lineage]) continued into the future, both physically and symbolically. The

---

* Peter Loizos was Venetia Kantsa’s supervisor at LSE and was aware of her new research on reproduction technologies. Dr Kantsa confirms that Peter Loizos participated in a workshop organised by her at the Department of Social Anthropology and History in May 2008 under the title ‘Motherhood at the Forefront: Recent Research in Greek Ethnography’. For more information see Kantsa, 2011 and 2013.
processes of human reproduction were accompanied by a good deal of uncertainty and anxiety. Some families failed to produce any children; some had girls, only; some had a few sickly children who died before themselves reproducing, or, worse still, died prematurely after having reproduced, but leaving their dependants poorly provided for.¹

**Turkish Procreation Theory, from Delaney’s Village**

My original impetus for this paper came from the way some fragments of my own field data were illuminated by some material drawn from Carol Delaney’s book *The Seed and the Soil: Gender and Cosmology in Turkish Society*. The fundamental ideas for this book were also set out in a paper in *Man*, 1986. Delaney noted, as had other ethnographers in Turkey, that when talking about the way a child is produced, people used a metaphor, or analogy, of the seed and the soil. The man, the producer of semen, could be understood to sow his seed in the woman, who is likened to a field. The Turkish word *döl* means seed, foetus, and child. But the verb *dölemek* does not mean to fertilise the ovum, it means, to put the seed in the seedbed. Delaney insisted that her villagers did not know much about the ovum and genetic theory.

Delaney extends her argument in several directions, but the essence is that in the views of the village men, the child’s future development and character is contained in and determined by a single drop of semen. The woman is no more than a nutrient medium. ‘The creative, life-giving ability of men is felt to be godlike’, Delaney argues. As God is to man, (creator, rule-maker) so man is to woman. A whole paradigm of patriarchal gender relations is thus derived from this metaphor, and others associated with it: ‘It is not just a theory of procreation, but a fundamental principle of the universe’ (1991, p. 35). Delaney explains, convincingly to my mind, the emphasis on virginity in this kind of patrilineal society in terms of the desire of a man to be sure that his wife is bearing his seed, and no-one else’s. ‘A woman’s value in Turkish society depends ... on her ability to guarantee the legitimacy of a man’s seed’ (1991, p. 40). One is tempted to say that it must depend on many other things, too, but Delaney’s style of argument is full of such reductionist flourishes.

The local word for abortion or miscarriage is *daşak*, from *daşmek*, to fall. That is not obviously consistent with the agrarian seed-and-soil metaphor, and is perhaps suggestive of unripe fruit falling from a tree, but Delaney makes nothing of this. In Cyprus, *pephto* [to fall] is used in a similar way – men describing to me their wives’ miscarriages would say ‘epesen tis ena’ [one fell from her]. When an abortion is referred to, the verb *richno*, to throw, is used, as in ‘eripsen enan’ [she threw one]. Only God knows what sex a child will be, and all over Turkey there are divinatory rituals to find this out. In Delaney’s village there is the belief that if the child in the womb is positioned to the right hand side, it is likely to be a male. In some parts of Turkey it is believed that

¹ From my own fieldwork, I can recall a woman from a wealthy family who was pregnant thirteen times, but produced only one child. In another family, tuberculosis killed four siblings each in their twenties, and ate up the family land in the process.
white foods like milk, yoghurt, and rice are likely to make a woman have a girl, but if the mother ate meat, tomato paste, and fried foods, (‘red foods’) the child would be male.

After a birth a woman is dangerously and intensely ‘open’, and her blood is dangerously polluting to her husband. This lasts for 40 days after the birth. This sounds somewhat similar to Greek beliefs about the *lechona* (Cypriot, *lechousa*) (du Boulay, 1984). Indeed, Delaney’s informants used the word *lohusa*, which sounds Greek in origin. The period of vulnerability is the same as that among Greeks, and the Greek idea of vulnerability is also expressed in the term *anikti*, open. And as in Greece, an immoral woman is one who is open, (Turkish: *açık*) Delaney suggests that the sense is of a woman who is not covered, owned, protected, by a man. She sees this as a metaphor from the difference between an enclosed, owned field, and a piece of open land, which is there for the taking. The word *søy* in Turkish is a descent notion, meaning family, race, lineage, and ancestors. A similar word, *sor* is used both among the Sarakatsani of Epirus (see Campbell, 1964), and Greek Cypriots of the Morphou region. It is widespread in both Greece and Cyprus and it appears in standard Greek dictionaries.

There are numerous other major and minor similarities to elements of the ethnography of Greece and Cyprus in the core gender ideas Delaney reports. For example, her villagers have the same negative attitude to an in-marrying husband as is reported widely in Greece. It is certainly the case in Zakynthos (Theodoropoulos, 2003), and in Argaki, Cyprus (Loizos, 1975) (in some other Greek islands, like Lesbos, the majority of husbands have ‘married in’ at least at the level of neighbourhood, and often, of village). Another similarity is the great importance of sons as a seed-line, and there is the general feeling that people without children are incomplete. (Such a view extends, of course, far beyond Greece and Turkey). And there is a way of talking about agreeing a marriage, *sözc kesmek*, to cut words, rather like *ekopsamen kouventa*, and *edokamen logon* similar Greek phrases for the same event.2

Now, Delaney is not content with developing an argument about gender ideas at the village level. She allows the seed: soil metaphor to take her far and wide, both through Islam and Christianity as male-favouring religions, and to the Turkish state, with its tendency to one-party Weberian patrimonialism, and strong government.* Delaney has been criticised by scholars of Turkey in various ways. One way, most important for my later analysis is the argument that Turkey is ethnologically heterogeneous, and that it is methodologically unsafe to take data from a single

---

2 Moving away from gender, to an issue of great general regional interest the attitude to bread is quasi-mystical. It is, as in Greece, a nearly holy-substance. And the word for yeast is *mayza* (which etymologically alludes to magic), the same word as in Cypriot Greek.

* Peter Loizos includes at this point a comment on politics in Turkey at that moment, which may now seem outdated, yet is indicative of the paper he had planned to write (see editor’s note on first page). He had said: Mrs Çiller was elected after the book was published, and her continuing difficulties could be said to support Delaney’s view rather than contradict it. In ways I cannot fully understand, the tension between Kemal’s secularism and Islamic radicalism is also related back to this root metaphor. I shall not take up these issues in this paper, but in a later one.
village and project it onto the whole of the Turkish state and society. Many of us would be sympathetic to such reservations. To use a free-floating structuralist analysis may be plausible when dealing with a few hundred or a few thousand closely related people, living within a compact area, and not differentiated by literacy, and other related features, but the method is a problematic one for an understanding of a country the size of Greece or Turkey. Having been at some pains to spell out patterns of regional variation in Greece and Cyprus on matters of kinship-and-gender, (Loizos and Papataxiarchis, 1991) and having regard to much more detailed and highly scholarly attempts to spell out Greek island variations (Svila Dimitriou, 1988) I think there are grounds for dissent from Delaney's willingness to move so confidently from a single village to Turkish state and society.

Delaney's wide ranging outreach is not supported by equally wide-ranging local ethnography, for while telling us that the villagers rely for half their sustenance on livestock rearing, animals raised on common pastureland, she tells us nothing about core ideas, still less on the metaphors relating to animal fertility. She allows agriculture, and the individually owned field to tell the whole story. Since livestock, according to Richard Tapper, are very often given matrilineal kinship attributes by their owners, precisely, he proposes, in contrast to human beings, there were issues to be discussed here, at very least. Delaney, then, privileges a single set of metaphors in an area where there is reason to believe that other metaphors, with rather different implications, may play an interesting role.

**Some Greek Procreation Ideas**

The work I shall report on below has been carried out by three Greek and Greek Cypriot anthropologists at my request. My initial fieldwork (1968) was in Argaki village, Cyprus, a mixed village with a numerous Greek population and a small Turkish population; I tried among other things, to understand the formally bilateral kinship system of the Greeks³ which seemed to give both parents equally important roles in creating the child, and in giving it social legitimacy.

But there was a 'male bias' which seemed slightly at odds with bilaterality, as Herzfeld has argued against Campbell (Herzfeld, 1983). Greek Cypriot men said to me a number of times: 'Look, it's this way: the woman is like a field. The man sows his seed (sporos) in the woman, and what he sows, he gets later. If you sow barley, you get barley, you don't get something else. The child takes after the father.' The men were usually smiling when saying such things. It was not, it seemed, a heavy-duty official statement, of the kind which men made when they told me that Argaki was a village where no-one seduced, or even commented on the attractiveness of the wives or daughters of other men. To say these things they spoke with measured seriousness, solemnly, without smiles.

---

³ I have given my reasons for not having conducted intensive field research among the Turkish Cypriots in Argaki, in Loizos 1975: Appendix Two, 'The Turks of Kalo', pp. 304–306. Further background both on the Turkish minority, and on the tenseness of intercommunal relations in Cyprus at the time of my initial fieldwork are given in Loizos, 1981 and 1988.
And Greek Cypriot men used the same serious tone in other villages, when I was introduced as half-English, half-Cypriot. Which parent is from Cyprus? they invariably asked. When I replied that my father was born there, they tended to say ‘O sporos itan Ellinikos’ or ‘O sporos cinai Kyprios’ [The seed is Greek-Cypriot]. What did this really mean?

When I later, and separately, asked kinswomen to comment on the seed-field analogy, they laughed, and said ‘That’s the sort of thing the men say. But who really does most for the child – the man who takes his pleasure in a few moments, or the woman who carries the child inside her for nine months, and who nourishes the child with what she has inside her, and later with her breasts?’

The women’s laughter seems important, and I cannot resist pointing out that women are not reported to laugh over such issues by Delaney.

Further support for a half-serious male view of the primacy of paternity came when my father visited the village. People commented on our physical likeness, whereupon my father put an arm around my shoulder and said (somewhat to my discomfort) ‘Dhen m’eyelase i mana tou’ [his mother did not deceive me (with another man, understood)]. Finally, there were cases of infertile couples where in my hearing an old man said loudly and angrily ‘My wife is no use’ but her young male and female relatives took me aside and said, in whispers ‘It is not her fault – they both had medical tests, and it is he who has the problem. His seed …’.

So, here, among men and women in their forties, in 1968, was a half-serious, half-humorous, and clearly, contested account of something. As these men and women had recourse to doctors, and the women gave birth in hospitals, and had been to secondary school, they were even then somewhat removed from Delaney’s more ‘traditional’ informants. I did not then pursue these issues with older men and women. But on reading Delaney and thinking about other people’s procreation theories (e.g. the Azande, the French Basques, the Sudanic Uduk, the Trobrianders, and the inhabitants of Karpathos, the Greek island studied by Vernier) I began to wonder how much more there was behind these chance remarks. Inquiries were conducted in 1993 in villages near Limassol, among elderly men and women by Marios Sarris and Egli Pittaka, and in Zakynthos and Alonnesos, by Dimitris Theodossopoulos.

First and foremost, children are the gift of God, and arrive as male or female, strong or weak, many or few according to God’s will. That, from our point of view, is the vital initiating cause. But once that divine encompassment has been stated, it becomes possible to talk of human agencies. Women blamed men for having more children than they could support, and they knew that coitus interruptus would prevent pregnancy. They also knew that both men and women could have fertility problems. Men responded to initial questions on this issue by saying ‘It is the woman who is at fault’, and only then subsequently allowing the possibility of men having a problem more

---

4 In 1993, Sarris and Theodossopoulos were writing their PhD theses at the London School of Economics. Ms Pittaka was working towards her PhD at the University of New Mexico under the supervision of Prof Jill Dubisch. The material described below was paid for by research grants to me from the London School of Economics. We acknowledge this support gratefully.
This readiness to blame is also noticeable when Greek Cypriots discuss the once rare, now more commonplace issue of marital separation. The first question on hearing of a separation is poios pftaei? – who is to blame? The Turkish Cypriot psychiatrist and author Vamik Volkan assures me that when Turkish Cypriots hear of separation or divorce they immediately ask, in Turkish, the identical question. We should keep in mind this zero-sum attitude to disharmony when thinking about the Cyprus problem. Why is it so hard to think of blame as shared?

Marios Sarris, who collected this information, thinks there may be some connection in the classic Greek words for (bone) marrow (myelos), and the word for mind (myalo).

According to the same procreation theory, semen (sporos, seed) originates in an area known as ta nephra. [Cypriot: nevfra] literally, the kidneys, but including the lower and middle back, and perhaps being synonymous with the bones. One Cypriot man explained that semen came down the backbone to reach the genitals, but most informants were rather vaguer than this. Men could strain this area by having too much sex, or perhaps, immoral sex. Some informants produced the seed/field metaphor but it seems more likely to be produced by male than female informants. And there is a notable spread or scattering of metaphors – they are a mixed set, and not a single, unified master-metaphor. One Greek Cypriot woman remarked that ‘a woman is like the tree, which you must hoe and give sustenance and then it bears fruit’. On being asked what she meant, did she mean a woman was cultivated and so fertilised, she replied ‘Certainly – the man cultivates her with his thing and fertilizes her with his seed’. Another woman said a woman is like a hen which lays an egg. A third said that a woman is like a potato because a man plants it and cultivates it in a field. Women would also say that a woman gives birth as a goat does, but made no other analogies between women and goats, and explicitly did not relate them in terms of sexuality (Cf Campbell, 1964).

Women see men as agents who get them with child, from a single act of intercourse. The man ‘makes’ the child, but the woman nourishes it with her blood and juices, and the food she eats. The man may get the woman pregnant, but the woman ‘gives birth’ [yennaei]. These two processes, then, are equated by women as complementary acts, but whereas the man’s act involves a brief moment of pleasure, the woman carries the child for many months, and gives birth slowly, with pain. Whereas the man might suffer strain during the sexual act, a woman might strain ta nephra tis in the act of birth. So, the complementarity is asymmetrical.

A drunken man is likely to create a child with problems. But an even stronger likelihood of damage to the child would come if a man had intercourse with his wife while she was menstruating. That is sinful, polluting and dangerous. Some men in Cyprus said you should not have sex or plant crops at certain phases of the moon [Cypriot: lypsi phengoma, when the moon
is waning]. And one woman cautioned against getting injured at this time, because one would not heal properly.

So, in summarising: We can see some similarities but also marked differences from Delaney’s material. The seed/field metaphor is sometimes present, but it does not seem to have the same dominance and centrality as Delaney (1991) argues based on her fieldwork in the Turkish village – there is a scattering of useful metaphors. There is a greater sense of a gendered division of labour, between two members of the same human species [both have ŭa nephra as sites of procreation, for a start], species which are biologically somewhat different, whereas it is possible to get a sense, reading Delaney, of women as much more radically ‘other’ in the view of village men, almost a different kind of being.

It is interesting to note certain differences between Cyprus, and the island of Zakynthos, where Theodossopoulos (2003) carried out research on the human environmental relationship. The Zakynthians will also use the seed/field analogy at times, but Theodossopoulos, who was accompanied in his research by his partner and their infant son, said that the islanders used a phrase with several senses. They repeatedly said oti speireis, tha theriseis, that which you sow, you will reap, which can be interpreted to fit with the notion of seed producing its own likeness, but also can imply ‘You have intercourse, and a child is the result’. And he suggests there is a third meaning implied, ‘When you get a child, you get the responsibility for bringing it up’.

The Zakynthians yielded several other insights. One high-status visitor to the island was heard to say ‘My wife is sterile – she has borne only two girls’. To which his male Zakynthos friend replied ‘No – she isn’t sterile – she produced what you planted in her’. This seems at first sight to add weight to the Delaney doctrine of the primacy of the male seed, but with the fascinating twist, apparently not appreciated by Delaney, that the man and not his wife becomes responsible for a lack of sons. (I have been told by a Cypriot doctor many years ago, a man whose wife produced only girls might be angry with her and beat her). Delaney seems not to have seen the implications of male seed producing only girls. It seems to me this is an important possibility which might have given many a Turkish woman a counter-argument to use with a frustrated husband, whether or not she would actually have dared argue it out with him.

The Cypriot Greeks interviewed seem to have very few ideas about factors which might influence the sex of a child. Indeed, one woman said to Ms Pittaka, ‘It isn’t like rolling out dough, and making what you like with it’. And one Alonnessos woman said, sceptically, about herbs which were said to determine the gender of the foetus ‘If these things were true, I would not have had six girls’ But on Zakynthos, there were all kinds of ideas. The moon could play a part. The waxing moon at the time of labour [rather than insemination] would lead to males, and the waning moon to females. Sometimes, a woman may secrete so much vaginal fluid that it ‘drowns’ the sperm which would produce males. (In fact, modern medicine can identify a condition in which vaginal mucus can impede the entry of the sperm to the neck of the womb). And after intercourse, a woman should turn to her right side if she wants a boy, a triumphant vindication of Durkheim and Mauss.
On Metaphors

Where, if anywhere, has this got us? Bourdieu, with his notions of *habitus* and *doxa* suggested that many important things in cultural life are lived and practised without much formal conceptual elaboration, and form complexes of assumptions which are rarely expressed in words, and certainly not in coherent and elaborated forms. What are the implications for our appreciation of striking procreation metaphors?

At first sight some procreation beliefs look like important Geertzian ‘root metaphors’, and might be thought to imply attractive possibilities for rock-bottom understandings, even across major differences of culture. So, to read Delaney, and to recall the ‘seed-and-field’ talk of one’s male informants immediately raises interesting possibilities. It seems to add to the list of grounds for Greco-Turkish mutuality. Let me sketch a hypothetical argument: Greeks and Turks may both understand fundamental issues of the creation of life and the person in similar ways. Perhaps their views of the nation are very similar,* and perhaps they are in some way derived from these more primary views about birth, the person, identity, blood, seed, and the core kinship group. But is this satisfactory? I am sceptical on several grounds.

1. First, I think the notion of root metaphors is seductive but probably finally unhelpful. People in complex multi-ethnic societies, with elite literate and folk traditions intertwined, do not have their lives organised for them by a few major metaphors, no matter how resonant, unless these are organised for them from above by an authoritarian state. When they do ‘follow’, metaphors very literally it often causes terrible trouble for someone, as in the metaphor of ‘ethnic cleansing’, because many metaphors are shorthand, encapsulated ways of saying things people are unsure about, and unable or unwilling to say more descriptively and explicitly. That tiny drop of semen which supposedly predicts the future development and nature of a child is also, when viewed more analytically, a man’s point of vulnerability, for if his wife does not produce a son, logic would point to an undermining of male status claims, and a critical view of the all-powerful, all creative male. Delaney has little to say about the possibility of critical thinking by her subordinated women informants.

2. Until the impact of bio-medical science, human beings have often had few certainties and many uncertainties about the way human procreation works (Barnes, 1973). It has been a chancy, unpredictable affair, causing much pain and difficulty for the unfortunate. With the incidence of infertility running (until recently) at the rate of about 10% of all couples, and with the possibility of a run of girls-only, the peoples of Greece, Turkey and Cyprus would have had much to worry about. The frequent remark that all such matters were ultimately in the hands of God, common to both Christians and Muslims, can be read both as a statement of faith, and a statement of the complete unpredictability of the outcomes. (Think how many

---

* See, for example recent work by Theodossopoulos (2007).
In a sense, then, the metaphors people have used to talk about procreation have been inventive, poetic ways of talking about areas of very great importance, where facts and security are in short supply. If we think yet once more about the seed and the field, we can see that the statements that if you plant barley, the field gives you barley, immediately lay themselves open to challenge. For, as every peasant knows, agriculture is nothing if not unpredictable. If the man sows his seed, and the woman is as a field, there are still other unknowns that are not inconsistent with the basic metaphor: Too much rain or a lack of rain; disease attacking a crop, and so on.

3. The problem of causal models. It has long been noted by Geertz and others that people seem to operate on at least two levels – a level of ‘common sense perspectives’ and a level of ‘religious perspectives’ (Geertz, 1973, Chapter 4, ‘Religion as a Cultural System’; see also, Bloch*, 1977). Other anthropologists, such as Bourdieu and Sahlins, have rejected this kind of ‘separation’ since it implies practical actions which are somehow ‘culture free’. Instead, they suggest that cultural thinking always complicates and encompasses all technical processes, and perceptions of biological processes. This puts all cultural action within any particular culture on an equal footing. If analysts wish to make such separations, in the name of analytic clarity, they are free to continue to do so, but particular cultures in terms of what we could call cultural phenomenology, may treat as a single system, matters which seem to straddle the practical/religious divide. This question has not been exhausted in Greek ethnography – Charles Stewart (1991) just recently re-opened it, and has taken a firmly unitarist view.

Delaney’s account of villagers’ views of cause is no more sophisticated than the accounts in most classical Greek ethnographies and very much less subtle than the work of Stewart (1991) or du Boulay (1974). But if we step back from the later ethnographies, we still do not know what sorts of causal models villagers in Greece or Turkey have used for explaining most of the agricultural tasks they performed, the relationship of soil, weather, fertiliser, temperature, to agriculture; the step-by-step experimental nature of cheese-making, brick-making, and a dozen other ‘practical’ activities. We do not know if their views of cause were as developed as the sophistication of their plant and animal breeding knowledge might lead us to believe. So, having only relatively thin descriptions of their views about instrumental productive procedures, we are not yet well placed to assess how they viewed the metaphors they used to discuss the mysteries of human reproduction. We need an entirely different ethnography here, which starts from the perceiving actor, and works outwards by separating out his and her modes of thinking, and contexts for particular styles of

* This bracketing together of Geertz and Bloch is rather unusual. Although (as Peter Loizos writes) Geertz does distinguish between ‘religious’ and ‘common sense’ perspectives, he also stresses the importance of the former for practical action. Bloch argues that, in effect, Geertz allows the ‘religious’ perspective to over-ride the ‘common sense’ viewpoint. See Gell (1992) chapters 8 and 9 for a discussion of Bloch and Geertz which is consistent with Peter Loizos’ view.
explaining, classifying, and analysing the material and social worlds. The most subtle published work known to me in this respect has been done by Juliet du Boulay in her discussions of the notion of blood in Greek kinship, and in her work on gender, nature and the cosmos (du Boulay, 1984, 1991) and by Pina-Cabral (1986) in North Portugal.

The suggestion that in some way the ethnography of the rural Mediterranean in general, and Greece in particular has been mined to exhaustion can only be viewed as eccentric, given how much more there is to understand about recent modes of conceptualisation. Prior to the gradual impact of modern science and medicine, delivered to villages by schools, the market and professional services, it is clear that rural people had their own ways of thinking about such profoundly important matters as how human beings are reproduced. In the formal ethnography of Greece, we have only recently made a start on these issues, and there is still much to be done. Much greater recourse will have to be made to written sources. Perhaps some changes in field research and writing up are also needed, in which the hesitancies, the ranges of opinion, the styles of questioning, and the conversations, and even the gestures, and facial expressions which pass between researchers and informants are more fully reported and contextualised. Matters which have been made the subjects of coherent consensus in earlier monographs may need to be re-examined more thoughtfully.
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Halloumi/Hellim:
Global Markets, European Union Regulation,
and Ethnicised Cultural Property
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Abstract
Halloumi/hellim is a cheese that does not belong to any one ethnic group or nation alone. Rather, its messy genealogy mirrors the complicated histories of the peoples of the Eastern Mediterranean. Historically, the multi-ethnic and multi-religious population of Cyprus had many food traditions in common, and Peter Loizos in his work repeatedly referred to the importance of commensality and the shared culinary practices of Greek and Turkish Cypriots. Recently, however, Greek Cypriots are laying claim to halloumi cheese as an ethnicised national product. Since the EU accession of 2004, the Republic of Cyprus has become eligible to apply to the European Commission’s programme for protective food labels to be awarded to so-called origin products. When a food item is declared an origin product, it is taken to represent the group’s history and its distribution is mapped onto the group’s territory. The conflicts that ensued with the Republic of Cyprus’ halloumi application to the EU are evidence of this type of ‘gastronationalism’ (DeSoucey, 2010), but also show how the claim to exclusive cultural property is contested by local actors under conditions of globalising markets and supranational political regulation.
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In 2006, a German enterprise based in Stuttgart registered the trade mark ‘hellim’ for one of its dairy brands called ‘Gazi’ with the European Union. Hellim is the Turkish-language name of the cheese known among Greek Cypriots as halloumi. Taking the perspective of social anthropology, one has to contend that halloumi, or hellim, is a cheese that does not belong to any one ethnic group or nation alone. Historically, the multi-ethnic and multi-religious population of Cyprus held many food traditions in common, and Peter Loizos in his work repeatedly referred to the importance of commensality and culinary practices to both Greek and Turkish Cypriots (Loizos, 2008). In his 1998 paper, ‘How might Turkish and Greek Cypriots See Each Other More Clearly?’, he explores commonalities in daily life and social terminologies, many also mentioned by Papadakis (2005), asserting that ‘bridges might be built by understandings in historical depth of more detailed and specific local similarities – and differences’ (Loizos, 1998, p. 46).

However, immediately after the German registration of the trade mark for hellim, an association that represents the interests of Greek Cypriot dairy companies, the Organismos
Kypriakis Galaktokomikis Viomichanias, lodged a complaint with the EU’s Office of Harmonisation in the Internal Market (OHIM). The Cypriot dairy producers’ organisation had also been granted a trade mark by OHIM in 2000, albeit a slightly different one called a ‘collective community word mark’ which reserves the use of the product name halloumi. Legally, the complaint by the Greek Cypriot producers had to rely on the allegation that consumers could easily confuse products called ‘halloumi’ and ‘hellim’.\(^1\) In 2010, OHIM and on appeal, the General Court of the EU in 2012, both turned down the objection by the Greek Cypriots, arguing that there was no risk that consumers would mistake the German-produced ‘Gazi hellim’ for ‘halloumi’ produced on the island of Cyprus, because the words are phonetically and visually sufficiently distinct.\(^2\) In this, trademarks differ from other property rights such as patents which protect a design or technology, and also from the so-called quality labels of the EU that designate and protect regional origin. A trademark grants an economic actor the exclusive right to use a name for a product, and to take action against any other producers calling their product by the same name. Nevertheless, the trademark, does not prohibit other producers from manufacturing the cheese, it allows for using the same recipe, provided that the resulting product is labelled so that it cannot be mistaken for the trademark-protected commodity. The General Court of the European Union finally ruled in June 2012 that the Germany-based company is permitted to call its cheese product ‘hellim’ when exporting it throughout the European Union.\(^3\) Not surprisingly, the Greek Cypriot dairy sector is displeased with the outcome of this legal altercation.\(^4\) That Greek Cypriot dairy corporations failed to prohibit the use of the term hellim by a German producer acquired particular salience against the backdrop of a Greek Cypriot application to secure a so-called geographical indication for halloumi cheese produced in the Republic of Cyprus. Within the various international frameworks of intellectual property regulation, geographical indications constitute a form of protection that markedly differs from such rights as a copyright, a patent, or – as in the example of ‘Gazi hellim’ – a trademark. While trademarks are conferred to entrepreneurs or companies, geographical indications are awarded to products whose provenance is territorially

---

1. For information on the definitions and regulations concerning trade marks within the European Union, see [http://oami.europa.eu/ows/rw/pages/index.en.do]. For an analysis of the role of patents, standards, and certifications in the globalised economy, see Busch (2011).

2. According to the press, the General Court of European Union announced late in 2012 that it will review its earlier decision, following an appeal by the organisation of dairy producers in the Republic of Cyprus. See also ‘Hellim vs. halloumi debate will be heard in EU court’, Cyprus Mail, 24 November 2012.


4. A few weeks after the court ruling, an organisation representing the interests of Greek-Cypriot producers of cows’ milk moved to beat the Germany-based ‘hellim’ producers with their own weapons. They founded a cheese production company and lodged a whole series of applications for EU trade marks with OHIM, for a number of cheese products containing the word ‘halloumis’ in their name.
defined (see Creditt, 2009). As a consequence, geographical indications cannot generally be reserved for one producer or company, but are shared by all producers in a given area. Once a product is protected under a geographical indication, it cannot be claimed for a trade mark by a single company. The German-based company marketing ‘Gazi hellim’ had apparently used the window of opportunity that halloumi cheese had not yet been awarded one of the geographical indications granted by the European Union. In what follows, I attempt to dissect some of the conflicts surrounding the attempts to claim halloumi as an origin product.

This article is based on research conducted in Greek Cypriot society between 2005 and 2011, after the Republic of Cyprus became a member of the European Union. Earlier, I had conducted a small-scale field study of the modernisation of halloumi production, in collaboration with Nicholas Andilios, a Greek Cypriot school teacher and food researcher born in Argaki, the community that had catalysed Peter Loizos’ entry into ethnography and triggered his anthropological imagination throughout his life. It was at the 2001 conference at Intercollege Nicosia in honour of Peter Loizos and his lifetime achievement (see Papadakis, Peristianis and Welz, 2006) that Nicholas Andilios approached me to ask whether I would be willing to work with him on this topic. In 2002, we visited both small-scale halloumi producers and the huge industrial mass-production enterprises and eventually published a paper (Welz and Andilios, 2004) that ended up as part of the background documentation for the application for origin protection to the European Union that the Republic of Cyprus launched in 2009. This paper, which mentions the fact that both communities on the island traditionally produced the cheese under discussion, was also used by Turkish Cypriot cheese producers to halt these proceedings and make a claim, albeit in vain, for inclusion in the application to the European Union. For the follow-up work on the effects of transnational regulation on halloumi production and marketing that I have done independently since 2004 (see Welz, 2012; Welz, forthcoming), qualitative interviews and ethnographic observations were conducted during annual visits to the island. Among the experts included in this later study were entrepreneurs engaged in marketing regional specialties, administrators who implement the European quality label programmes – both in Nicosia and in Brussels – consultants who assist producers in complying with food hygiene guidelines, food scientists at research institutions, representatives of NGOs that safeguard consumer rights, public health officials, veterinary officers, ‘slow food’ activists as well as restaurant chefs and hotel owners.

Culinary Heritages and Invented Traditions

Historians Alexander Nützenadel and Frank Trentmann assert that ‘food consumption plays a crucial role in the construction of local and national identities and in the changing self-
understanding of social groups’, adding that ‘foodstuffs [...] raise sensitive questions of authenticity. Of course, many of these claims to authenticity are products of what Hobsbawm and Ranger in a different context called “invented tradition” ’ (Nützenadel and Trentmann, 2008, pp. 1 and 13). In the case of ‘Gazi hellim’, the suspected usurpation of halloumi cheese by Turkish economic interests raised Greek Cypriot concerns. The conflict that ensued is not just about economic stakes but about heritage claims, as well. Social anthropologists define heritage as a complex of objects and practices that embody the uniquely characterized and enduring presence of a collectivity, typically a nation or an ethnic group, at once founding and displaying its identity (Filippucci, 2004, p. 72). More often than not, nation states have successfully deployed heritage preservation as an instrument of identity politics, creating a homogenised national culture (Hobsbawm, 1992). Heritage production indeed is a modern phenomenon, deeply rooted in both the political economy of capitalism and the emergence of the modern nation state (Hylland Eriksen, 2004).

Today, the culinary heritages of Europe are marketed globally, and traditional food constitutes a growing economic sector within Europe. As a consequence, competition between producers is fierce, and the need to protect the uniqueness of one’s product becomes particularly important. Contrary to what many observers of this conflict in Cyprus suspected, however, the Stuttgart-based company producing ‘Gazi hellim’ has no connections with Turkish or Turkish Cypriot business interests. It was founded by a German of part-Spanish descent. For many years, he has been developing a number of brands with foreign-sounding but invented names, catering to various ethnic niche markets of immigrants from Southern Europe who had settled in Germany. Increasingly, Germans, interested in the food they had tasted while on holiday in Italy, Bulgaria, Greece or Turkey, as well as restaurants and convenience caterers, also became customers of this very successful company. ‘Gazi’ products, like the company’s other brands, are produced exclusively in Germany, utilising milk from German dairies, and are distributed primarily within Germany even though broader European markets are also targeted. The brand name ‘Gazi’ is a fictitious creation for marketing purposes rather than the name of a product or brand originally produced in Turkey. Having said that, the name appears to convey authenticity to the Turkish immigrant clientele, even though not surprisingly, as one marketing promoter demonstrating how to grill hellim at promotion events in immigrant supermarkets throughout Germany told me, Turkish housewives living in Germany are largely ignorant of hellim cheese and have to be told how to prepare it. This is no surprise, as hellim only became widely available in Turkey some years ago. There, it is not explicitly marketed as a Cypriot product.6

6 Once they enter the Turkish market, Cypriot products tend to lose their association with Cyprus. I thank Kerem Öktem for sharing this insight with me. He suggests that increasingly, even among Turkish Cypriots, products originating in the north of the island are considered to be of inferior quality when compared to products from Turkey. This constitutes a reversal of earlier hierarchies of value and appears to reflect growing ambiguities and even ‘insecurity in the North, regarding what it means to be “Turkish”-Cypriot’ (personal communication, 2012).
Because of the dominance of distributed production networks and transnational value chains, commodities today often lack clear-cut or proven connections with specific places of origin or actually identifiable producers. Food producers as well as state and private regulatory bodies are increasingly making use of designations of origin to add value to individual products, hoping that the distinction will make them more competitive on globalised markets. Globalisation:

> ‘on the one hand limits consumers’ knowledge about the spatially distanced systems of provision through which food commodities come to us; but, on the other, and at the same time, also puts an increased emphasis on geographical knowledges about those widely sourced food commodities. These geographical knowledges – based in the cultural meanings of places and spaces – are then deployed in order to “re-enchant” (food) commodities and to differentiate them from the devalued functionality and homogeneity of standardized products, tastes and places’ (Cook and Crang, 1996, p. 132).

The case of a Cypriot cheese re-invented by a German entrepreneur to cater to German residents with a Turkish background is, then, a telling example of how associations with place and culture are employed by the food sector in order to ‘re-enchant’ food products and target specific consumer groups. In the case of ‘Gazi hellim’, the connection to a place of origin is visibly fabricated. The German enterprise employs the Turkish-sounding names as marketing ploys and does not even pretend that the product’s provenance is originally from the Eastern Mediterranean. With consumers in Germany, this poses no problem. Within the Cypriot context, the Stuttgart-based company’s claim is explosive, as it goes to the very heart of the cultural nationalisms that actors on both sides of the Cyprus conflict have known to wield as divisive instrument for many decades. In a sense, the Greek Cypriot response to the Stuttgart case, then, is an example of what Peter Loizos has called ‘invasive ethnicity’, indicating that these ‘ways of thinking and acting about nation, ethnic and personal identity’ (Loizos, 1998, p. 37), once they have taken hold in social life and people’s subjectivities, insidiously dominate any perception of self and other. Ultimately, social anthropologists contend that any claim to ethnic ownership of a food product or a recipe is always the outcome of social constructions, in this case resting on an ‘authentification regime’ (Nutzenadel and Trentmann, 2008, p. 13) that privileges discursive and symbolic evidence of a groups’ social and territorial integrity through history.

**Same or Different? Contested Origins**

But is halloumi an exclusively Greek Cypriot product? Is the hellim produced by Turkish-Cypriots a mere copy of the authentic original, or do dairy producers in the north of Cyprus have a legitimate stake in this food tradition as well? Did halloumi originate on the island, and was the recipe later exported to other regions of the Near East where halloumi is known today, such as Lebanon and the Emirates? Or has the practice of making a cheese that is resistant to melting, an effect of the fresh curd being heated before the cheese is shaped, been imported to Cyprus from
other areas of the Eastern Mediterranean? All of these questions are rife with ethnicist assumptions and economic competition.

Etymologically, the term halloumi points to an Arabic root and cultural historians insist on Venetian sources that had encountered halloumi in the pre-Ottoman period (Patapiou, 2006). German folklorist Magda Ohnefalsch-Richter, whose 1913 monograph on Greek customs in Cyprus today enjoys a second life as source book for Greek Cypriot cultural nationalism, mentions halloumi as one element of a Greek Cypriot family’s hospitality offered to passing travellers but does not insist on its Greekness (Ohnefalsch-Richter, 1913, p. 96). A recent study by sociolinguists at Eastern Mediterranean University relies on Ottoman sources and traces back the origins of halloumi to the Roman Empire and ancient Egypt (Osam and Kasapoglu, 2011), thereby attempting to prove that halloumi/hellim is definitely not the cultural property of Greek Cypriots. Their findings suggest that the recipe and the specific technology of cheese making predates the division between orthodox Greek-language Cypriots and Muslim Turkish-language inhabitants of the island, and indeed was known on the island before the formation of these ethnic communities.

Etymological origin of a term may point both to lexical borrowing and to technology transfer, migration, or trade. Clearly, the adoption of cultural innovations from other societies has made cultural change possible in societies throughout the world, for thousands of years. Contemporary anthropology is wary of explanations that cite evidence for the unequivocal provenance and historic continuity of any cultural artefact, knowledge, or practice. Anthropologists consider all tradition invented in so far as it is always an interpretation of the past guided by present-day interests and identities. While it is often cited as common knowledge that halloumi cheese production goes back many centuries, and was not exclusive to one group of the population, as both the Greek and the Turkish Cypriot rural population utilised sheep and goats milk in their food production, there is no evidence that in the village context, cheese production occurred in cross-ethnic contexts. Rather, it is safe to assume that this gendered subsistence activity where groups of women pooled the milk of their animals to produce cheese once a week (see also Loizos, 1981, p. 22) was known to and practiced by Orthodox and Muslim women in their respective neighbourhood groups separately. In her ethnography of Kozan village – known by Greek Cypriots as Larnakas tis Lapithou – where she conducted fieldwork between 2003 and 2006, Lisa Dikomitis encountered hellim making as a family-based gendered occupation (Dikomitis, 2012).

7 The fact that both main communities on the island produce and consume this type of cheese is not emphasised particularly in information resources presently made available by Greek Cypriot agencies. See the ‘Virtual Museum of Cypriot Food and Nutrition’. University of Cyprus [http://foodmuseum.cs.ucy.ac.cy/web/guest/home], or ‘Halloumi. The Flagship of Cyprus Authentics’. Cyprus Chamber of Commerce. Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Republic of Cyprus [http://www.cyprusfoodndrinks.com/], accessed on 5 August 2012. In the work of ethnologist Ephrosini Rizopoulou-Egoumenidou, however, who curated the Virtual Museum, there is ample evidence of shared culinary cultural traditions between Greek and Turkish Cypriots. See for instance Rizopoulou-Egoumenidou (2002); Rizopoulou-Egoumenidou (2007).
Her observations of Turkish Cypriot families, many of whom were displaced from the Paphos district, mirror first-hand observations in Greek Cypriot society among small-scale domestic halloumi producers in the south (Welz and Andilios, 2004).

Halloumi/hellim is only one of a whole series of Greek and Turkish twin terms, such as loukoumi/lokum and flaouna/pilavuna (Sycallides, 2004a, 2004b; Papadakis, 2004), denoting the same food item familiar to and consumed by both communities (Hatay, 2006). This phenomenon is not limited to Cyprus but can be found in other countries where Muslim and Christian populations coexisted during Ottoman rule as well. Since the 1974 Turkish invasion and the de facto division of the island, references to food and eating, with their benign connotations of commensality, pleasure and sharing, have served to lend credibility to Greek Cypriots’ insistence on the so-called good neighbourhood coexistence prior to 1964 and especially during the colonial period. During the 1990s, bi-communal peace activism on both sides of the Green Line employed the shared food culture of Greek and Turkish Cypriots as a medium for reconciliation and rapprochement, citing it as evidence of an older unity broken by the colonial regime’s politics of divide and rule. The findings of ethnologists and folklorists have been used to substantiate this view of socio-political relations between the communities under British rule (for a critique and a summary, see Azgin and Papadakis, 1998). Conversely, as Constantinou and Hatay argue, in Greek Cypriot society today, ‘non-ethnic or cross-ethnic heritage [...] is underestimated, with the exception of peace activists concerned with the construction of a common Cypriot national identity’ (Constantinou and Hatay, 2010, p. 1601). In the 2004 referendum shortly before EU accession, the majority of Greek Cypriots turned down the UN peace plan and shut the door to the EU in the face of Turkish Cypriots who continue to be locked into an internationally non-recognised polity8 with very restricted access to European markets. With regards to agriculture and food production, the 2004 European Union accession of the Republic of Cyprus introduced many European Union regulations and funding opportunities to Greek Cypriot society. These also tend to stabilise differences and deepen disparities between Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

The Origin Foods System of the European Union

Halloumi/hellim and its messy genealogy mirror the complicated histories of the peoples of the Eastern Mediterranean. Ultimately, any cultural claim of collectivity towards ownership of this or

---

8 A recent book by Yael Navaro-Yashin (2012) addresses what it means to be citizens of a state that is considered non-existent and even illegal according to international law. She analytically dissects the discursive and material practices of contemporary statehood in northern Cyprus that aim to produce a semblance of legitimacy and sovereignty, and paints a grim picture of the situation of Turkish Cypriots, cut off from international mobility and the European economy. The focus of the study is on the period before 2003, when there was no mobility possible across the Green Line and the regime in northern Cyprus employed spatial confinement as a systematic method of social control.
that tradition or artefact is a construction that is guided by present-day feelings and narratives of belonging rather than being evidence of centuries of unbroken transmission and in-group purity. Yet, it is precisely such claims – to unbroken transmission and purity – that the European Union’s instruments of regulation are inviting, facilitating and stabilising. It was in 1992 that the member states of the European Union first decided to establish a quality label system for the protection of geographically specific food products. The strengthening of the culinary diversity of Europe is often linked with attempts to ensure the EU’s competitiveness in global markets. Since 1996, the European Union has given official recognition to regional culinary traditions by extending copyright protection to so-called origin foods. By reserving the use of the name of the product to a certified group of regional producers, and by monitoring that production continues to follow the traditional recipe, with ingredients sourced from the region, the relationship between the product and its area of origin is protected and competition from other areas excluded. Thus, the European Commission has created legal as well as administrative procedures to define the rightful owner of a traditional food product, its recipe and the knowledge of the proper production methods. These procedures are implemented by state bureaucracies in the member countries whose primary interest is to sell the products of their countries on the European market. For the European Commission, the goals of the programme are manifold. The creation and protection of niche markets will also serve the ends of sustainable regional development, creating employment in rural areas, while the preservation of the diversity of European food products makes Europe more competitive in global markets for high priced delicacies.

The European Union’s PDO/PGI system, being valid only within the European Union, is one of a number of frameworks of geographical indications established worldwide. Systems of geographical indications that build on place-based product and do not permit producers outside of the defined area to use the place name in labelling or marketing have become more prevalent in recent years in many countries and in larger frameworks of transnational trade. This reflects the increased competition on global markers for agricultural products and foods. Transnational regulatory bodies such as the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and the TRIPS agreement as well as the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) continue to be engaged in negotiations with the European Union and other actors over the status of the EU’s system of ‘origin foods’ protection.

The pertinent European Union regulation distinguishes between two categories of protected names: The protected designation of origin (PDO) and the protected geographical indication (PGI). The inclusion in the public register of protected product names is preceded by a publication in the Official Journal of the EU. When the label is awarded, the product is listed on

---

9 For an in-depth discussion of the contested status of the European Union system of geographical indications within the framework of the WTO, see Credirt (2009) and Raustala and Munzer (2007). For the relation between TRIPS and the WIPO regulation of cultural property, see Bendix et al. (2010).
the internet. To be eligible for the protected designation of origin (PDO), a product must meet the following conditions:

The quality or characteristics of the product must be essentially or exclusively due to the particular geographical environment of the place of origin; the geographical environment is taken to include inherent natural and human factors, such as climate, soil quality, and local know-how; the production and processing of the raw materials, up to the stage of the finished product, must take place in the defined geographical area whose name the product bears’ (Guide to Community Regulation, 2004, p. 6).

For the protected geographical indication (PGI), the requirements are less stringent. It is sufficient that one of the stages of production takes place in the defined area. In both cases, however, elaborate and very precise product specifications form the basis for the European Commission’s decision to include the product in its list of ‘origin products’ and to give the applicants the right to print the certification seal on the product label. Specifications are required to give precise information on the authentic and unvarying production methods as well as any other properties which allow ‘the objective differentiation of the product from other products of the same category through characteristics conferred on the product by its origin’ (Guide to Community Regulation, 2004, p. 12). Among these, there are not only physical, chemical, microbiological or biological characteristics, but also the so-called organoleptic qualities of a product that make it unique to sensory perception, be it by its taste, smell, colour or texture.

The PDO/PGI system, then, does not protect the mere provenance of a food product, but engages origin as category constructed to signify the interdependence between the place of production, the producers and their knowledge, and the historical depth of a tradition, as French food ethnologists Laurence Bérard and Philippe Marchenay (2007) contend. Most important is proof of what is called the ‘link’, involving documentation – such as archival materials, historical accounts and old newspaper articles – of the historical connection between the product, its name, and the area. Here, also biochemical data and information on plant genetics may be engaged. It is not particularly difficult to recognise the similarity of these European regulations to the French concept of ‘terroir’. ‘Terroir’ presupposes ‘specific rural space possessing distinctive physical characteristics […] seen as the product of the interaction between a human community and the place in which it lives’ (Cégarra and Verdeaux, 2005, p. 22). Indeed, the European quality label system of PDO/PGI integrated and superseded the national legislation already in place in France and Italy. Economic geographers consider it an exemplary case of ‘respatializing’ (Feagan, 2007, p. 23) or ‘relocalizing’ food systems (Brunori, 2006, p. 121) as a reaction against the on-going trend towards large-scale, globally distributed production networks. PDO/PGI creates links between producers and consumers. The operation of ‘fixing products to place through place labeling’ (Feagan, 2007, p. 27) is instrumental for the valorisation of niche products and the creation of new markets for them.
Who Owns Culinary Traditions?

Many artisanal foods, produced in rural households and small family-run businesses, have become almost extinct because of the small-scale of production and markets. They are today at risk to disappear altogether when the older generation of producers abandons production and no successors take over. Other products — especially dairy and meat products such as cheese, sausages, and hams — may survive because they have made the transition to semi-industrial or even industrial food production. Thus, vernacular food in the sense of traditional local food systems had mostly ceased to exist decades ago. At best, ‘one item in an older farming or culinary system [...] has been selected out by the market, [while] the rest of the local system is largely abandoned and un lamented’ (Pratt, 2007, p. 298). Today, most artisanal products marketed in European countries have been ‘generated out of sustained commercial activity, state regulatory systems, and international trade agreements’ (ibid).

For the larger part of the population, regional diversity in food consumption — compounded by differences between rural and urban populations — had remained in place throughout most of Europe well into the twentieth century. The year-round availability of industrially produced, packaged and branded food and the integration of European agricultural products into global markets contributed to severing the link between regional diet and regional farm products — a process that was far advanced by the end of the twentieth century. Still, food products did not become uniform and homogenised throughout Europe. Rather, increasingly specialised demand created the need for ever new and more diverse products, as consumption became a culturally expressive practice. The EU’s quality label programme and its intention to strengthen the economic competitiveness of regional food producers as well as to sustain the diversity of the European food repertoire have to be interpreted against the backdrop of these developments (Welz, 2012).

In spite of the opening up of national markets within the framework of the Common Agricultural Policy of the European Communities, coupled with the ability of industrial food production to mass produce and widely distribute such local food products that were once limited to specific regions and dependent on artisanal production skills, small-scale rural production of traditional foods has greatly endangered and to a large degree diminished throughout Europe since the 1980s. Out-migration from rural areas to urban centres, especially in Southern Europe, had already hastened along the declining viability of agricultural production in many European regions. Working in conjunction with regional development measures to halt rural decline, the quality labels programme was instituted by the European Union in the early 1990s to counteract these trends. Perhaps more importantly, the origin foods programme emphasis on diversity and quality helped to create a market for high-end culinary specialties domestically and also to strengthen the EU’s role vis-à-vis global food markets.

Nevertheless, internally within the EU, conflicts ensued between member states over the right of producers to use particular food product designations. Some of the most-publicised of those
concerned cheese products such as the Italian regional specialty ‘parmeggiano’ and the Greek ‘feta’ cheese (see DeSoucey, 2010). Conflicts less well known than these played out in the international arena, but more indicative of the effects of the EU’s quality label programme on regional food producers, are conflicts over market shares and authenticity claims that have occurred within member states of the European Union and that have been studied by ethnologists and anthropologists. Studies conducted in Italy show that producers outside of the regions designated as the origin of a particular product have repeatedly tried to usurp the product name or attempted to influence the application process for a quality label in such a way as to leave the door open for producers other than those with whom the product originated (Grasseni, 2005). In many areas, small-scale producers increasingly have to compete with big companies. These produce protected food products in an industrial fashion more cheaply, eventually pushing the small-scale producers out of the market. In Italy, some of these conflicts have been solved with the aid of marketing initiatives and social movements such as Slow Food (Brunori, 2006). It is easy to see that while the procedure of application to the European Commission rests on an agreement, presumably of all producers in a defined region, it is rarely consensual and quite often very controversial. In many European regions, the link between the product and the area which gives its name is also difficult to document, so that disputes over property rights erupt easily.

The quality label system of the EU helps to preserve the kind of regional diversity in culinary traditions that has been historically generated in countries such as Italy or France where each community, municipality and even the tiniest region boasts unique products that for centuries have been produced in the same place. Here, the concept of ‘terroir’, once used to denote small-scale units of wine-growing regions, actually is reflected in a patchwork of place-specific products and production areas. Cyprus differs from these countries that were instrumental in serving both as a template for the programme and also had pertinent domestic legislation in place prior to the European quality label system. Government officials in the Republic of Cyprus contend that the main difference is the smallness of Cyprus, with its territory barely larger than individual regions or districts in some of the larger European states. However, Cyprus also differs from countries such as Italy or France in the ways in which agricultural production and the processing and distribution of agricultural food products was organised after Independence. In Cyprus, industrialised processing in the agri-food sector created a strong tendency to disarticulate regional differences in quality between agricultural products, with the possible exception of potatoes grown in the east of the island. Rather, grapes, olives, and milk from large numbers of farmers were pooled in order to manufacture standardised products of medium-range quality for the domestic market, be it olive oil, wine, wheat flour, yoghurt, or cheese. Only more recently, there have been efforts by individual producers as well as local associations to reinstall or even invent regional specificity. This has been most successful in the wine sector (Jepson, 2004).

Conversely, biochemists and food scientists argue that to consider halloumi a cheese product that is uniform throughout the island disarticulates differences between regional variations of
halloumi. According to Papademas and Robinson (2001), these differ both in terms of the recipes and in terms of taste and organoleptic quality. Also, differences in vegetation that grazing animals feed on translates into differences in the final product. In the western part of the island, i.e. in the Paphos district, thyme and other macchia plants are prevalent. They are consumed especially by goats and give the cheese a characteristic taste. Traces of etheric oils of thyme and other macchia plants have been evidenced in halloumi cheese made from milk originating from this region (Papademas and Robinson, 2000).

The Quality Label Application that Failed

Up until the 1960s, the production of halloumi was a gendered activity that formed part of the subsistence economy of agrarian households. It was modernisation, growing prosperity and urbanisation since the 1970s that turned the traditional collective cheese making into a more professional and commercialised activity. Side by side with village-based small-scale production, halloumi developed into an important mass market commodity produced by large dairy companies who dominate the national market for cheese and other milk products. Their high-tech modern factories produce halloumi primarily for export. In recent years, small- and medium-scale cheese production has come under considerable pressure, among other things, also as a consequence of the financial burden of implementing the food hygiene measures required by the European Union. The dairy sector in Cyprus has been undergoing a process of concentration within recent years and has become dominated by a handful of companies. Halloumi exports have more than tripled in the past decade, with their annual value averaging around €30 million (see Gibbs et al., 2004; Cyprus Exports of Halloumi Cheese, 2003–2007).

In 2009, the Greek Cypriot government submitted a proposal to the European Commission, in order to secure PDO status for halloumi cheese. There were many delays in the process. By 2011, even the first step of the process, the publication of the product specifications in the Official Journal of the European Union which invites international objections and qualifications and must precede the actual registration procedure, had not occurred. The application submitted in 2009 laid claim to halloumi as being uniquely and exclusively Greek Cypriot. This construction of nationalised heritage works to exclude all those groups that are considered external to the national project. In 2008, Turkish Cypriot dairy companies located in the Turkish-controlled north went to court in the Republic of Cyprus in an attempt to halt the process of the halloumi application submitted by Cyprus to the European Commission, demanding acknowledgement of the fact that this is not an exclusively Greek Cypriot product. They referred to the fact that historically, halloumi/hellim is an element of the habitual diet shared by both Turkish and Greek populations of the island. The complaint proved to be futile, and the Greek Cypriot application went ahead without acknowledging production in the north of the island.

But for all that, in the end, the European Commission did not award the PDO label that the government of the Republic applied for in 2009, because the application was retracted in 2012.
Why did this happen? For sure, in Brussels, doubts had been voiced as to whether it would be wise to certify a product so hotly contested. Members of the European Parliament had launched official inquiries at the European Commission, implying that a designation of halloumi as an exclusively Greek Cypriot product would unfairly discriminate against Turkish Cypriot producers of the same product, and, in more general vein, contradict the European spirit of integration and inclusiveness that the PDO/PGI programme should be infused with. Nonetheless, that the Agriculture Ministry of the Republic of Cyprus saw itself unable to go through with the application process ultimately has less to do with conflicts over ethnicised cultural property than one would assume. Because of its high export volume, halloumi cheese is a product of paramount economic importance for the Greek Cypriot dairy sector. Since its emergence as an industrial mass-produced cheese, it became the most important export good of the Republic of Cyprus. When the Republic applied to the European Commission for the status of ‘protected designation of origin’ for halloumi cheese produced in the government-controlled areas, intense struggles ensued over the ingredients that go into this cheese. Traditionally, it is a cheese produced from a mixture of goat and sheep milk. For the industrially produced halloumi cheese in Cyprus, however, especially the grade made for export, cow’s milk is utilised due to its easy availability year round and the much lower price. National legislation passed in the 1980s allows for this practice. It specifies that a ‘substantial amount of goat’s and/or sheep’s milk’ needs to be included in a cheese called halloumi, but allows for up to half of the milk to be from cows. Dairy cows had only been introduced to Cyprus on a large scale in the 1960s, so the claim that a halloumi cheese that contains cow’s milk may still be called traditional is hotly contested. In the years before the halloumi application was submitted to the EU, the industrial dairy companies applied considerable pressure on the government bodies preparing the application for PDO status for halloumi cheese, to ensure that they would be able to continue using cow’s milk, and still acquire the coveted designation for their cheese. Consequently, the application to the European Commission included up to 49% cow’s milk in the list of ingredients for the product specification. However, in 2010, the owners of large goatherds and flocks of sheep had protested, mounting demonstrations in the island’s capital and demanding assurances that goat and sheep milk would continue to be an important ingredient in the future production of the EU-certified cheese. They argued that due to lenient controls in the implementation of the 1985 law, industrial companies had for years habitually substituted the milk of goats and sheep with milk from cows to a much larger degree than provided for in the domestic halloumi law. In early 2012, fierce debates, political altercations, and street protests again erupted around the issue of halloumi ingredients. As it turned out, the powerful dairy companies who also dominate the Cyprus Cheese Makers Association were not satisfied with a product specification that gave them the right to use only 49% cow’s milk in the certified product, and that would submit them to stricter controls than before. Indeed, the fact that the PDO application submitted by the Agricultural Ministry allowed for cow’s milk in the first place had been an important concession to the larger dairies’ interests. It would have been more in the spirit of the EU’s origin
foods programme to put up a traditional product for certification, for example, a halloumi cheese made only from goat and sheep milk, possibly with a regional denomination such as Halloumi Pafitiko, i.e. halloumi from Paphos district. But, the industrial cheese makers had been against that proposition from the outset, as it had been their intent to have their entire output of halloumi valorised by a PDO label, and to consequently be able to sell it for a higher price. As the producers group responsible for the PDO application, they threatened the government with retracting the halloumi application. For a short time, after intense and lengthy negotiations, it appeared that some measure of compromise had been found. Yet, in April 2012 the applicant, the Cheese Makers organisation, quit from the process, leaving the Agricultural Ministry with no other choice but to retract the application and abort the process.

**Conclusion**

Regardless, in the Greek Cypriot media and political debates, the failure to acquire a PDO label for halloumi cheese is primarily viewed as making the cheese industry vulnerable to incursions and usurpations by competitors from other countries. Turkish Cypriot producers as well as dairy companies from Turkey and Bulgaria particularly, are feared in this context. But also, the case of hellim produced in the South of Germany acquired a particular salience, feeding into paranoid notions of halloumi being stolen by foreign agents. Yet, some more positive developments have also come out of this. Indeed, Dacian Cioloș, the member of the European Commission in charge of agricultural affairs, in his response to an inquiry by a member of the European Parliament, stated that he took the concerns of Turkish Cypriots seriously and urged all concerned ‘to reach a mutually acceptable and sustainable solution’ to end the on-going division of the island. The solution to the Cyprus problem would then also, so Cioloș implied, put an end to both sides trying to secure the cheese as their property. One would hope that he is correct in this view of what the future holds for halloumi/hellim. In a statement in August 2012, the agriculture minister of the Republic of Cyprus, Sophoclis Aletraris, did not rule out the possibility of re-applying for the PDO label, but this time launching a joint application including hellim. So far, no proceedings have been initiated. And whether this move would give producers in the north a fair share of the real and symbolic benefits of origin certification or whether it is an attempt to colonise Turkish Cypriot hellim and subsume it under a product legislated by the Republic of Cyprus, is hard to predict. Constantinou and Hatay, however, claim that ‘in recent years, and especially with Greek Cypriot entry into the EU, Greek Cypriot identity has been progressively redefined as a national Cypriot one, in which the essential identity of the island is Greek, but in which the majority identity can also show tolerance for other cultures’ (Constantinou and Hatay, 2010, p. 1614).

---

The certification of protected origin foods by the European Union transforms local food products into ‘commodity-heritage’ (Grasseni, 2005, p. 80). The term ‘commodity-heritage’ was introduced by Cristina Grasseni to denote a traditional artefact that is modified and standardised so that it can be sold on globalised markets. When food is discursively distinguished and politically regulated in order to become commodity-heritage, it is taken to represent a group's history, and the distribution of that artefact is mapped onto the group’s territory. Claims for origin foods, then, may be based on notions of an ethnicised ownership of tradition or even of a ‘gastronationalism’ (DeSoucey, 2010), as can be seen happening in the Republic of Cyprus. This is by no means inevitable. Examples from other member states of the European Union show that the origin foods programme can also be deployed politically to enhance both regional diversity and cultural heterogeneity within a country. Also, in some cases, European quality labels have even been awarded to ‘origin products’ that are produced across state boundaries, giving producers in two countries the right to carry the quality label on their products. In its failed attempt to apply for the origin foods programme, the Republic of Cyprus seems to have missed the opportunity to celebrate both its hybrid legacy as a country that links Europe and the Middle East and to supersede its ongoing division.
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The Occupy Buffer Zone Movement: Radicalism and Sovereignty in Cyprus
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Abstract
As a response to the call of the global Occupy Movement in 2011, a number of people occupied the Cypriot no-man’s land in the UN-controlled Buffer Zone of the capital Nicosia, a space that has historically divided the two ethnic communities, in the old part of town since the late 1950s. The re-insertion of human life on the border, in the midst of derelict buildings, barbed wire and under the watchful eyes of contesting sovereignties came under scrutiny and was contested by various actors in 2011 and 2012. The article is an ethnographic study of the Occupy Buffer Zone (OBZ) movement, which explores these contestations. It traces the development of OBZ from a small anti-authoritarian group to a movement that momentarily gained the support of various anti-establishment and anti-capitalist groups and individuals and its eventual dissolution after a violent police raid. In doing so it shows how a space for alternative politics was opened up, as well as the limits that claim to space hit upon.
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Introduction
Writing about the Occupy movement in Cyprus, known as Occupy Buffer Zone (OBZ) is a complex task for a number of reasons: the most important of these being that my association with it did not develop out of a preformed academic interest. I became involved in the movement as a member of an anti-authoritarian group that found itself at the centre of OBZ’s development. At the same time, as a student of property rights and sovereignty in Cyprus I could not help but think critically about the struggles and negotiations that unfolded around OBZ during the eight months of its survival, from October 2011 to May 2012. Often, in previous studies, I found myself ‘seeing like a state’ (Scott, 1998), that is to say, thinking about the aims of particular state policies and trying to understand the means through which they have been pursued in the context of Cypriot ‘modernisation’ and the conflicts that it entailed. This meant, for example, deciphering the

* I would like to thank all OBZ members with whom I shared a small chunk of my life for a meaningful journey, an experience through which I feel not only privileged, but also wiser. A debt to Peter Loizos is ever present for inducing my interest in anthropology.
classifications of OBZ along ethnic, class, gender, and other structures of division which members of the movement strove to dispense with. Being perceived as a ‘marginal’ in many instances during my time spent in Cyprus (living between the two sides and perceived as an outsider in both societies) I did share with other OBZ members, the critique of the system that produces such marginalities. It is from this place, uncomfortable at points, but ‘homely’ in others, and most often exciting, that I became a participant researcher at OBZ.

I lived with OBZ activists from October 2011 and shared their plans and visions on how to move on within the movement and beyond it. I was certainly at the margin of both societies (north and south of the Green Line) but I often felt ‘at home’ in OBZ. Still, I always returned to another home to sleep, rest, and shower (the same as many other OBZ participants). Thus, at the point of writing, my engagement with OBZ became fraught with the dilemma that anthropologists recognise so well: practicing ethnography through cultural immersion while maintaining some distance in order to critically reflect on that practice. In my case, the lack of a clearly-defined ‘participant observer’ identity from the outset, exacerbated that dilemma. In fact, I aim to argue that this is what the main issue related to OBZ is: dealing with the problem of identity, when ‘identity’ is seen as a misnomer from the start.

Writing about OBZ is also permeated by a power dynamic in the sense that it carries the weight of creating knowledge about a movement whose history is too recent and academic debate around it has yet to be formed. It means that the contours of questions to be probed regarding OBZ have not solidified. ‘Explaining’ OBZ is not a set task in relation to responding to questions like ‘what did OBZ mean for Cypriot society?’, ‘who did OBZ represent?’, or ‘does OBZ belong to the past?’ It also means questioning the structures that give rise to such ‘set’ questions and the politics of ‘situating’ OBZ within the logics of state, of academia, and of liberal norms.

The violent attack by the police anti-terrorist squad of the Republic of Cyprus (RoC) which is alleged to have signified the end of OBZ lies at the extreme of such attempts to situate the movement. I perceive this violence to be an indication of the political priorities of ruling authorities, not only in the RoC, but also in the Buffer Zone (i.e. the United Nations that allowed

---

1 Marginality is a complex and multi-faced phenomenon that implies variables of time, context, and position, which make up the dialectics of subjectivity and objectivity. In Cyprus, such variables are loaded with historic, cultural, economic, and political discourses, embedded in the social structures that are upheld as ‘social norms’. These ‘norms’ are mostly over-determined by a discourse of difference that separates people on the basis of ethnicity and attaches ethical orientations of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ to this understanding. This in turn affects the ways in which gender, class, and even space and time, are understood. In these terms, my ‘marginality’ is a factor of being a Turkish-Cypriot male, living on the wrong side of the divide—thus, I may be crossing the border as a ‘Turkish-Cypriot’ pedestrian, or a ‘Greek-Cypriot’ car driver. My education in ‘elite’ academic institutions abroad has also rendered me an ‘outsider’ of sorts, as well as nurturing a critical ‘insider’ perspective. It is this critical marginality exposed on a daily basis that makes me particularly aware and empathetic to other forms of marginalities imposed on other people, which ultimately fostered the particular alliances outlined here.
the raid to happen), and the ridiculously ‘air-quoted’ (Scheper-Hughes, 2007, p. 190) ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC)’, which seemingly had been informed of the attack. Equally, the subsequent lack of general support and response by the public is indicative to me of how OBZ managed not only to tease the establishments, but also played with liberal sensitivities regarding cleanliness and the propriety of not having ‘matter out of place’ (Douglas, 2002 [1966]). Such perceptions of cleanliness were made apparent in media reports about OBZ through the suggestion of drug use, sex, political naivety, childishness and mental deviance. Following the police raid, these associations were used to delegitimise OBZ in the eyes of the wider public, however many of them pre-existed this event and were apparent to greater or lesser extents in the reactions of many sections of society that came into contact with OBZ throughout its lifetime. These people ranged from well-dressed passers-by who looked down upon OBZ members, to officials who failed to negotiate with them, and even intellectuals who attempted to ‘explain’ the reasons for the movement’s deviance, yet frequently taking that ‘deviance’ at face value. With this in mind, writing about this topic is a radical task because the meaning of OBZ exposes skeletons of conservativism in the Cypriot political closet.

Crossings: Sovereignty and the Contestation of OBZ Space

The story of OBZ begins, as its name suggests, within the space of the Buffer Zone. The tents set up by the Cyprus Occupy movement were pitched along Kykkos road which was renamed by the OBZ movement as ‘No Borders Street’. The street lies in the space known as the Ledra Street or Lokmaci crossing point, a 50 metre-long stretch of road between the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot checkpoints, under the authority of the UN. This point, in the heart of the old town of the divided capital of Nicosia, was opened to crossers north and south of the dividing Green Line in 2008, five years after the first crossing point at Ledra Palace opened in 2003. On that April morning of 2008, an opening ceremony attended by UN, EU and other local officials celebrated the occasion as a step further towards the island’s unification. The optimism of this message, however, was quickly dampened by the temporary closure of the checkpoints on the same evening because of disputes over the precise extent of each authority’s jurisdiction in that space. This ‘scandalous’ dispute was telling of the postcolonial power struggles over legitimacy and sovereignty that thrive in Cyprus and of the significance of this particular part of the Buffer Zone in them. These struggles are what OBZ inherited and tried to build on by claiming its own legitimacy in this marginal but important location under the aegis of ‘performing’ sovereignty. This performance set it apart from other local movements, as well as Occupy movements elsewhere.

2 On the political import of the notion of ‘scandal’ and its relationship to the colonial arrangements of sovereignty see Dirks (2006). See also Krasner (1999) and Teschke (2003) who explore aspects of this in relation to sovereignty under the concepts of ‘hypocrisy’ and ‘myth’ respectively.
In the year 2008, the Ledra Street/Lokmaci crossing opened. That same year, Lehman Brothers collapsed, precipitating events around the global economic crisis that led to the appearance of the first Occupy movement in Wall Street, New York. These twin events shaped the way in which OBZ emerged at the interstices between global and local dynamics. Hence, OBZ was a movement intervening in ‘glocal’ politics (Swyngedouw, 1997; Swyngedouw and Kaika, 2003). It did this by appropriating the historic symbolisms of the space it occupied in the frame of global concerns. So, the movement’s power stemmed from its strategic geographical location and in its inherent refusal to be identified solely through local issues. The suitability of the space of the Buffer Zone as a stage for protest was contested. Some argued that the location was a liability and that political fights should be conducted from within the centre of the system rather than on the periphery, the border and the margins. In locating itself in the Buffer Zone, OBZ also contested some of the liberal premises of the bi-communal movement: premises which have tied the concept of ‘peace’ in Cyprus to the coexistence of two communities, positioned at opposite sides of the dividing Green Line. The way in which OBZ conducted peace through the prism of wider concerns united not only Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots but also people of other nationalities around issues that prioritised multiplicity, flexibility, and inclusiveness.

Figure 1: Map of the OBZ Space (produced by the author)
Ledra Street/Lokmaci crossing is an asphalted road junction inside the Green Line, surrounded by derelict buildings, some of which were being given a facelift by OBZ while the movement was there (see figure 1). These buildings, sitting at the heart of what was once the richest commercial road in old Nicosia, had been turned into military defence and attack structures since the 1960s. And, since the installation of the UN on the island in 1964, and especially after the demarcation of the ceasefire line in 1974, the legal status of the area has been uncertain. The extent of UN control, or indeed control of the space by the authorities, north and south, has remained disputed. This was advantageous for OBZ as the existence of multiple or contested sovereignties also meant the absence of sovereignty. In Schmittian terms, a sovereign is 'he who decides on the exception' (Schmitt, 2005, p. 5; also see Agamben, 2005). Indeed, as this strip of road was judged an exceptional space, it was often the site of disputed decisions that could not be implemented. In the life of the OBZ movement this indecision often gave space for OBZ to make its own decisions (see below). In this context, OBZ provided the space for individuals to step out from particular political configurations, predicated on the assumption that states are ultimate sovereigns over (and thus owners of) their citizens. OBZ members were, in a sense, ‘defectors’ from their societies, seeking refuge from the ‘boredom’ (see Toohey, 2011) of determinist and highly structured social norms, which in their view left them with little prospects. This boredom, it could be argued, was in fact ‘profound’ enough to effect the radical action that OBZ undertook (Agamben, 2004, pp. 63–70).

Prior to the establishment of OBZ as a movement, a radical group known as ‘the Manolis/Phaneromeni crowd’ had already been active in the old town. They congregated in the square outside Phaneromeni Church, which they referred to as ‘Manolis’ after a tree they had named. The group included students, academics, artists, activists and others, who espoused critical views on the systems of governance in Cyprus. Ideologically, these views generally ranged from the marginal left to anti-capitalist and anarchist. This group organised events and festivals in the area, which it established as its meeting point, particularly on weekend evenings.

After 2010, these activities became increasingly politicised as public discourse began to emerge around the gentrification of the old town. Because of this, the group itself were cast as marginal and threatening towards the development of the old town as a liberal consumerist space. There were a number of instances when extreme right-wing groups even staged protests against their existence in the space and the group found itself defending its territory against opposition marches. At one point the group sought to expand its territory by rehabilitating an empty plot and making it into a ‘little park’ (parkouri as it came to be known). On still other occasions, the group staged street parades through the centre of the old town and beyond. It was on one such occasion – the carnival parade in 2010 – when a group in fancy-dress pushed a makeshift music cart into the Buffer Zone and held an evening party joined by a large crowd of one hundred or more people. This was

---

3 See Christodoulidou (2008) on the legal disputes around the designation of the Buffer Zone; Constantinou and Richmond (2005), Constantinou (2008, 2010), and Erdal Ilican (2011) on the issue of sovereignty in Cyprus.
repeated at other times as well, establishing the Buffer Zone at Ledra Street Crossing as a
destination for the next spatial expansion of the Manolis crowd. The opportunity to realise this
goal came with the creation of Occupy movements around the world, seeking solidarity with
Occupy Wall Street. In mid-October 2011, some members of the Manolis crowd, together with
others, decided to occupy the Buffer Zone by meeting there on a weekly basis and soon after that,
tents were pitched, marking the beginning of OBZ.

In the cold winter of 2011 the crossing was, by and large, used by Turkish-Cypriot workers and
shoppers coming to the south plus occasional Greek-Cypriot and RoC citizens of other nationalities
and tourists going to the north. Since its opening, the respective state authorities used the crossing
point as yet another platform where ‘sovereignty’ can be exercised based on the nationalist script of
ethnic antagonism. Faith in high-level talks that might provide a settlement to the Cyprus conflict
had waned after the two pro-reconciliation leaders, Christofias and Talat, admitted that an
agreement would be harder to reach than was first thought. With no prospect of a settlement,
nationalist attitudes surged on both sides, and public discourse became insular and focused on the
deteriorating internal socio-economic conditions. Consequently, news of newly-discovered natural
gas reserves off the southern coast of Cyprus were, on the one hand exploited as a bone of contention
within the frame of the Cyprus conflict, and the global economic crises on the other.

Meanwhile, as the Arab Spring gained momentum against authoritarian regimes in the
Middle East, scenes of rioting, civil disobedience, occupation and state-led violence were becoming
staple news stories. Similar scenes were also projected from Greece and Spain, who were both in
the grips of financial austerity. In this environment the OBZ crowd in the Buffer Zone gained a
following from a variety of backgrounds including social classes, political orientations, education
levels, ages, sexes, ethnicities and religions. What united them was a general discontent of the
situation locally and globally, and their aspiration for change from the bottom up.

‘Identity’ as Misnomer

The first question that emerges in almost every context where OBZ has been, and still is discussed,
is that of identity. What is OBZ? In a conservative, clientelistic society like Cyprus (see
Faustmann, 2010; Egemen, 2006) ravaged by ideologies of nationalism and enmity shaped within
a postcolonial cold war context (see Kizilyürek, 2002, 2005; Drousiotis, 2005, 2006, 2008), this is
a crucial question for many. Was OBZ a left-wing or a right-wing group? Were members of OBZ
communists, anarchists, bi-communalists or hippies? What was their manifesto? Neatly organised
thoughts on paper that would help ‘us’ to make sense of ‘them’ is what many seemed to be asking
for. Who are they? What ethnicity do they have? What is their faith? What is their sexual
orientation? Are they homeless? Are they drug users? Are they dirty? To all these clichéd questions,
OBZ members reacted by refusing to be identified. They chose instead to have no identity, no solid
lines or no boxes of any kind but rather to promote the idea that identities are limited and
exclusionary, and are essentially an artificial construction.
Figure 2: Photo of welcome banner at OBZ © Murat Erdal Ilican

Figure 3: Photo of sign put up after police raid against OBZ © Murat Erdal Ilican
The welcome banner of OBZ flying over the occupied street and facing the southern checkpoint bore the words ‘Καλωσορίσατε Κύπροι’, a bilingual welcome in Greek (kalosorisate, meaning ‘welcome’) and Turkish (‘Kıbrıs’, meaning ‘to Cyprus’). Its reverse side, facing the northern checkpoint, stated the ‘welcome’ in Turkish and the phrase ‘to Cyprus’ in Greek: ‘ho geldiniz ÙÙËÓ ∫‡ÚÔ’ (see figure 2). After the brutal police raid, which saw most of the slogans posted on every available corner of OBZ during its lifetime disappear, a single hand-written poster announced that ‘Peace was here’ (see figure 3). So, the identity that OBZ claimed was at best, ‘Cyprus’ and ‘peace’. In the intervening period, the numerous slogans that covered walls, tents and glass windows, over time, explained repeatedly the problems associated with exclusivity, homogeneity and other such monolithic categorisations. Hence, if OBZ persistently rejected an identity of any sort, the most discussed question should be turned around so that it does not read: ‘what is, or was the identity of OBZ?’ but rather ‘why did people perceive OBZ to be in need of an identity?’ Put differently, why was it important in people’s perceptions for OBZ to have an identity in order to be legitimate?

In the postcolonial context of Cyprus, modernity has been attended by ideas relating to location and ordering (see for example, Satia, 2008; Mitchell, 1988; Legg, 2007; Given, 2002). If this ordering is not complete (as it is always shifting and changing), the sovereignty that bases its legitimacy on such ordering is bound to be constantly put in question. In turn, using various ‘techniques of governance’ (see Cohn, 1996), the state tries to establish its sovereignty through disciplining its subjects (see Foucault, 2007) into becoming a particular type of citizen within the frame of liberal economic democracy. One of the side effects of such systematic liberal disciplining is that public perceptions have come to consider as ‘natural’ even the most problematic political ordering on the island – namely its division. As a result the border is often taken for granted, and its presence is questioned only on the basis of nationalist, xenophobic, racist or masculinist assumptions. This explains why OBZ seemed to need an identity within this frame and it remains the main issue behind the simple, but hugely complicated question of its individuality. It also brought to a head the most fundamental ideological clash of the OBZ movement with social norms. In the context of post-war Cypriot polity of countless divisions, OBZ members decided to adopt no identity rather than be associated with any and they advanced the idea that it is the system alone (educational, legal and administrative) that forces individuals to be categorised. But in doing so individuals lose out on the many other things they can be or engage with simultaneously and on a non-exclusionary basis. It could therefore be claimed that the radicalisation of OBZ lay in the rejection of identity.

OBZ members represented a wide range of ‘identities’ and it is on the basis of this that they resisted individual identification as well as an identity for the movement as a whole. The denunciation of this went hand-in-hand with the rejection of hierarchy within the OBZ movement. In their engagement with OBZ, the authorities frequently requested to meet with a leader: the lack of one was seen as a structural and fundamental problem. At one point a UN
military representative asked: ‘How could you go anywhere without a leader?’ At other times local authorities questioned how they could handle a headless movement which was reaching a critical mass and keeping itself alive on an important border crossing. People were also surprised, not so much by the lack of leadership and structure issues, but by the ‘craziness’ (delilik, which also implies ‘bravery’ in Turkish) of sustaining a struggle against such fundamental social values. ‘How can you live in the street?’ OBZ members were asked, particularly as this street was the symbol of division, at the heart of Nicosia where such acts might lead to serious personal or bodily harm. Contestation for sovereignty in this small space was certainly unsafe, and danger would become evident as the movement developed.

The First Phase of OBZ: Form and Content

OBZ shared a vision of peace, equality and an equitable distribution of resources. This is mirrored in the only text that the group agreed on, following two months of deliberation and discussion. The text comprising of four points is meant to be non-exhaustive and open to additions under the salutary heading: ‘Greetings from the Buffer Zone: At the End/Beginning and in Between Ledra Street/Lokmac›Buffer Zone which has been under occupation for two months’. It emphasises space and location as the primary claims of OBZ. The first point in this document deals with confiscation and the redistribution of land from ‘the state, the church and immense land owners’ to the public for housing usage as well as reforestation, organic agriculture, renewable energy infrastructures and other public utilities. The second point stresses ‘the right to own a home [as] a human right and a biological need. Every person should be allocated a home ... no-one needs ten houses’. The third point calls for demilitarisation and an end to policing as a key feature of the state, together with free and unbiased education, and free medical care. The last point is a declaration that ‘[w]e are against racism, sexism, and any ideology that transforms man into an object. Every immigrant or refugee is welcome on the island, provided they are prepared to contribute’. At the end of the declaration there is an injunction written in capital letters reading ‘ANY SOLUTION OF THE CYPRUS PROBLEM [IS] TO BE BASED ON THESE PARAMETERS’.

Apart from this text, OBZ used a number of other venues to publicise its commitments. The use of mobile phones, internet and social media – utilising both ‘northern’ and ‘southern’ providers – helped OBZ communicate with the wider world in an inexpensive and efficient way. Utilising these relatively new communication channels alongside more traditional ones, OBZ members made use of humour to encourage critical questioning of both the state and the subjects it creates. With numerous slogans, artwork, performances and other activities (including musical evenings, film screenings, parties and demonstrations), OBZ targeted the ruling elite, the global and local capitalist systems, the military and police, and the political and economic power centres such as the Church and the media (see images in figure 4).
Figure 4: Photographs of OBZ creations using humour to make political statements © Murat Erdal Ilican
Initially, the authorities did not react vociferously to the occupation of the Ledra Street crossing, perhaps believing that the winter cold would eventually drive people away from the street and back to their homes. Often, during those early days, police, other officials and state agents, asked, ‘don’t you guys have a place to stay, a home, a family, a job?’ In braving the cold weather, OBZ members capitalised on their previous experiences of camping outside and created separate tent zones as lounge and kitchen areas, whilst keeping in mind a passage for civilians who they viewed as potential allies. Despite the space being under the watchful eye of the police, military, and the UN through cameras and other forms of surveillance, the camp soon began to grow and OBZ quickly learnt to identify agents monitoring them.

It became obvious rather quickly that the coexistence of passers-by, authorities, and OBZ members in this limited space required some basic rules. To apply rules in a space with no law and amidst a law-resilient crowd of people is, I believe, the most difficult compromise that OBZ members had to make. The old adage of who sets the rules, where, when, how and who enforces and obeys them, presented a challenge for OBZ. One advantage that OBZ gained was a clean space where law seemed to be suspended, thus offering the chance to experiment with the creation of a model society.

Yet, it should be said that contrary to common views, OBZ was neither ‘lawless’, nor staked on the abolition of all law. Its ideology was rather driven by the vision of creating rules in common, and developed for reasons that were clear to everyone and agreed unanimously. Each OBZ member had the power to veto and the right to express their views on any issue. The inefficiency
of this system and the extremes to which it was taken by OBZ in the name of inclusivity became obvious with time, as shown in cases of Occupy movements elsewhere. A jovial comment among some OBZ members whenever an imminent but minor dilemma was faced is: ‘we should put it up for discussion at the General Assembly!’ or ‘let’s put it on Facebook!’ (where supporters would also post comments and partake in long electronic discussions). The differentiation between matters of a practical nature and those of political importance was not always obvious, but slowly they began to emerge.

In the first phase of occupation, the main focus was on the meetings, discussions, events and activities. They were all open to the public. General Meetings, where much of the planning took place and the management and representation of OBZ discussed, attracted a large number of OBZ supporters. As in other Occupy movements, these Assemblies and other meetings were like a laboratory of social experimentation. In the meantime, the contestation of OBZ’s space and legitimacy ensued through impromptu negotiations between OBZ members and the authorities.

One such occasion was the first written exchange with the UN. An ultimatum with no signature or name, but stamped with UN insignia, was presented to OBZ on 25 November 2011. It stated the requirement to obtain permission to stage a ‘bi-communal event or activity’ in the Buffer Zone. The immediate response from OBZ was to question the ethnic lens under which any activity related to ‘peace’ is immediately interpreted as ‘bi-communal’. Hence, OBZ replied to state that ‘we are not a bi-communal movement or activity, but a peaceful, yet occupying multicultural force’. Given this response and the demand of the OBZ members for an immediate demilitarisation and reunification of the island, which is compatible with UN discourse, the UN, at least in the beginning, chose not to pursue confrontation. Instead, the UN kept its distance, but UNFICYP personnel frequently visited the site to intimidate, record, and photograph OBZ members and the space.

Early one morning an incident took place when a young, low-ranking soldier attempted an inspection by marching in front of the tents where people were sleeping. On occasions prior to this, journalists and secret police had also walked by this ‘private’ area of OBZ under the pretext of wanting to photograph slogans for newspaper publication, however dogs belonging to OBZ members attacked the ‘intruders’ and chased them away. This happened again in the case of the UN soldier who took refuge in the Greek-Cypriot police station and called the RoC and UN authorities’ attention to ‘the dog problem in the Buffer Zone’. In earlier episodes, intruders had similarly run away shouting, ‘control your bloody dogs’. Dogs and other animals gradually became an important aspect of OBZ, not only as defenders of the territory, but as a prism through which OBZ was viewed.

Hygiene was the key discourse used by the authorities to attack OBZ. The dogs and their excrement were cast as a major concern when the attitude of confrontation took on a humanitarian tone (OBZ should be dismantled because it endangered the health of its own members). In their attempt to resolve the issue OBZ members opened up a passage behind the tents that led into a derelict building in the demilitarised Buffer Zone on the Turkish-Cypriot side.
This new space, containing the only ground soil accessible to OBZ members, was then designated as a place where dogs could defecate and humans could urinate, but in spite of this the 'animals and their discharge' would continue to be one of the crucial points around which many of the internal and external power struggles of OBZ would be conducted. In fact, the only physical fight that took place amongst members of the OBZ movement was over the issue of 'dog shit'. This all points to the significant role that dogs and other animals played in the development of the movement: spatially in spurring the first expansion, and socially by impacting on relations between OBZ and outsiders as well as within the group. It can be asserted that there was also an ontological role in the structuring of OBZ dynamics along the human-animal nexus, so that 'time' and 'boredom' became conditions for the possibility of action.

Time, at Ledra Crossing, was about a series of performances (aiming at communication), tests (where the aims were to understand) and negotiations (aiming at accommodating others). These scenarios became part and parcel of the movement's daily struggle for survival on the street. OBZ members during their prolonged stay at the Buffer Zone frequently compared themselves to caged animals. They sensed that although they were acting out their freedom in the occupied space, they were, at the same time, very aware of the enclosure they were in and the perils that it held. These feelings were also reinforced by the very space of the Buffer Zone which was similar to a cage, guarded on all fronts. As Agamben says:

"In becoming bored, Dasein [Existence] is delivered over (ausgeliefert) to something [or, is at the mercy of something] that refuses itself, exactly as the animal, in its captivation, is exposed (hinausgesetzt) in something unrevealed" (Agamben, 2004, p. 65 – square brackets added).

Boredom, it seems, functions in a similar way in OBZ, showing the border between human and animal as it blurs. Whilst OBZ members advocated that there is little difference between humans and animals, passers-by and authorities appeared to single out critically the animals as a way of dehumanizing OBZ protesters.

In this space, the role of animals and humans did not differ much; ultimately they were occupiers on guard, living in the street. In reality, as the animals did not have any concept of man-made militarised and guarded borders they appeared as free as OBZ members would prefer to be. On the human side, however, things were different. The profound 'boredom' that OBZ members experienced within their own societies had led each one of them to exit that society and search for openness in the Buffer Zone, only to face the realisation that even this type of openness is itself confined. It provided no new space from which to exit other than the one-way-street back to the rejected society. Yet there was hope in change as well, and the actions and performances of OBZ were influential in helping to conceptualise new inclusive and open spaces, implying a determination to stay and continue the occupation struggle. This was an important aspect of OBZ's development as it moved into the next phase.
Second Phase: Occupation as an Ethical Issue

Almost from the start one issue that divided OBZ members was the possible expansion of the camp with use of the surrounding space in the Buffer Zone. While one group considered expansion as necessary, either through the arrival of more people or to satisfy a genuine need of the group, others advocated ‘no expansion in order not to risk [losing] what we already have’. Nonetheless, for some, expansion seemed a matter of survival, claiming that ‘we either expand or die’. In this sense, the expansion into a nearby derelict building was a necessity aimed at relieving the pressure of constantly cleaning up excrement after the dogs. Other projects were planned for the new area like the creation of a vegetable garden plus keeping chickens there (for eggs only) when the weather became warmer. Initially, the Turkish military limited their involvement to the monitoring of this expansion.

Moreover, the new space became a test tool for OBZ members to assess visitors’ reactions. When visitors arrived and asked whether there was a public toilet, they were given two options: either use the municipality toilet which meant crossing through the Greek-Cypriot checkpoint, or use the ruins, which technically lay ‘on the Turkish side’ behind an opening in the razor wires. The most frequent reaction was initial confusion, which amused OBZ members. To OBZ, the first option signalled conformity (prioritisation of cleanliness), while the second indicated a more relaxed, perhaps pragmatic, or even nationalist approach (‘pissing on the Turkish side’).

The relaxed position of the Turkish military to the expansion soon changed when OBZ members decided to construct a banner facing the northern checkpoint which expressed solidarity with an imprisoned Turkish-Cypriot blogger who had written of torture in the Turkish army. The UN removed the banner almost immediately and during the same night they supervised the Turkish military’s confiscation of OBZ’s generator, which had been sited next to the ruins where OBZ had expanded. As mentioned previously, although, the ruins were technically positioned in the Turkish side, entry into the space by the military was formally prohibited as it was deemed an infringement on UN jurisdiction. So, the Turkish military’s confiscation of OBZ’s generator, in addition to sealing off the entry point into ‘their space’ took place under the supervision of the UN and in front of the RoC’s secret police. This was the first concerted and open attack on the OBZ group by the sovereign(s) of the Buffer Zone. In response, OBZ produced a second banner, reading, ‘UN supports torture in the Turkish Army’, and placed it opposite the UN’s entry point to the area. Opposite the Turkish checkpoint, OBZ then raised a second banner that read, ‘There is no torture in the Turkish army ...?’ What the group learned from this experience is that whilst each sovereign unilaterally acted dismissively of OBZ so as not to bestow importance on the movement and elevate it to the level of an interlocutor, unilaterally they each had no qualms about sabotaging OBZ in their own small ways.

The next stage of expansion is when the struggle for space reached its peak and the show of sovereignty turned violent. The expansion took place on a cold rainy night when some OBZ members broke into an empty corner shop of the Kykkos Building and slept in it for warmth.
Soon afterwards, it was cleaned up and a decision was taken to use it as ‘the people’s coffee shop’. Discussions continued in the rain the next day on the subject of rules governing the only dry public space, and a no smoking policy was adopted. This decision led to a further occupation: this time it was the shop next to it where smoking was allowed. In time this new larger space was used as an activity centre (figure 5).

Figure 5: Photos of OBZ’s Activity Centre © Murat Erdal Ilican
At that point OBZ received a second letter from the UN requesting people ‘to vacate the area immediately’. The reasons given stated that ‘the procedures to be followed of events in the Buffer Zone’ had not been followed (notably no reference to bi-communalism was made this time); that the renovation of ‘works [to the buildings around the camp site] are being seriously impeded’; that OBZ posed a ‘public health hazard’; that it created a disturbance in a ‘residential area’ because of the ‘noise’ it made and from the ‘smoke from fires’ lit to provide warmth; that it caused ‘discomfort for the children and elderly’; and that it attracted ‘feral dogs’. The expansion with regard to ‘at least
two vacant buildings in the area [where] fires [had been set] inside these buildings, contrary to regulation', was also emphasised but without referring to which specific regulations these were. OBZ publicly responded to this letter the same day, explaining that:

'our efforts to revitalise the Dead Zone create a fertile environment for producing culture and education "beyond borders". Here, new bonds and friendships can \textit{flourish between people who are otherwise segregated}. We believe the reasons we are here matter a lot more in terms of the welfare of this island than the regulations the United Nations claim we violate' (OBZ, 13 January 2012 – emphasis in original).

Their response went on to dismantle the UN's claims by refuting that renovation was impeded, rejecting accusations of producing litter or disturbing the neighbours, claiming that the dogs belonged to them and were not 'feral'. Furthermore, it was pointed out that the occupation of empty buildings without authorisation from the UN was a political act. The emphasis on the 'feral' nature of the dogs, in light of the role they played in OBZ, was arguably a moral attack on OBZ and the 'humanity' it represented. The UN's dismissal of the dogs and of OBZ because of them, brings to mind Agamben: 'If in the machine of the moderns, the outside is produced through the exclusion of an inside and the inhumane is produced by animalizing the human, here [in the machine of earlier times] the inside is obtained through the inclusion of an outside, and non-man is produced by the humanization of an animal: the ape-man, the \textit{enfant sauvage} or \textit{Home Ferus}, but also and above all the slave, the barbarian, and the foreigner, as figures of animals in human form' (Agamben, 2004, p. 37). The UN's reference to 'feral dogs' was therefore far from a simple statement of concern for hygiene. It was a political statement about how – dehumanised through their dogs – the OBZ movement needed to be delegitimised as a political agent in modern liberal discourse.

Indeed, liberal discourse affected the internal dynamics of OBZ too. This surfaced in a debate about the morality of expansion into a private building. By extending out from the street into the surrounding buildings brought OBZ face to face with the limits of inclusivity and unanimity. On the subject of increasing the group's space, OBZ members found themselves divided once more over a significant question of modernity: the issue of deciding what is private property. While one part of the group advocated expansion and wanted to claim the unused and derelict space in its totality for the movement to use in common, others objected that buildings were private property and should not be violated to avoid the risk of losing what OBZ had gained so far. In the end, by utilising the relevant articles of the only agreed common text, the 'radicals' of OBZ won the argument that there is no legitimacy for private property beyond what one needs for survival, and they occupied the upper floors of the Kykkos Building.

For a short period whilst the occupiers waited for possible reactions from the authorities, the entrance to the upper floors was covered by a cloth and disguised. In time, a door with a lock...
replaced the cloth but this controversial act created practical as well as theoretical difficulties. The practicalities related to inclusivity, and access was handled through the distribution of copied keys to any OBZ members upon demand by designated master key-holders whose job also included admitting people on request. This procedure was adhered to in the name of security to protect its members from the state, its agents, and others who may have desired to hurt OBZ. The idea proved futile since the door was almost always open, especially during daytime, and lost keys were constantly being handed in to OBZ by border police. Even then, the theoretical issues concerning the contradictory needs of inclusivity and access on one hand, and privacy and security on the other, was voiced in various heated debates in which the main point was defining the ‘public-private dichotomy’. This refers to the western binary conceptualisation of property as being either privately or publicly owned without a clear-cut remedy to the inherent problems associated with the notions of what constitutes a private or public domain in addition to the rights, norms and behaviours associated with their use (see also Geuss, 2001). The debates in OBZ constantly revolved around the designation of particular spaces and activities, even labelling time as ‘public’ and ‘private’: what might be done where and when.

In the newly acquired space there were two upper floors arranged around a small courtyard and divided into commercial office spaces. The area had excellent scope not only for accommodating people but for other activities too; however it was full of military sand bags, razor wires, old newspapers, and rubbish. All of it was in need of some repair, though not structural work (figure 6). This new space was like entering a time warp: it was frozen in a violent past. The entire building had, in fact, been used as a military defence and attack structure by the Greek-Cypriot military post-1963 and up until the demilitarisation of the old city. Extensive cleaning, repair work and painting were necessary before the building could be made use of. By mounting a communal effort the space was cleaned up eventually and people began to move in and claim their own rooms. In other words, the right to a private space – in this case an individual room – was allocated on a first-come-first-served basis but it had required a considerable amount of labour in the form of cleaning, fixing and painting. In between these private spaces were bigger rooms designated as lounges, a kitchen, guest rooms, a music studio, a radio station, an art studio, and a coffee shop.

The building slowly became another valuable asset for OBZ. It meant that the movement was now able to survive the spring and the intense summer heat, which was more threatening than an unusually difficult winter. Additionally, the covered spaces could be used for specific functions, thus providing more venues to reach out to the public and avoid the cultural stigma attached to ‘the streets’. The concept of dirt, as matter out of place, drove a wedge between some sections of society and OBZ, whose spreading fame cast it first and foremost as ‘dirty’ and ‘out of place’. As cleaning was underway, the street was used for events and public interactions, which allowed for the renovation of the surrounding buildings as well as ‘easing’ the passage of crossers; a problem that the UN had complained about.

But with expansion, the vilification of OBZ took on another form. This time, rather than
being branded as dirty losers and vagabonds occupying the streets, OBZ members were classified as sex and drug addicts, holding orgies in the building. In reality, OBZ members were busy cleaning and reclaiming dead spaces from the past and bringing them one by one into current use. Undeniably, OBZ members often drank beer, consumed other alcoholic drinks in public and shared cigarettes in private, but they also chased away people who tried to join them, seeking to sell drugs or use hard drugs. Sexual relations did develop between some OBZ members. Issues of legality and illegality, politics, and drugs, were discussed alongside the equal division of tasks and gender dynamics within the group. In such debates, the ‘confusion’ surfaced in relation to social policy where drugs were concerned – criminalising possession of cannabis, for example, but not alcohol or tobacco, which Mazower describes as a Europe-wide phenomenon (1998, p. 343). In this zone an ‘alternative space’ was being established which soon began to attract marginalised people from all walks of life. As a result, OBZ found itself confronting wider problems within Cypriot society as the OBZ movement was also perceived a safe haven for many locals who felt victimised by the established norms of the society – namely life, freedom, expression, family, religion, education, law, age, sex, gender, race, class, violence, military, authority and order.

Renewed energy came with every room that was being rehabilitated in the Kykkos Building. Countless labour hours were spent in this endeavour; cleaning, fixing, painting and removing dirt. The questions of legitimacy being levied at OBZ no longer centred around the concepts of home, family or job but on the legality of occupying a private property – in this case the Monastery of Kykkos, i.e. belonging to the Church. In other words it appears that OBZ, like other Occupation
movements, was ‘accused of not respecting private property – but the Wall Street speculations that led to the crash of 2008 wiped out more hard-earned private property than anything the protestors would be able to achieve’ (Žižek, 2012, pp. 82–83).

Third Phase: Forced Eviction and OBZ’s Afterlife

With the arrival of spring, OBZ members began to open their windows and doors and utilise the overhanging balconies of the Kykkos building which protruded above the road that functioned as a passage connecting the two sides. Tourists and others stopped to take in the ‘colour’ of OBZ while walking between frosty-faced police encountered at the crossing points. At times orange juice was offered to the public on the ground floor while on many other occasions the sound of live music performances reached the street from the balconies. The expressions of passers-by would sometimes be supportive, sometimes reserved, yet at other times they were curious. Some brought food and others shared the contents of their shopping bags. Some left money while others offered equipment, chairs and so on. OBZ, not only survived the streets but had managed to expand and elevate itself above the streets metaphorically and literally: a radio station was due to begin its transmission, the building was almost clean from top to bottom and it was freshly painted. Also, water had been sourced by tapping into a pipeline nearby which meant that toilets were potentially usable and electricity was provided using a generator. In fact the building was about to be opened to the public at large. For instance, Scapula, a radical/progressive student youth club with premises in the building, was opening to the public on the night that the police raid took place.

On the night of 7 April 2012 the anti-terrorist unit of the special operations police squad, entered the building through a hole in the wall and over the roof attached to the Greek-Cypriot checkpoint proving the naivety of relying on a simple door lock to keep the ‘state’ out. Purpose trained, anti-terrorist police attacked OBZ members, beat them up, and arrested them at gunpoint after forcing them onto the roof of the building where they made them huddle on their knees in a circle for about an hour. Twenty-eight people were arrested and seven of them sustained serious injuries. The question ‘why?’ still lingers. Even though the raid was officially sanctioned because of suspicions of drug use, the police confiscated one gramme of marijuana and charged those arrested with ‘illegal entry’. According to RoC law, ‘illegal entry’ on its own is not an offence without the intent to commit a crime (see also Sunday Mail, 2012). The Turkish-Cypriot charged with being in possession of one gramme of marijuana denied the charge and claimed that he was picked out randomly and beaten to confess possession (which he did not) once the police realised that he was Turkish Cypriot. A Greek Cypriot who refused to confirm the police’s allegation and defended his Turkish-Cypriot friend was also beaten. There were suggestions that the raid might have been a practice run for the riot squad to polish their skills prior to possible attacks during the EU presidency which the RoC took up in June 2012. It was also thought that they might have wanted to clear the area in preparation for showcasing the division line during the presidency. What this appears to confirm is that OBZ had grown to the point where it was perceived to be more than a
'wacky' movement, and posed a substantial threat to the status quo of the Buffer Zone, perhaps also to the social order beyond it. In short, it had established its own sovereignty to the degree that the sovereign being threatened responded by utilising the ultimate weapon: the state’s monopoly on violence.

The following day, the music on 'No Borders Street' was replaced by tension and crying. Dogs were separated from their owners and some were hurt. Although four chickens were missing and two were dead, the remaining seven were found alive. Doors, chairs and music equipment as well as expensive instruments were deliberately damaged. OBZ members with their bodies and souls broken, debated how they would carry on the life they had built over the past six months. With tears and anger in their eyes, OBZ members continued to remonstrate with various sovereign authorities who visited the site to warn them that unless they left immediately they would be met with more force than before. The police left and the OBZ members stayed. The coffee area on the ground floor, which had been locked by the police, was re-opened and some OBZ members moved back in as a last attempt to hold onto their space. It was an act which lasted for a further month, at the end of which OBZ disbanded completely. That final month was akin to a period of mourning and an attempt to find some degree of communal healing to ease the trauma inflicted by the RoC anti-terrorist squad. To this day, every individual OBZ member carries the scars of that attack mentally and physically.

The public’s response to the raid was quite diverse. Comments from the recently elected right-wing Nicosia Mayor criticised the use of force, ‘no matter where it comes from’, but also added that the situation raised health and security issues associated with OBZ. It was suggested that ‘the problem’ would resolve itself when the area is revitalised, including transferring the bi-communal information office from Ledra Palace crossing to the Kykkos Building. Nationalist media described the raid as necessary because it put an end to the abominable acts that the OBZ group had allegedly engaged in for the past six months, naming orgies, sex between adults and minors, and indiscriminate drug use (ANTI TV news, 2012). It also rationalised the raid on the basis that ‘repeated calls for a peaceful withdrawal were not heeded’ (ibid). The Turkish-Cypriot media joined the nationalist fervour by focusing on the brutality of the Greek-Cypriot police, for example, talk of ‘extreme force’ being used against a ‘peace-loving bi-communal crowd’ and detailing the hair pulling, gun-pointing at people, and breaking doors and windows (Kibris, 7 April 2012). The more liberal media condemned the violence of the attack, noting that it would not even excuse an operation against ‘drug lords’ (Politis, 10 April 2012) giving prominence to the message of the movement over the violence of the police raid (Cyprus Mail, 14 April 2012; Sunday Mail, 8 April 2012). Following the incident similar condemnations led to a large protest march through the
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streets of central Nicosia. A well-known peace activist and musician composed a song about it which began with the lines ‘For 1 gramme of cannabis/the police tried to/kill peace’. The Bicomunal Teachers’ Platform held a solidarity event in the space a few days after the raid.

Today, Ledra Street crossing is a ‘revitalised’ area with potted olive and jasmine trees running along it, dividing the lanes of crossers north-south and south-north (figure 7). The OBZ movement existed for over six months and was attended not only by progressive and radical Cypriots from various ethnicities, walks of life, ages, genders and from both sides of the divide, but also by people from elsewhere with similar visions and goals who had congregated within the space from different parts of the world. In this respect, OBZ was a unique phenomenon in the ‘modern’ history of protest in Cyprus and one of the most prolonged among other global occupation movements. With its noise, colour, smoke, humour, tolerance, desire for demilitarisation and peace, and last of all with its effective resistance to authority, discipline and power, OBZ set an example worthy of reconsideration the day after. As Žižek recently said ‘[Occupy] protests are the beginning, not the end. Their basic message is: the taboo has been broken, we do not live in the best possible world; we are allowed, obliged even, to think about the alternatives’ (2012, p. 77).

**Figure 7: Ledra Street crossing cleaned up after OBZ eviction** © Murat Erdal Ilcan
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OBZ was neither a political party that needed to satisfy people with a specific political manifesto, nor was it an NGO with an agenda. OBZ was a movement that evolved through a group of people who felt the need to exert some sovereignty over a number of the most fundamental issues concerning their lives. OBZ could be viewed as an idea or ‘desire’, more than a ‘thing’ or concrete institution, for the creation of an alternative society and space where people can attain self-fulfilment within a more sustainable and fairer world. Along this line of thinking, one of the slogans created after the raid, declared that ‘you cannot evict an idea’.

Returning to its identifiers of ‘Cyprus’ and ‘peace’, OBZ has set a precedent as regards thinking differently about both. By planting a criticism of the ethnic logic of ‘the Cyprus conflict’ including that of bi-communalism, it raised the stakes of peace activism. It connected peace activism with both anti-militarism and anti-capitalism. By adding militarism and police violence to the agenda, it highlighted the induced insecurities of divided societies in Cyprus. By claiming a marginal space (the Buffer Zone) as well as being at the margins of society itself, it elevated the level of negotiation between the ‘marginals’ and the state. It politicised ‘marginality’ as a relevant constituency within the peace movement and within Cypriot politics. It also consolidated the space of the old town, inclusive of the Buffer Zone, as a space of possible future protests, actions, and performances. The advance of gentrification, rather than the re-vitalisation which is going on in the area at the moment, is a reminder that the battle continues.

The violence of the police in crushing OBZ did not – as coined by Foucault – subjectify members of the movement into docile individuals. Instead, it exposed, contrarily, the actual failure of the state to ensure that its political logic was internalised by everyone, and therefore it consolidated the now ‘former’ OBZ movement and its friends as individuals and collectivities that continue to resist it, either in public (utilising, in some instances, more radicalised practices such as littering and deliberately creating noise) or in private (conducting meetings and events in homes). What was considered a ‘homely space’ prior to OBZ is no longer there, but activities that were formerly public have now been pushed ‘underground’, while others are more visibly ‘delinquent’. Thus, in relation to what disciplinary control should be about, it could be argued that violence has had the opposite effect. According to a Foucauldian perspective ‘disciplinary space tends to be divided into as many sections as there are bodies or elements to be distributed. One must eliminate the effects of imprecise distribution, the uncontrolled disappearance of individuals, their diffuse circulation, their unusable and dangerous coagulation’ (1977, p. 143). The breakup of OBZ has multiplied such bodies and spaces rather than contain them, possibly laying the foundation for new forms of protest.

*This is not to homogenise the forms and extent of ‘gentrification’ throughout the old town, which is admittedly very differentiated – the Paphos Gate area to the west is still relatively impoverished, while the Famagusta area to the east is being renovated and is becoming a cultural centre, popular with young families: Ledra Street falls somewhere in the middle, with commercialisation driving gentrification policies.*
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Diasporic Voices from the Peripheries
— Armenian Experiences on the Edges of Community in Cyprus and Lebanon
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Abstract
Post-genocide Armenian diasporic communities are historically structured around the same diaspora institutions which act as transmitters of traditional identity. Broadly speaking these are: the Churches, schools, the political parties and their offshoots (clubs, associations, media, youth groups, cultural groups etc). These transmitters effectively create and control the infrastructure and ‘public space’ of the diaspora community, espousing what is often in substance a prescriptive ‘Armenianness’.

The linear, fixed versions of ‘Armenianness’ represented and perpetuated by the leaders and elites ‘from above’ tend to alienate various groups of people, whose voices are marginalised and not represented in the official, hegemonic history and identity of the diaspora or the community.

This paper focusses on four distinct groups of Armenian Cypriot and Lebanese individuals (identified as the Dislocated, the Assimilated, the Outsider and the Disillusioned) and makes substantial use of ethnographic interviews in order to allow these authentic voices to be heard. The findings reveal that the voices from below or from the side-lines are gaining legitimacy and influence through dynamic dialectical encounters with the host state structures, the transnation and the homeland, being rooted and routed in alternative new spaces and possibilities carved out by the process of globalisation.

Keywords: diaspora, Cyprus, Armenians, Lebanon, identity, community, identity

Historical and Political Background

Introduction

The contemporary Armenian diaspora is spread throughout the globe, with its core composed of descendants of the survivors of the atrocities and genocide carried out by the Ottoman authorities during the decline of the Ottoman Empire (1881–1922). While the Armenian communities in the Middle East have historically been the diasporic epicentre, the last thirty years have seen their
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* My thanks to two anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions.
steady decline and the ascendency of communities in Europe and North America in particular, reflecting global emigration patterns. The diaspora communities, through organised as well as informal activities, maintain active links with each other. At the same time, the independence of the Republic of Armenia in 1991 (which most western diasporans\(^1\) have no historic roots to) has contributed to an increasing rootedness of diasporans in their respective 'host' states (effectively their homes) and a more engaged civic participation. This, alongside an orientation towards Armenia, the 'step-homeland'\(^2\) as a symbol of the 'transnation'\(^3\), acts as a revitalisation of the traditional triadic\(^4\) approach to diaspora (Kasbarian, 2006).

Post-genocide, Beirut became the undisputed 'centre' of the diaspora, both due to the size of the community (peaking on the eve of the Civil War to 180,000\(^5\)), and its being recognised and actively engaged as an integral part of the burgeoning Lebanese state (Schahgaldian, 1979; Migliorino, 2008). The Armenian identity was thus protected by the state, safeguarding the distinctness of the community, while other factors encouraged integration to the wider society, sometimes making for a difficult position to negotiate (Sanjian, 2001). Before the civil war, Beirut was the headquarters of the diaspora leadership, with the Catholicosate of Cilicia in Antelias and the political parties and institutions' nuclei based there, administering their satellites throughout the diaspora. It was also the hub of cultural production and intellectual life, producing priests, teachers, artists, leaders and intellectuals which, as diasporic agents served the diaspora communities in the west.

---

1 'Western diasporans' refers specifically to the descendants of those Armenians who hail from present-day Eastern Turkey. They are clearly distinguishable from the post-Soviet wave of Armenians from the Republic and the Former Soviet Union who constitute a distinct 'new' diaspora and are known as eastern diasporans.

2 My notion of 'step-homeland' describes a situation where two entities that are not related are forced into a familial relationship by external forces, i.e. it is not a naturally occurring relationship but one that is forged. The sense of 'stepness' also carries with it connotations of difficulty and a need for adjustment by both parties (Kasbarian, 2006 and forthcoming).

3 Tölölyan (2000, p. 130, n. 4) uses the term 'transnation' to mean 'all diasporic communities and the homeland; the nation-state remains important, but the permanence of dispersion is fully acknowledged and the institutions of connectedness, of which the state is one, become paramount'.

4 The triadic approach (homeland–diaspora–host state) underpins traditional approaches in modern Diaspora Studies (e.g. Cohen, 1997; Safran, 1991; Sheffer, 1986). Since the 1990s the rise of Cultural Studies, Migration Studies, Postcolonial and Postmodern Theory has led to a broadening of the use and resonance of the term Diaspora, although the triad is still present in some form or another (e.g. Tölölyan, 1996; Knott and McLoughlin, 2010).

5 It is difficult to ascertain population figures as the last Lebanese census was carried out in 1932 and demographics are highly politicised due to the consociational nature of the political system (and the common belief that Christians are far fewer than official figures show). The conservative 180,000 figure included tens of thousands of Armenians from Syria, who moved to Lebanon in the 1960s, but did not get citizenship until 1994. The current Armenian population of Lebanon is estimated to be around 80,000. I am grateful to Dr Ara Sanjian for these detailed figures and explanation (communication 31 August 2012).
Despite small numbers, the Armenian community in Cyprus has both longevity and historical and cultural significance, in and of itself, and as a pivotal diaspora microcosm (Pattie, 1997). At the peak, there were around 7,000 Armenians in Cyprus in the early 1950s but many left after the struggle for independence. At the end of 2008, there were 2,700 Armenian Cypriots, making up 0.4% of the Greek Cypriot community and 0.3% of the total population. While the Armenian community in Cyprus may seem to lack the obvious political significance of that of Lebanon, it shares several interesting characteristics. Both states’ citizenship policies stem from the Ottoman millet system, which decrees and safeguards difference along religious grounds. Both countries are relatively new post-colonial states where competing narratives and nationalisms collide (resulting in bloody conflict in both cases). Both communities are part of a well-established and active transnational network – a dimension that has made their ‘host’ states sometimes question their loyalties, agendas and priorities.

The contemporary Armenian communities in both states are overwhelmingly composed of the descendants of the post-genocide wave of arrivals who gradually merged with the pre-existing local Armenian communities, who tended to greet them with distance and disdain (Pattie, 1997) – a common dynamic among multi-layered communities composed of distinct waves of arrivals. From their arrival as desperate and ravaged refugees, these disparate Armenians were transformed into a cohesive and thriving community7 (Pattie, 2009) which is generally middle class and considered quite affluent, although there is poverty on the edges. In Lebanon there is a greater social and economic divergence within the community, reflecting the years of conflict which resulted in an economic and brain drain all round. In Cyprus the community was affected by events on the island as were other Cypriots, from the losses of 19638 and 1974, to the economic boom of the 1980–1990s and more recently, the current economic crisis. Both communities have seen regular influxes of Armenians fleeing the troubles in the Middle East, most of who subsequently immigrated to North America.9 The most recent and substantial wave of arrivals are from formerly Soviet lands (1990s onwards), including of course, Armenia. It is hard to estimate numbers (complicated by the fact that their official status is often unclear) but there is a clear social and economic distance between the established community which is generally well-off and secure and the latest arrivals who are struggling at a more basic level (Kasbarian, 2009b).

---

7. Panossian (2006, p. 299–301) discusses the role of the Church and other institutions in transforming these disparate refugees from diverse social, economic and cultural backgrounds into a relatively cohesive group through the imposition of a homogenous Armenian culture and identity predicated upon the values of preservation, language and diasporic nationalism.
8. The troubles of 1963 disproportionately affected Armenians who have never been recognised or compensated for their losses (Demetriou, 2014, forthcoming).
9. This article does not extend to the events since the Arab uprisings of 2010 – present, which has resulted in continuing devastation in Syria, where the Armenian community, as all other Syrians has experienced destruction at every level, and led to thousands becoming refugees.
The Impact of Historical Legacies on Citizenship and Belonging

The concept of community, stemming directly from the Ottoman millet system, has had a profound impact on the diaspora such that it is considered almost impossible to define Armenian identity without an organised community. The minorities system in Cyprus is a direct descendant of the Ottoman system in that the head of the national Church is recognised as the (figure) head of the Armenian community. The British colonial period translated the religious-based identities of the Ottoman period to ethnic identities, leading to a rigid constitution (upon independence in 1960) which only recognised two national communities – the Greeks and Turks, thereby erasing the centuries of multi-ethnic, multi-religious, and multi-cultural life on the island, and the experiences of groups as diverse as the LinoBambaki, the Jews, and the Roma. Trimiklioniots and Demetriou (2012, p. 285) speak of the postcolonial frame as producing a ‘somewhat inchoate nationhood’, which, on the one hand, maintains ‘surplus ethnicities’ of the recognised minorities (Constantinou, 2009) and, on the other hand, reproduces ‘different kinds of residues of ethnicities and social, cultural, and political identities’ as contradictions to the hegemonic national homogenisation of society. The constitution gave three minorities, deemed ‘religious groups’ three months ‘to decide’ which of the two communities to join. All (the Maronites, the Armenians, and the Latins) opted to affiliate themselves with the Greek Cypriots. As individuals, their members have the same rights and duties as Greek Cypriots. In addition, they elect a Representative for the group who is allowed to attend meetings of the House, but has very limited participatory powers. The government is supposed to consult with him in dealing with all issues concerning the minority and as such the Representative acts as a mediator and broker on behalf of his group.

The constitution deemed all Cypriot ethnicity apart from the Greek and Turkish as being ‘surplus’ and therefore ‘expendable’ (Constantinou, 2009). The misnomer of Cypriot minorities as ‘religious’ groups is something that European policy bodies have expressed concern about as it negates the ethnic identity of the minorities (The Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, 2007). Constantinou (2009, p. 366) says that the ‘the paradox of the consociational system is that though it appears to make a virtue of heterogeneity at the national level, it assumes and intensifies homogeneity at the ethnic level’. The identities of these minorities have been overridden by a dominant ethnicity that they have neither chosen nor can shed. The imposition of this identity highlights the need to ‘belong’ however forcefully and illogically to the dominant majority in order to be safeguarded. Varnava (2010) talks about how this swallowing of the minorities’ identity by the dominant Greek Cypriot one in order to strengthen the Greek–Turkish divide, creates problems of ‘internal–exclusion’ whereby these minorities are subjected to strong policies of assimilation coupled with discrimination on the everyday level, a trend that was apparent through my interviews (see below).

Perhaps the most important legacy of the colonial period in Lebanon was the French favouring of the Maronites and the subsequent 1926 constitution written to establish (or create) a
state with a Christian majority. That this does not reflect contemporary realities where Muslims clearly outnumber Christians is ignored as no census has been conducted since 1932. It is worth emphasising that sectarianism is fundamentally a ‘modernist knowledge’; that it was a system produced in the context of Ottoman reforms, European colonialism and local nationalists (Makdisi, 2000, p. 7). The Armenians were enshrined as one of the seven main confessional communities and an intrinsic part of the state fabric. With the quota system, Armenians have six representatives in the 128 seat parliament (five Orthodox and one Catholic). In addition, because most Protestants in Lebanon are Armenian, traditionally the Protestant representative has also been an Armenian. There is always one and sometimes two Armenian ministers in government and this quota system extends to other public sector positions.

The system allows for groups like the Armenians to live in a ‘parallel society’ (Kymlicka, 2002) should they wish to do so, cushioned by their representatives and leaders who deal with matters of the state. For traditional community leaders the system has served Armenians well in that it has allowed them to preserve their identity — the deep seated fear in post-genocide Armenian communities the ‘jermag chart’ — the white massacre — where Armenians are annihilated through assimilation rather than massacre. The emphasis on ‘hard’ boundaries as set out by the Lebanese consociational state is something that has also contributed to delaying the integration of Armenians, something that even traditional community leaders have recognised is not conducive to the guaranteed future of a community that is vibrant rather than stagnating.

The consociational model that both the Cypriot and Lebanese state are founded upon is a model which is supposed to protect differences and promote power-sharing between state-recognised national groups (Lijphart, 1977). However, the model also contains the seeds of its own destruction in that institutionalising communalism and reinforcing difference can neglect to foster an overarching national identity that all groups can subscribe to meaningfully and actively. Lebanon, the ‘state of minorities’, is indeed considered to be caught in the double-edged sword of the consociational model which seems to be the only model that can work in a state with political sectarianism at its foundation, and it seems to work quite well except when it does not, when it is disastrous. Coupled with the fact that ‘personal matters’ (relating to marriage, divorce, adoption, inheritance) are governed by religious courts, instead of creating a common civic culture and social capital the consociational system has meant that communities have historically been vying with each other for power and influence (and prone to interference from external powers) and that the state is a distant and separate entity. Many of my interviewees complained that there had not been a sincere attempt at the national level to productively engage with differences, that each group was self-obsessed and inward-looking, oblivious to the concerns or grievance of the others. Salibi (1988, p. 234) talks about the need to ‘properly sweep’ the Lebanese attics as the ‘house of understanding’

---

10 The sizable group of post-genocide Armenian refugees were granted citizenship in 1924 thereby bolstering Christian numbers.
has ‘many mansions’. In the case of Cyprus, Peter Loizos has written insightfully about the ‘obsessive ethnic nationalism’ (1998, p. 40) among Greek and Turkish Cypriots, which negates the experiences of the Other, leading to what Papadakis (2006) following Ignatieff (1999, p. 60) calls ‘ethnic autism’, ‘the self-obsessed reiteration of one’s own pain and denial of that of others’. Bryant (2010, p. 114) more recently talks of the continuing historical silences which seem to have become ‘louder’ still since the borders opening in 2003.

The Ambivalence of Identity

The common perception in both states is that postcolonial legacies and the consociational system have adversely affected the development of a common civic identity that citizens of all hues can fully identify with. In Cyprus political identity has been caught in the Greek–Turkish binary, with little space for the third way, Cypriotness, which has a somewhat mythical quality about it. Anthias (2006, p. 177) suggests that the term ‘Cypriot’ identity is ‘divested of value in and of itself; it is an apology for not being complete, and a form of self-hatred and denial is sometimes witnessed’. Rauf Denktash, the Turkish Cypriot leader in 1995, famously declared that the only thing that was Cypriot in Cyprus was the donkey. In Lebanon, each group has been bent on preserving, asserting and attempting to impose its vision of Lebanon (MacKey, 1991). While conflicting narratives are part of every nation, in the case of these two states, the lack of a united coherent story at the level of the nation has been a major obstacle in peace-building and in creating social capital. Anthias (2006, p. 177) talks about how ‘postcolonial frames leave subject positionalities where identity politics is overstressed as a compensatory mechanism for the uncertainties and fissures in society’.

Political agendas have therefore mostly supported the binary vision of Cyprus and the sectarian version of Lebanon in order to build up each group against the insecurity which lies at the very heart of the state.

In the Greek Cypriot case political orientation has shifted between the polar ends of Hellenocentrism and Cypriotism (Peristianis, 2006). Beyond the official discourses however there has been clear evidence of Cypriot identity in everyday life and at the grassroots (Argyrou, 1996; Papadakis, 1997, 2003; Mavratsas, 1997, 1999; Calotychos, 1998). Since the 1990s there has also been a bicomunal movement and brief periods of opening at the civil society level (Demetriou, 2007; Hadjipavlou, 2000, 2006). For the Turkish Cypriots, the arrival of substantial numbers of Turkish settlers since 1974 (themselves from heterogeneous backgrounds but categorised as ‘Turks’) has led to a more nuanced reflection on ‘Turkish’ identity in Cyprus and a reclaiming of the ‘Cypriot’ identity to distinguish themselves from the arrivals from Turkey (Navaro-Yashin, 2006). Although power relations and class differences are intrinsic to this continuing compulsion to ‘otherise’, ‘the language of ethnic differences is still central to politics in Cyprus’ (Navaro-Yashin, 2006, p. 95) and this extends to the creation of new categories of difference which may challenge or subvert the hegemonic binary. Needing to shift positions and accommodate various perceived Others at different times means that identities are located within competing and sometimes
overlapping narratives, the Self and Other constantly recreated and context-dependent. This ambivalent Self compulsively situates Him/Herself within a binary power struggle, compulsively trying to define and assert his/her shifting Self against the fluid Other(s).

For minorities in Cyprus this compulsion and ambivalence is all the more developed in that their own identity has been negated by being formally subsumed by the dominant Greek Cypriot political identity, and their status within the Greek Cypriot community remains un-reconciled, a position of struggle. More than anything it is the fact that their story is largely unknown and untold, their Cypriotness marginalised and relegated to a few pages in the nationalist school textbooks (Varava, 2009) and questioned on a daily basis, that is most alienating (Kasbarian, 2006). The situation is far more diluted in Lebanon where there is not one clear majority to which one situates oneself, but several. The numerically far larger Lebanese Armenian community also means that the Armenians there have been properly woven into the state fabric and not merely inserted as they have been in Cyprus.

The Politics of Community

The modern Armenian diaspora community has been established around a fixed set of institutions which are present nearly everywhere there is a significant number of Armenians. The gaghut – the community infrastructure – is centred around the national Church, with schools and other political, cultural and social offshoots (Talai, 1989; Bjorklund, 1993; Suny, 1993; Pattie, 1997). The historical political polarisation of the Armenian diaspora has been discussed at length in academic studies (Atamian, 1955; Panossian, 1998; Libaridian, 1999; Tölölyan, 2000). Structurally, the division has served as the internal framework by which life has been organised since the birth of the post-genocide diaspora. In its simplest form, the dichotomy has taken the form of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF), the Dashnaktsutyun (Dashnak) umbrella on the one side, and the non-ARF umbrella on the other. Under this is housed the opposing political party, the Ramgavar, the Armenian Democratic Liberal Party and the smaller Social Democrat Hunchakian Party (SDHP) and a range of linked institutions, of which the most venerable is the Armenian General Benevolent Union (AGBU). Competition for control of the community has led in most places to two sets of institutions. Organised community life takes place within these structures, and socialisation between the two camps has historically been rare, though less rigid in recent years. It is important to recognise these institutional spaces as neither monolithic nor homogenous, but as sites where different actors vie for dominance. Brubaker (1996, p. 61) insightfully conceptualises a transnational community:

---

11 Spyrou (2002, pp. 267–268) in his study of Greek Cypriot children’s ‘imagining’ of ‘the Turk’, says they are ‘... drawing on different voices at different times and in different social contexts. These voices are, at times, contradictory and ambiguous. The demands of the conversation may necessitate the use of different voices to explicate identity ... these voices reflect contradictory ideological positions which, at times, compete with the dominant ideology.’
‘not as a fixed entity or a unitary group but rather in terms of the field of differentiated and competitive positions or stances adopted by different organisations, parties, movements or individual political entrepreneurs, each seeking to “represent” the (community) to its own putative members, to the host state, or to the outside world, each seeking to monopolise the legitimate representation of the group.’

These traditional institutions act as transmitters of traditional diasporic identity. Broadly speaking these are: the Churches, the schools, the political parties and their offshoots (clubs, associations, media, youth groups, cultural groups, women’s groups and charities), making for a diaspora that is ‘institutionally saturated’ (Tololyan, p. 2000). These transmitters effectively create, define and govern the infrastructure and ‘public space’ of the diaspora community, espousing what can be a prescriptive ‘Armenianness’. This top-down Armenianness revolves around community involvement and commitment to the traditional pillars of Armenian diasporic identity – language, church, endogamy, political and social commitment and ideological dedication to the Armenian cause, Hai Tad (broadly defined as preservation of ‘Armenianness’, political commitment to the recognition of the Genocide and the return of Armenian ancestral lands).

These gatekeepers of diasporic identity, as examples of governance, have been quite successful in that they have defined, shaped, led and maintained Armenian communities. Yet when one looks at actual numbers, involvement and vibrancy, it would appear that this framework is in crisis, that there is a definite loss of faith in these institutions and most significantly, in the version of Armenianness they espouse (Kasbarian, 2006, 2009a). In fact it is identities at the margins of these institutions, and in some cases alongside or counter to them that are proliferating and represent the most dynamic and vigorous articulations of what it means to be Armenian in a diasporic space. In the case of Cyprus and Lebanon, these voices have the additional layer of dealing with their postcolonial situations and situating themselves within wider nationalist, post-nationalist and trans-nationalist discourses.

**Transgressing ‘Community’ – The Voices from the Peripheries**

Cyprus and Lebanon, through their historical legacies have enshrined the principle of community in their constitutional and political makeups. This paper challenges the notion of community which is the foundation of the modern Armenian diaspora by focusing on the individuals on the margins of or outside the organised community. Whereas traditional transmitters maintain a prescriptive Armenianness which runs the danger of being essentialised and reified, peripheral voices are caught up in carving and claiming a space for themselves – a space which challenges or transgresses the established terrain. That the two tendencies exist and indeed reinforce each other cuts to the contradictory heart of diaspora studies, caught between desiring difference and embracing fluidity and hybridity. Brubaker (2005, p. 6) calls this the ‘interesting ambivalence in the literature’, saying that:
...although boundary-maintenance and the preservation of identity are ordinarily emphasised, a strong counter-current emphasises hybridity, fluidity, creolization and syncretism. Diaspora can be seen as an alternative to the essentialisation of belonging; but it can also represent a non-territorial form of essentialised belonging.

The linear versions of ‘Armenianness’ represented and perpetuated by the leaders and elites ‘from above’ tend to alienate those who do not subscribe to the values or ideology espoused or are excluded for other reasons. These groups and individuals are marginal in that their experience is not articulated or given centrality. Their voices are largely silent and not represented in the official history and identity of the community. This paper looks specifically at articulation from individuals at the peripheries. Often they are situated directly in relation to the hegemonic in the diaspora space. As Bhabha (1994) has noted, ‘counter-narratives’ do not necessarily have to be radical or progressive in meaning or in form, though I would suggest that in the Armenian case, their proliferation can be interpreted as a transgressive force. This paper explores the tension between the individual and the community and the possibilities of meaningful diasporic identities unmediated by the traditional gatekeepers.

This paper focuses on four distinct movements that became apparent through the analysis of my fieldwork in Cyprus and Lebanon where I employed a snowball method to interview as many individuals as possible, cutting across age, gender, class, sexual orientation and political affiliations. My focus was on non-hegemonic sites of diasporic activity, on groups and individuals outside of the community infrastructure, those that identified as Armenian but were distanced from the organised community, intentionally or structurally. This paper focuses on these individuals and makes substantial use of ethnographic interviews in order to allow these authentic voices to be heard. These transgressive reflexive ‘voices’ relate to Anthias’ (2006) concept of ‘translocational positionality’ where ‘narratives of interculturality’ can insightfully reveal and reflect the multi-layered and overlapping power structures and social forces that shape political identity.

**Diasporic Voices from the Margins**

**The Disillusioned**

Tanya is a new mother in her late twenties. She has lived in Lebanon all her life until the last two years which she spent in the UK where her husband was completing his PhD. Tanya herself has

---

12 This of course extends to the vast category of ‘women’ which I examine elsewhere (Kasbarian, 2006). See also Cockburn, 2004.

13 Interviews were carried out in Beirut in March 2002 and in Cyprus in February-April 2001, and March 2003. Each interview consisted of open-ended questions, and took two to three hours. A total of over 80 interviews were conducted, a sample of which were chosen to represent the four categories which evolved through analysis. All names have been changed in order to protect anonymity, apart from those individuals who spoke in their formal, public capacity.
a Masters and is considering starting a PhD. She has been finding it difficult to adjust to life back in Lebanon and specifically within the hub of the family and the community since her return, complaining about the lack of boundaries and privacy. Tanya describes her brief time in the UK as a respite from the ‘pressure’ of community life:

‘It’s such an amazing feeling to be somewhere where no one knows you and no one is interested...’

This is felt more keenly as she was ‘highly involved in Armenian community life’ throughout her life, up until her departure to the UK, when she felt she ‘had had enough of all of it’. Tanya is typical of an intelligent, thoughtful young Armenian who was once completely embedded in community life, underwent a ‘crisis of faith’ and has distanced herself from it. She says that she is currently rethinking everything her identity has been based on, and questioning the community discourse she had previously been a strong supporter of.

Tanya’s upbringing is fairly typical of traditional and conservative families who are considered pillars of the Armenian community in Lebanon. Her schooling was exclusively Armenian and she hardly knew any Arabic until she attended the French university in Beirut. Her father was a strong Dashnak and seems to have been the dominant figure in her life until his death a few years ago. Tanya became a committed ARF member, especially active in the student association. Although she says she ‘enjoyed it at the time’ Tanya is clear that she is ‘happy to stop taking part since she left’, now thinking ‘all this political noise’ to be ‘pointless’. Part of her disillusionment is based on what she considers the gap between the political posturing and the community realities. While she reflects on her position, Tanya has taken the decision to remove herself from community politics:

‘I was so active, I gave everything I could, so from now on, I will stay Armenian, but I feel I can do more for my people when I am outside of a political party. Tashnakstoutyoun was my definition of being Armenian for a long time ... it’s just that the political aspect lost its interest for me.’

Tanya uses the telling phrase ‘I will stay Armenian’ evoking the professed raison d’être of organised community life – perpetuating Armenianness that is based on core principles. By shunning the community framework, Tanya behaves like a faithful believer who rejects organised religion, preferring a personal faith based on an individual interpretation. Tanya’s case is typical of many

14 One of my Cyprus interviewees used the poignant phrase to explain his conscious breaking away: ‘Once upon a time I used to be Armenian.’ This comes from a man who speaks Armenian, attends church and keeps up to date with Armenian news. However, by pulling away from organised community structures he acknowledges (and believes that others may also interpret it so) that at some level he is no longer Armenian. The community seems to have the final judgment on ‘how Armenian’ one is. Another young person in Cyprus described this tendency amongst her peers: ‘Many say “I was Armenian, now it gives me nothing so I am no longer Armenian.”’
interviewees who disagreed with or were disillusioned with organised Armenianness. They proclaimed a strong faith in their personal convictions but did not want to participate (any longer) in a fixed, rigid, top-down, hierarchical interpretation of the ‘faith’, either because they found it outdated, irrelevant or because they resented the patriarchal authoritative streak running through organised community life.

Tanya charts her personal crisis of faith to the diaspora’s ambivalent relationship with the new independent homeland, the Republic of Armenia, and specifically her personal ARF version of that.

‘I think at some point we got lost because we did not know what our role was anymore. Tepi Yergin16 but no one went back, and if you asked me to go to Van, I wouldn’t go either because I was born in Lebanon ... in the diaspora they don’t know what to do, organise the diaspora or try to send people back to Armenia – how, why?’

Tanya herself has visited Armenia several times, before and after independence, with family and as part of ARF youth camps. The experience, especially as an adult was an uncomfortable one, bringing up questions of ‘home’, belonging and the ‘in-between’ nature of being a diasporan who is taught to always be dreaming of somewhere else:17

‘I had the feeling that I am a stranger in a country which is supposed to be my homeland and then I go back to Lebanon and I am a stranger there as well because I am supposed to have a homeland somewhere else; and actually that’s the way I feel now too. Now I’m trying to see Armenia as a country, not the real Armenia I heard about as child, with the stories of fedayeen etc ... I went to Armenia and it’s just a country with a government and people and bookshops ...’

The coping mechanism is to assign one version of the homeland to being the imagined homeland to which one can nurture feelings of longing and belonging, and assign the other version as ‘just another country’:

‘The Armenia I have in my mind is my homeland definitely but I kind of lost touch with that Armenia a long time ago. Even western Armenia, Van, Kars etc. I’m sure are very different now from the Armenia I read about in the books. That Armenia I think was a dream. The Armenia now is just a country. I have to get used to it. It kind of feels that I don’t have a homeland.’

---

15 One interviewee who had served for years on the local committee recounted an incident when she half-seriously said to her (male) colleague that she was looking forward to becoming a member of the Central Board, to which he replied ‘never dream about that because you’re a woman’.
16 Meaning ‘towards homeland’ a slogan of the ARF; which symbolised a reorientation towards the new Republic.
17 Lomsky-Feder and Rapoport (2003, p. 296) describe the ‘return’, i.e. visit of Jewish Russian students to Russia as a ‘disruptive event’.
Similarly, Aline, a young woman who was very involved in AGBU activities until her recent self-proclaimed disillusionment, noted the same schism between what she knew she ought to feel, and what she actually felt. She compared Armenia to being her mother from whom she was separated at birth and Cyprus to being her stepmother who has taken care of her all her life. With the former there is a blood relationship but no real bond, with the latter there is an actual living ongoing commitment.

Although Tanya is disillusioned with organised community life and has distanced herself from the ARF world, she says that she is not resentful of the ‘training’ she received there. Her major gripe is one that is on her mind since becoming a mother – the over-emphasis placed on the genocide and the sense of burden and victimhood:

‘It wasn’t really fair to teach us only about this genocide thing and make us feel that we are victims of the world (sighing). That wasn’t fair. I mean we’re not, we have this amazing culture and spiritual history but we only learnt about Armenia in war and under Ottoman Empire, under Russian dictatorship – this is not fair on children. Because you grow up thinking of yourself as a victim nation … Armenian children feel that the world is a dangerous place and we always have to defend ourselves … I don’t feel that it was necessary to feed us with this as well to keep us Armenian.’

This blurred victimhood/colonisation complex can also be the reason why Armenians are traditionally model citizens in their host states, politically cautious and conservative and usually supportive of the existing regime, regardless of its political hue. On the one hand, this is interpreted by them as being a shrewd survival strategy; on the other it can reflect deep political disempowerment. The layers of domination reverberate throughout the Middle Eastern diaspora experience, starting with the family structure. In this traditional thinking, the host state is still something to be feared, obeyed and kept out as far as possible. Tanya conducted a survey of 120 young people of the community, aged 18–25 as part of her Masters dissertation. She concludes that the Lebanese Armenian identity is in crisis, trying to emancipate itself from the insular ghetto mentality of older generations, but still suffering from the hangover idea that ‘being Armenian is linked to not having relationships with non-Armenians’.

‘The Other is so scary for us, I think because of our history and the genocide, because we have a victim history (700 years) and it’s not something a collective consciousness would forget, so the Other is always this danger … don’t get too close because you could lose your identity …’

18 I am limiting this statement to diaspora created by the genocide and not recent arrivals from Armenia who have in some cases attracted negative attention precisely by challenging the previously untarnished reputation of Armenians, much to the dismay of the settled diasporans who are at pains to distance themselves from them.

19 ‘We’re always the first to pay our taxes etc … We keep our heads down and don’t make trouble in the hope that they will leave us in peace.’ Interview with fifty-two year old Elise, Nicosia, 5 March 2001. This was a common sentiment articulated by all my interviewees, especially the older generation.
Linked to this fear of the Other and the Outside, the community in Lebanon attempts to exert a totalising hold over its subjects, starting from the nuclear family unit. Tanya describes an experience which disciplines the individual and makes her bow to the collective will, to the extent that the Self, the Individual has no legitimate will or desire of her own, but is merged with the community will. In this interpretation, being Armenian cannot but be a burden on the young person:

‘Being Armenian indirectly implies that you have to cast away everything else, there are some things you cannot do, you cannot marry a Lebanese (Arab) guy for example. If you are to assume your Armenian identity completely, you don’t do this. ... You succeed ... You have duties towards your community, you have to be active. Being an Armenian is such an oppression sometimes, especially for a young person. You cannot dream basically, about going to Hawaii or anything like that, you would be a traitor. You cannot leave the Armenian community without feeling guilty ...’

At the same time, Tanya is outraged that the preoccupation with norms and codes only extends to superficial levels — that what is seen, heard and discussed is what one is judged on. This is the chasm between official and unofficial, appearance and substance that she considers typical also of the mainstream host state culture. Interestingly the young people from her survey do not tend to openly rebel against their parents’ authority because ‘it’s mostly perceived as useless’. Instead, they simply follow their desires, just making sure that they do so covertly. Even when the situation is known, as long as it is not openly discussed and no ‘dishonour’ befalls, a collective blind eye is turned. In this way, the existing ‘regime’ can be perpetuated, as there is this space to bypass it, which has a soporific effect. On the official level though, Tanya describes a situation where one is well versed from a young age on the correct thoughts and attitudes, revealing a schism between the Self and the Self ‘watching the Self’, the Self and the collective:

‘The message that has been transmitted is always the same while life is changing. For example my grandmother told me stories about the genocide because she lived through it. And when my teachers etc. tell me the stories and want me to really feel these things, I cannot because I was not there, I can just pretend to really be very moved by these genocide pictures — I am disgusted by these pictures if you want the truth. But at the same time I cannot say that, this kind of control, collective super ego wants to control everything, everything!’

Reasons for disillusionment by previously active community members in Cyprus were more centred around the themes of disempowerment and the ‘realisation’ that the activity is devoid of depth or lacks the capacity to make a difference. Several interviewees mentioned a trend of individuals ‘getting hurt’ or having bad experiences which resulted in them leaving the fold. Aline said the trend for intermarriage with Greek Cypriots often resulted in community disapproval, leading many such individuals to withdraw and become more assimilated into the Greek community which, in contrast ‘seems to be welcoming them’.
The Assimilated

Sophie is a lawyer in her mid-twenties. She is part of a growing, largely ‘silent’ and under-represented group of individuals in the Armenian Cypriot community – the ‘half and half’. Her mother is Armenian Cypriot and her father Greek Cypriot, a situation which has caused Sophie much soul-searching and analysis about her own identity and her choices.

Sophie and her older sister went to state schools where they encountered prejudice and bullying emanating from ‘Greek bigotry’. She was most hurt by taunts that Armenians were Turks, and other racist comments; ‘there was always the need to fight and justify myself’, a situation which she says she still encounters in diluted forms today as an adult professional. The fact that Greek Cypriot education is nationalistic in its approach and makes little mention of the Armenians or the other minorities in its curriculum is a problem for the pupil who is not 100% Greek Cypriot (Trimikliniotis, 2004; Varava, 2009). Sophie feels that the prejudice against Armenians was worse (in comparison to other ‘half and half’ experiences) because of the complicated history of the Armenians: ‘it’s not a clear-cut nation’. The situation became so difficult that Sophie’s sister took to hiding her Armenianess and passing herself off as fully Greek Cypriot, something which Sophie never resorted to as she was ‘proud’ of her identity in contrast she says, to her sister who, she says, developed a complex.

Thirty-two year old media personality Zaven, whose father is Armenian and mother Arab, had a similar experience going to an Armenian school in Lebanon:20

‘When we were at schooling age, there was a big debate at home. My mother agreed that we should be in Armenian schools and all my education was in Armenian schools. No matter what we say Armenian schools are weak, weak because Arabic is not the first or second language, but the third language. Second is French or English. Secondly, Arabic is not taken seriously in Armenian schools, at least in my time. Armenians in their mentality feel that Arabic is inferior and this is something I used to hate.’

Although Sophie considers herself lucky to have a father who is both interested and involved in Armenian community life, his Greek Cypriot family have not been fully supportive of his wife, apparently on the grounds of her being Armenian. This impacted Sophie from a young age, with the result that she ‘always wanted to protect her from them’. This situation could have led to Sophie’s mother being somewhat ‘ambiguous’ about her own identity, something which the children picked up on. Other people I spoke to reinforced this picture — that mixed marriages were historically rare and frowned upon (by both parties) often leading to a situation where the children had to make a stark choice between one identity or the other (or have the choice made for them). Esther reports significant numbers of ‘half-Armenians’ visiting her bookshop in Nicosia:

---

20 Children usually attend the school according to their father’s ethnicity, although there are exceptions.
... half-Armenian kids who have swung the Greek way. They come to the shop, very curious. In those days you had to make a decision to be either Greek or Armenian, there was no neutral in between which you can do now.

Not being ‘pure’ acted as ‘a disadvantage on both sides’ for Sophie. This complaint was voiced by all the ‘half and half’ individuals I interviewed including Zaven:

‘I myself am half Armenian, half Arab and I’m very proud of that. It used to make a lot of problems for me. At school Armenians always looked down on Arabs. For me being half was a shame. I always heard ‘his mother is Arab’. Being half [and] half, for the Arabs you’re Armenian and for the Armenians you’re Arab, and I hate this.’

Sophie was encouraged to be involved in Armenian community activities when she was young, and was part of an AYF dance group for several years. This experience was tainted by her constant awareness of her ‘impurity’ and of attention always being drawn to her inferior status in the eyes of the community: ‘in an Armenian context being called Greek’. Although she recognises that her experience is limited to the ARF version of organised community, nonetheless Sophie found the community ‘not receptive or welcoming’ and has since become withdrawn from it. Having tried to connect at a young age, Sophie is quite resentful of the uncompromising dominant spirit she encountered infiltrating all levels of organised community life, emphasising hard boundaries and rigid standards based on essentialised versions of Armenianness. Although Sophie does attend Armenian events occasionally, her last experience, a Christmas Ball left her feeling like an ‘outcast’ with no one to sit with so she has vowed to ‘never go again’.

From this distanced position, Sophie is able to look at the community more ‘objectively’ and with more understanding. She is now able to see that the community frameworks are held in place by a hard core group who are more ‘ghetto-like’ than the vast majority of Armenians who are more integrated in mainstream society and simply do not have the time and the necessary commitment to dominate organised community life. The problem as she and others see it is that it is those with the time who become the dominant interpreters of the Armenianness in the community when in fact they are the activist minority. Sophie is aghast for example that ‘some of them still have the language problem despite being third generation’, something remarked upon by many individuals:

‘There is absolutely no excuse – you are born and live in a country and not being able to speak the language! Sometimes I am really ashamed when this happens ...’

(Silva, teacher and writer, in her late thirties)

In Lebanon the situation is more exaggerated as the stereotype of the Armenian who speaks Arabic badly prevails in the mainstream culture. Although it is still just about possible in the parallel universe of the Armenian ‘ghetto’, to conduct an exclusively Armenian life in Lebanon, this is impossible in Cyprus. Zaven has worked extensively in television and has his own talk show on Future TV which is broadcast via satellite to the Arab world. He has played on this negative...

Armenian stereotype:

`... People were curious, because of the stereotype of Armenians here, so there [was] this sudden attention on me to see my mistakes ... and that is one of the reasons why I quickly gained this "fame" ... I could break the stereotype, in a short time, of Armenians eating basterma and speaking broken Arabic ... From age 20 I work in TV and now people are used to me being an Armenian. For example if I’m out and somebody forgets my name they will call out "the Armenian!"

Sophie’s community experience has not deterred her from claiming her Armenianness, and she believes ‘it is important to acknowledge being half Armenian’. This she does in her own way and through her own efforts rather than being based on any community standards. For Sophie, this role is a self-conscious individual rebellion against the pillars of Armenianness that have alienated her. They extend to playing the ‘Armenian witness’ among her non-Armenian friends, keeping alive the memory of the genocide (and supporting related political activity), an appreciation for Armenian music, dance and culture; and something she feels in her ‘deeper soul’ which is shared in her most intimate relationships. In her profession, Sophie has not kept her Armenian identity a secret but does not advertise it, saying she ‘can project Greekness, although (she) always feels half inside ... sometimes a lonely position’. She is not sure that she would pass this identity on to her children in the likely event of their father being a Greek Cypriot as she does not really think it will be relevant to them.

For Zaven, being half Armenian has meant that he has had to make a great deal of personal effort to break into the profession, working harder than other candidates partly to dispel any concerns:

‘At first they were sceptical about my Arabic, that if I were angry how would I speak, when you are cool you speak fine but ... if you are under tension you might suddenly become “an Armenian” ... Secondly, they did not know how an audience would take [to] an Armenian reporting political or social things.’

Being half Armenian may have been a personal handicap but once he broke into the profession, it gave him a certain celebrity, although he does not want to make a political issue of it:

‘It’s not a lifestyle being an Armenian ... My being an Armenian is just who I am but my character and lifestyle I build them as Zaven not as an Armenian.’

For the most part, reactions to Zaven in the mainstream Lebanese and Arab media have been positive despite his sometimes controversial, liberal views. One notable exception concerned a show he did about youth in the Arabian Gulf which referred to homosexuality. On this occasion the response from all over the Arab world was vehement and made particular reference to his Armenianness:

‘I had lots of hate mail and it all mentioned “Zaven, an Armenian Christian has no right to interfere in our (i.e. Arab) business” ... They posted messages on my website directly ... three
pages of threats that they will campaign to stop all advertisements from the Gulf, to boycott
the programme ... I was astonished to see these emails, because for the first time I was
referred to by so many Arab viewers as Armenian Christian ... So once there’s a problem
(my boldness here) it came up, my Armenianness. Maybe if I was not Armenian Christian,
I don’t know how they would have taken it.’

Like Sophie, Zaven is detached from the community which he sees as insular and parochial. Like
other ‘outsiders’ he has made it ‘big’ on a national and regional map precisely by being distanced
from the community. He also sees the dominant versions of Armenianness as hard, reified and
uncompromising:

‘It’s either ... you’re too much Armenian or you’re too [far] away from Armenians, there is
no middle. Either you’re a Bourj Hammoudsi22 living in another universe or you’re too
much integrated you’ve forgotten everything to do with Armenians. I think both are bad. I
think I’m in the middle. I know Armenian, if there’s something interesting for me I go, but
I don’t go because it’s Armenian and I have to go and at the same time I’m very much
integrated in Lebanese society.’

The solution for Zaven is the affirmation of an overarching Lebanese identity which would go
beyond the sectarian divisions the state is founded on. Many of my Cypriot interviewees expressed
the same hope and desire although they were less confident that it was possible. In Lebanon,
sectarianism is the very foundation of the state so these issues and the many different pulls and
possibilities are always at the forefront of mainstream discourse. For Zaven it is something of a
personal crusade and he sees the problem lying on both sides – the Armenian community leaders’
insular desire to be ‘different’ and ‘apart’; and the Lebanese state system’s reinforcement of this
separation:

‘I want Armenians to feel that they belong to Lebanon ... if they don’t like the country, if
they are not happy, they should leave. If they prefer living in Armenia, Turkey, USA, let
them go. Every person should feel [a sense of] belonging to where they live. This is step one
to live happily and to take advantage of what’s being offered in the country – to live the
country.’

Both Sophie and Zaven are emphatic that their homelands are their ‘host states’ without question.
Sophie is typical of the more romantic half Armenian who has a desire to visit Armenia out of
sentiment, one day. Most others are content to ‘piece together’, through art, music, stories and
literature, a personal imagined ‘Armenia’ existing somewhere deep in their psyche.

22 Meaning a person who lives in Bourj Hammoud, a suburb in North-East Beirut, one of the original sites where
the Armenian refugees settled post-genocide. It is considered the traditional nucleus of the Armenian Lebanese
community and remains heavily populated by Armenians.
The Outsider

Gerard is a well-known personality in Lebanon and the Middle East. He is an actor, director and artist with a long and varied career. Although he says he is 'very attached' to his birthplace, Lebanon, he 'does not mind moving', which he does roughly every five years, citing his attachments to his projects as being more of a pull than anything else. Describing himself as 'an outsider but not an outcast', Gerard sees the status as being 'a personal choice which is voluntary' and 'nothing to do with being Armenian'. On the contrary, he cultivates this status as he 'adores freedom' and being 'beyond boundaries and cultural gaps'. His expert knowledge of different cultures and several languages lend him a chameleon property, allowing him to adapt sufficiently in different situations without being pinned down to anyone. Having travelled widely, lived in different countries and continents, possessing French and Lebanese passports, Gerard says he has 'no homeland really'. Despite his relative privilege, in many ways, Gerard is quite typical of the Armenian intellectuals I interviewed, who are 'outside' the community framework by choice or design and are actively involved in creating an alternative fluid Armenian identity.

Gerard’s main grievance against Lebanon is its sectarianism, as he is against ‘fundamentalism and extremism of any sort and against religion being used politically’. To this aim he has become something of a celebrity, speaking out against the ‘fanaticism’ which he thinks threatens to destroy Lebanon. He does not accept religion as the foundation to Lebanese society and is very vocal about this, becoming a controversial figure preaching ‘freedom’ and something of ‘an advocate for the youth, the future of the country’. Despite clearly having a thoughtful and informed personal commitment to Lebanon, Gerard is still perceived as an outsider by mainstream Lebanese, to the extent that individuals ringing up the talk show that he is appearing on, invariably have to make a point of congratulating him on speaking Arabic well, an occurrence which he ‘hates’. Indeed in the 1970s, Gerard says he was the only Armenian writing plays in Arabic and it was commonly assumed that he was ‘masking someone else due to the mastery of language’. He says that going ‘against the Armenian stereotype’ has caused him ‘serious conflict from both ends at different times’.

Gerard was ‘raised outside of the Armenian ghetto’ as were his parents (orphans in Danish and Italian orphanages). They spoke Armenian at home and Gerard went to French schools. Gerard is keen to cultivate a sense of himself as a free, unaffiliated artist, and seeks the universal in all his projects. When we met he had been trying to secure financial backing for a production of ‘David of Sassoun’, a popular Armenian tale of heroism. Gerard rejects the nationalistic reading of the story, preferring it to be interpreted as a universal tale: ‘other cultures have almost identical stories’. Unfortunately, the project fell through due to lack of Armenian financial backing. The

23 Interview with Gerard Avedissian, Beirut, 14 March 2002.
24 This regularly happens to Zaven as well (see earlier section).
Lebanese government was prepared to help finance the project but wanted match funding from the AGBU who had recently decided to reorient more towards helping Armenia, a policy which Gerard agrees with. His first big Armenian production in 1971, was interpreted by the ARF as a nationalistic story, which Gerard found amusing, together with the fact that suddenly ‘they thought I was integrated with the community’, even inviting him to run for Armenian MP. Gerard’s reply was that, if he was interested in politics, he would want to simply be a Lebanese MP, so deep is his distaste for the sectarian foundations of the state. As such he claims he ‘avoids state sponsored Armenian occasions as he does not want to be categorised’ and ‘hates it when the Lebanese speak to him as an Armenian’.

Gerard’s sense of absolute security with his Armenianness is at the core of his identity and also grounded in his relation with Armenia. He spent five years as a student in Soviet Armenia, on a generous state scholarship and ‘was firmly embedded in the intellectual and artistic higher echelons of society’, enjoying ‘an honoured and privileged lifestyle’. He loved the experience of ‘discovering Armenian culture’ which was actually ‘very different from the Lebanese version of it’, preferring to stick to the locals as far as possible, as it was ‘the only authentic way of communicating with Armenian culture ... despite some of them being very Russified’. However, in the long run, the lifestyle was no compensation for the freedom he craved, and he ‘basically ran away from Soviet Armenia’. Gerard has never returned, at first ‘too scared to go back’ and now fears ‘being disappointed’ if he were to visit the new republic. Despite being invited many times, and on one occasion when they wanted to honour him, Gerard is reluctant to return, especially on the latter occasion ‘as it was becoming a political statement’.

Gerard’s relation to the Lebanese Armenian community has always been a detached one, but he is happy to get involved if something is of interest to him. As such, he laments what he sees as the decline of the Armenian community. Whereas there were many Armenians on the cultural scene of Lebanon in the 1970s there are few now. He does not fear for the continuing existence of the community, but does fear for its ‘quality’. Even the political parties, which have traditionally played the role of providing a sense of belonging, have ‘an uncertainty’ since the establishment of the Republic of Armenia. Culturally, he is disappointed that the community is being dominated by the older generations, ‘who are out of touch with the youth and reluctant to do things that would really attract them’. This was a common refrain among the artists I interviewed. One female international award-winning writer had this to say about the community in Cyprus:

‘... they are not open-minded – don’t dare to do anything different ... following the ways of the parents, so little room for change, difference, evolution etc. ... it’s always the same dances, same theatre, comedy etc. It’s very dated and keeps us within ourselves. Too much emphasis on preservation rather than exploration etc. leading to cultural stagnation.’

Gerard makes the distinction between the traditional largely Bourj Hammoud-based community of traders and craftsmen, and the increasing number of wealthier Armenians in west Beirut and beyond who are far more integrated into mainstream society. It is the former that are considered
the ‘community’ in the traditional sense. Gerard agrees with the thesis that very few individuals who are immersed in the community make it big on a national or international level, either due to real or imagined constraints. The community tends to confine one’s potential, limiting dreams and opportunities. It is those who are without these traditional boundaries of possibilities that are free to develop and make an impact beyond the community level. In Gerard’s case and others, a relationship with the ‘step-homeland’ can allow the individual to operate easily outside the community framework, being an alternative way of being grounded in one’s Armenian identity.

Haig is one such case in Cyprus. The son of Anatolian refugees, Haig is the founder and director of a cultural foundation based in Cyprus. Haig visited Armenia for the first time in 1991. Despite it being a very difficult period in Armenia, he found his visit ‘an extremely stimulating experience … so … ended up going backwards and forwards’. As a result he has become involved in many projects related primarily to arts and culture. Haig says that he is not a ‘typical Armenian Cypriot’ because most of his schooling was in the UK, as a result of which he feels somewhat detached from both Armenian and mainstream Cypriot society:

‘The degree to which I don’t feel integrated is very much my fault because … I wasn’t educated here: my knowledge of the Greek language isn’t what it should be. But I find Greek Cypriots are extremely accepting, I see no discrimination here whatsoever towards Armenians and I feel extremely grateful, if not the right word because I feel totally that I belong here, I feel totally at ease and at home. I love Cyprus; I am totally committed to Cyprus as a country and I try to contribute to it. As I speak strongly about my Armenian identity and my commitment to helping Armenia within my means and within my interests, I have exactly that feeling towards Cyprus.’

Although they considered themselves apart from the community, all the intellectuals and artists I interviewed were invariably extremely knowledgeable about community life and the hegemonic

---

25 Another interviewee from Beirut stressed the importance of class, education and parents’ role in this: ‘During the war most educated and cultured Armenians left the country. Most of those who remained are not educated or cultured. They don’t read, they don’t care about education and their children are going to be like them. … Very few want their children to become better people; that’s why I’m pessimistic. My parents always pushed us because they wanted us to become better people, all of us, four kids, the best schools, the best universities etc. They told me “why not go on and do your PhD”. If it was someone else, they would say, “you’re a girl stay at home”. It depends on the parents and most of them unfortunately don’t care if their kids become better people than they are … Before the war there were two kinds of people: the educated and the rest. Now it’s mostly just the rest’ (interview with Elizabeth, 38, Beirut).

26 On some occasions this is proclaimed openly. For example, at a debate on ‘The Future of Armenian Schools’ held at the Garminian secondary school in Beirut, featuring politicians, educators and parents on 15 March 2002, the youngest speaker, an advisor to a Lebanese MP, defended the falling standards of education in Armenian schools with this statement: ‘We don’t want walking encyclopaedias; we want Armenians with Armenian values’ thereby suggesting that the priority is on ‘creating Armenians’ rather than education. Interestingly, his statement was met with appreciation from some of the older people in the audience.
standards and discourse of Armenianness, usually situating themselves in relation to this when reflecting on their identity. Haig is typical of the outsider who finds the community framework does not suit him personally, but recognises a need for the model to persist, ‘collectively, if one is to maintain a minimum of Armenian diaspora life’ although he (and every other ‘outsider’ I met) believes that ‘Armenian institutions in the diaspora are in need of tremendous reform’. The intellectual’s traditional role of critiquing society from a distance was something that each of my respondents fulfilled with knowledge and authority. Many of the ‘outsiders’ I spoke to wished to be ‘active’ but realised that they would have to create a new ‘space’ or outlet for themselves in order to do so. Also, traditional community structures are often suspicious or prejudiced against ‘outsiders’ or are disinterested in the individual. One female intellectual in her sixties said this:

‘As I have been abroad most of my life most of the community here don’t even know who I am. I am usually judged as being like my mother/father, I find this simplistic. They are not interested in you; just assume that you are like the family. Not curious in getting to know you ... (It is) received, regurgitated information by the majority ... Collective living here, so more scope for received knowledge.’

Esther who is a publisher and considers herself ‘detached’ from the community related her frustrating experience of trying to arrange a formal launch for a book with Armenian interest. As she found ‘no neutral territory’ within the community, after much negotiation, she ended up having to hand it over to a local college who hosted it with no community involvement. The community structure therefore can act as a hindrance to individuals who do not fit the mould. Alternatives have to be carved out by the individuals themselves, either through direct involvement with the step-homeland, the ‘host state’ or the creation of a different kind of space.

The Dislocated

A significant number of people I encountered were in transit in some way, between temporary homes, or feeling displaced in spirit or culture. For Anna, a twenty-six year old graduate recently returned from seven years in the USA, her presence in Cyprus is purely based on her parents living there. For the Abcarian brothers, recent repatriates from South Africa,27 Cyprus is the unknown birthplace of their parents. For thirty-eight year old Sara and other individuals who have studied or lived abroad and regularly travel between families (homes) all over the world, there is a foreignness between them and their host state. For twenty-four year old Maral and other young people about to immigrate to North America, the ‘host state’ feels like a transit lounge one has made a home, uncertain of the future destination. The first language of many of these individuals

27 A significant number of Cypriots who had settled in South Africa in the 60s and 70s have returned to Cyprus in the last ten years or so, making up another dimension in the Cypriot multi-layered identity.
is English, reflecting their ‘post-colonial’ situation as well as the globalising nature of higher education. Interestingly, all the women teach English at different levels in schools in Cyprus and Lebanon.

Anna was born in London to Armenian Cypriot parents and spent her childhood in the UK. The family moved back to Cyprus thirteen years ago. She was awarded scholarships to study English and Education in the USA for five years followed by two years training. She is not sure whether she will stay on in Cyprus or not. Although Anna and her younger sister were quite fluent in Armenian as children, where it was spoken in the home, she has since forgotten most of it, something she ‘regrets’. Anna is fully aware of what she considers the community ‘pillars’ of Armenianness and the ‘scale’ to measure the ‘Good Armenian’. Her attitude is that of the interested bystander. She ‘wants to learn more’ and ‘feels’ her identity despite being aware of not conforming to the scale. She is aware of the existence of the ‘community framework’ but does not feel she is ‘woven in as yet’ and is not sure how and whether she would choose to do so. Anna believes that a great deal of ‘effort’ needs to be exerted on the part of the outsider to attend community activities and gradually become active. She is torn between thinking she ‘should’ do so or be true to her feeling: ‘it’s more important to be oneself rather than others’ perception of you’. Her ‘fascination’ for the Armenian aspect of her identity also extends to a fascination with Cyprus as her ‘adopted home’. This theme was repeated by other intellectuals who had spent time examining the notion of home through their work. Cyprus, with its layers upon layers, its peculiar post-colonial flavour and its ongoing search for a coherent inclusive identity that reflects its people, is a state many diasporans said they felt a deep affinity for.

Anna is in some ways, typical of the kind of ‘symbolic Armenian’ described by Bakalian (1993), who prizes ‘feeling’ Armenian as being a valid and honest national identity. She cites food, music and memory as being the tenets of her Armenian identity. This sense of history and the collective psyche are aspects of identity that all outsiders mentioned, even though they, like Anna, may not be ‘well versed in the facts’. Carrying a sense of a long and heavy history is not a burden, but a badge of honour from this detached position. This feeling is usually linked to the individual having had some personal relationship with genocide survivors. For Sara this means that future generations will lack this spirit:

‘Grandparents’ influence – especially the generation from the genocide is very important; you get this sense of loss from a young age; but it has to be from that generation otherwise it’s not possible. First-hand experience [is] essential. When they die off I think it will be very difficult to preserve that sense of identity …’

This situation is by no means restricted to Armenians. A sizable number of Greek Cypriot young people who have either lived or studied abroad; children of mixed marriages or ‘repats’ from the UK, South Africa and elsewhere, are in a similar situation. In the Lebanese case, the Maronites in particular claim they are more comfortable conversing in French rather than Arabic and a rising number of young people prefer French/English, either for aspirational reasons or because they have been shuttling between the west and Lebanon.
Anna’s US education has also politicised her into identifying with other minorities on a political and academic level. The Abcarian brothers in South Africa also said they gravitated towards similar ‘minorities’ in schools – the Greeks, Spaniards and Italians – differentiating themselves from the dominant ‘whites’. This sense of repeated Otherness has given these individuals a sense of ‘always being foreigners’ regardless of their environment.

In contrast to Anna, the Abcarian brothers are evidently delighted to be immersed in an Armenian community, having felt the uneasy duality between home life and values and that of the mainstream culture in South Africa. Their home environment was intensely Armenian, with the boys going to school not knowing any English or Afrikaans at all. Their home education extended to full knowledge of their ‘story’ and socialising with the ten or so other Armenian Cypriot families in the vicinity. The Armenian community in Johannesburg although tiny, was ‘very tight; very close and supportive’, a situation which was challenged by the recent arrivals from Armenia who reportedly had no such desire to remain apart, rapidly adapting to the mainstream South African culture, and also ‘causing problems’ for the established Armenians. After the troubles of South Africa, the boys seem to be relieved to have arrived in Cyprus even though it is an unknown place for them. Despite being citizens of both states, it is the Armenian culture that they feel ‘most connected to’ and would ‘fight for’. Although they are in their early to mid-twenties, the brothers have the utmost respect for their father who seems to be both their role model and guide. For some dislocated individuals, the Armenian identity, as encapsulated in the nuclear family can become the shelter and the fabric of meaning to one’s life, especially in the face of confusion and conflicting pulls of a challenging environment.

The dislocated carry with them some experience of multiple homes and possibilities and a sense of a wider diaspora. Sara, for example, has studied in the UK where she was involved in the Armenian community. She also visited Switzerland where her sister studied and has a sense of the community there. The internet has helped her to get in touch with distant relatives in South America and one of them visited her last year. Although they had ‘great difficulty in communicating with them as they didn’t speak any Armenian at all’ the experience was a wonderful one and Sara describes them as ‘feeling Armenian very strongly’. The dislocated are thus always aware of other communities and other versions of Armenianness, living in constant movement and relation to them, either through travel, communications or in the imagination.

Due to the Lebanese Civil War, Maral has lived half of her life in California, all her family members going ‘back and forth’ regularly. She is ambivalent about her impending emigration from California to Montreal where the rest of her immediate family have settled:

‘I don’t know where I want to be really. It’s very confusing right now ... When I use my head and be realistic I think yes, I have to go. But you have your social life, your past, childhood memories, it’s hard ... but I’m definitely going ...’

Maral attended Armenian schools, clubs and associations in all three countries. She is typical of young people who have experienced several different Armenian communities by a young age and
are always carrying a sense of comparison, critique and evaluation. For Maral it led to cultivating her Lebanese identity on her return:

‘When I was in California I was very involved in Armenian things, clubs etc, extremely extremely – you know when people go to the US they “lose” their Armenian identity/culture, for me it was the opposite ... When I came back (to Lebanon) I realised that this was not the right way to look at things and I’m very happy I did because you get to see things from others’ perspectives. You get to be a lot more mature. Because I think in our schools our kids are being brought up thinking that this is the world, not more than that. But it’s not the case – there’s so much out there.’

Having this insight, Maral made a special effort to learn Arabic well and to make close Arab friends. In this regard she says she is unusual in Lebanon, where those from conservative backgrounds like hers tend to stick to their own. Combined with her self-conscious opening-up to the host state is her desire to share her culture with her Arab friends, taking them along to community events. Sometimes, she says, she seems to be the only one doing this. Sara too is fluent in Greek despite her English education and considers herself to be ‘well-integrated with the Greeks’. Like Maral, her closest friends are all non-Armenians:

‘I try to keep a balance with non-Armenian friends and non-Armenian life otherwise it becomes very monotonous – same people, it can get claustrophobic ... I have no close Armenian friends or friends at all for that matter; just many acquaintances on [a] good social level.’

Although she has never encountered prejudice, Sara says that she ‘sometimes gets the feeling they are putting you in another category as such though no one has ever said it openly’. By being located in the nexus between host state and diasporan, Maral too feels that she has a duty to rise to the challenge of the encounter. She thinks it is the Armenians’ own ill-advised failing that they are still not popularly accepted as Lebanese, because they have cultivated that impression, ‘loudly proclaiming loyalties with Armenia and Armenian causes’. Still, the women’s personal integration into mainstream society does not extend to political interest. The dislocated are invariably disengaged from the politics of their host state, suggesting a somewhat detached or temporary residence and commitment.

Sara does attend community events when they interest her and prefers the ‘pick and choose’ approach to organised activity. Maral considers that she is ‘... neither inside nor outside (the community). I’m definitely not outside but not inside as I should be maybe’ revealing a normative standard by which she is judging herself. Both women consider the church to be very important though neither attend regularly. This is a regular theme among the dislocated – reverence for traditional pillars regardless of personal commitment. Maral makes the important point that the standard of involvement with which the community judges is an unrealistic one for the modern host state-integrated individual:
... everyone is complaining in all organisations that the youth are becoming too indifferent and not participating in traditional groups etc. Where is the youth? Well the youth is busy. I believe I am busy, I don’t have any time for any of these things ... things are different ... when our parents were my age they had more time, their lifestyle was different ... I mean if I had the time I would definitely be involved ... it’s not that I don’t want to be ...

Like Anna and the Abcarian brothers, Maral has never visited Armenia. In contrast to their detached attitude, she considers it a ‘great sin’ and feels ‘very guilty’. Sara has a romantic picture of Armenia as homeland, having visited on an organised tour in 1993. She considers it ‘an experience you can’t explain’, and evidently one that moved her. There is a mythical quality to the manner in which these interviewees spoke about Armenia as their ‘homeland’. With the exception of Anna, they claimed political loyalty to the Republic and a desire to be useful to its growth. Maral and Sara expressed a tentative desire to visit or even live there for some time, but their expression was somewhat unconvincing. It seems that the ‘obstacles’ – their actual lives, their careers, their families and their rootedness (however shallow) in the host state and in the diaspora space – will keep Armenia a distant and mythical land to them; perhaps that is what they are most comfortable with. Sara has lost touch with the distant relatives she discovered there; Maral and the others have no ties at all. It would be interesting to see whether once she settles in Canada, Maral’s longing will be for Lebanon, her adopted homeland as opposed to her imaginary homeland. However dislocated the individual, there seems to be an innate desire or pressure to subscribe to the community code, to appear both rooted and committed to where they are, but also routed in some way towards the mythical homeland, because: ‘It’s our only national symbol. If we don’t have that we don’t have anything left.’

Concluding Remarks

Beyond Community – Challenging Hegemonic Diasporic Discourses

The extracts above reveal how community structures and diaspora gatekeepers are being challenged or in some cases rendered unnecessary as individuals form meaningful diasporic identities outside of the norms decreed by the latter. The four sections: the Disillusioned, the Assimilated, the Outsider and the Dislocated, each focused on a distinct movement within the diaspora space. In the first, the Disillusioned manifested a turning away from traditional political community as the difficult realities of the ‘step-homeland’ and the host state challenged their vision. The Assimilated represented the growing number who are not fully accepted by the traditional Armenian community and are becoming submerged into mainstream society, an often neglected group of individuals, each with his/her own experience and self-conscious ‘mapping’ on to the diaspora and host state discourse. The section on Outsiders investigated the fluid situations and positioning of self-consciously non-aligned diasporans for whom the ‘step-homeland’ has provided a new pivot around which to explore new possibilities. The final section, on the Dislocated, encapsulates the
trend which is perhaps most exemplified in the wider diaspora condition in the context of globalisation. These individuals are in constant movement, physically and psychologically, carrying an awareness and knowledge of multiple homes and ways of living in diaspora. Through various orientations at different times, they reveal a fluid location in the diaspora space which takes on new significance when it is freed from the pulls of a clear ‘homeland’ or ‘host state’.

The mechanisms of Globalisation (travel, communication, mobility, social media) have empowered the diasporic individual in unprecedented ways such that s/he is in a position to experience a personalised version of Armenianness, bypassing traditional mediators, and also independent of the organised community. New versions of Armenianness are articulated from fresh positions of security, creativity and authority as the diaspora space is broadened to allow for other agents and sources of meaning-making. This paper has shown that the approach of mapping nation-building from the margins and the periphery is essential in analysing ‘old’ diaspora beyond the official, prescriptive, normative discourse. The findings reveal that the voices from the side-lines are gaining legitimacy and influence through dynamic encounters with the ‘host state’, the transnation and the ‘step-homeland’, being rooted and routed in alternative new spaces and possibilities carved out by the process of globalisation. This paper has argued for the need to liberate diaspora, as concept and practice, from the traditional parameters and confines as defined by diaspora institutions and leadership, by recognising the agency and creativity of individuals either outside or alienated from this infrastructure.

**Beyond the Binary – Minority Identities and Belonging in Lebanon and Cyprus**

The tension, apparent in diaspora communities, vis-à-vis their host states mirrors the tensions in debates on minorities and citizenship. Multiculturalism and Diversity as policies in particular have been criticised for ossifying differences by recognising and privileging them, and thereby replicating the binary mentality that earlier assimilation models were founded upon. In addition, all approaches which recognise difference, create a majority and minority, are to one extent or another guilty of seeing ‘culture’ and ‘identity’ (whether that of the ‘majority’ or the ‘minority’) as a static, homogenous and essentialised set of beliefs, lifestyles and ideologies which all group members subscribe to equally, thereby obfuscating complexities and inequalities within (Anthias, 2013). This replication of binaries has been most oppressive to individuals and groups which are not represented by dominant discourses or are very far from power structures. These are the silenced and side-lined experiences on the edges of the various boundaries being drawn and redrawn at the different levels of identity-building (community, state, nation, diaspora). This paper has argued for a more nuanced and critical understanding of differences and commonalities, and how these can be both contained and reified at the level of the official, and dynamic and flexible in practice, drawing meaning from multiple shifting sites. These hopeful ‘narratives of interculturality’ (Anthias, 2006) reflect the fluidity and multi-layered nature of political identity in people’s lives, beyond boundaries, imagined or constructed.
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Between East and West:
John Thomson in Cyprus

Nicos Philippou

Abstract
Thomson’s 1878 Cyprus expedition is a key moment in the history of representing Cyprus. This paper highlights the disconnectedness between the mostly uncritical contemporary consumption of Thomson’s images and historical realities. The paper argues that Thomson’s photographs are much more than documents of a Cypriot past and are, in fact, the product of complex political, ideological and cultural concerns of his time. The context, within which he operated, notably colonialism, was instrumental in shaping the vision of Cyprus his photographs construct. His text and imagery emphasised decay but also Thomson employed a narrative of salvaging. When dealing with people Thomson emphasised physical characteristics over culture and typicality and collective character over individuality. Further, and almost inevitably, Thomson engaged in a discussion about the cultural orientation of the place and its people. Yet, Cyprus proved to be a non-straightforward case. It was a geographical, historical and cultural territory that would ‘resist’ a direct and uncomplicated categorisation and placement within either cultural sphere.
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Introduction
In 1878 Cyprus re-emerged from obscurity vis-à-vis Europe to acquire new political significance when control of the island shifted from the Ottoman Empire to the British. The event heightened curiosity about Cyprus in Europe and especially in Britain. This thirst for information about Cyprus was satisfied by, among others, a number of British and European traveller photographers, the most important of which is probably John Thomson. This paper examines Thomson’s photographs of Cyprus taken in the autumn of 1878 and tries to interpret them in the socio-political context of the shift from Ottoman imperialism to British colonialism.
Today, Thomson’s work is popular among contemporary Cypriot institutions, such as banks and cultural foundations, which publish his photographs in glossy coffee table books, calendars and diaries. This contemporary consumption of Thomson’s images is rather uncritical, his photographs merely taken as a window into late nineteenth-century Cyprus. This can be attributed to a contemporary national project of nostalgia and a romanticisation of the past and it is only relatively recently that Thomson’s Cyprus project has been scrutinised through a critical lens (see Hajimichael, 2006 and Papaioannou, forthcoming).

This paper aims at highlighting the disconnectedness between the mostly uncritical contemporary consumption of Thomson’s images and historical realities. It is my aim to show that Thomson’s photographs are much more than documents of Cypriot things past; they are, in fact, the product of complex political, ideological and cultural concerns of his time and would fit into the greater scheme of the attempt of the British Empire to assert its control over the new acquisition.

The paper is also informed by the premise that documentary, ethnographic and pseudo-ethnographic photographs are not merely documents of whatever it is they depict but are first and foremost documents of the producer’s perception and evaluation of the subject. They are, also, evidence of how the perspective of the photographer is shaped by the image-producing context. The suggestion here is that Thomson is not solely responsible for his visual and textual assessment of Cyprus but that the context, within which he operates, notably colonialism, is instrumental in shaping the vision he projects. It is not clear if Thomson, in this case, was directly commissioned by the British government. His Cyprus project resulted in a two-volume publication titled Through Cyprus with the Camera in the Autumn of 1878, published in 1879 and dedicated to ‘Sir Garnet Wolseley, KCB, GCMG, Lord High Commissioner of Cyprus’.

This, and the fact that Thomson was the first writer and photographer to visit Cyprus after Britain gained control of the island, led his biographer to suggest that perhaps Thomson and his publishers ‘approached the Foreign Office for a commission to provide an “official” survey account, as a sort of “cultural” propaganda mission’ (Ovenden, 1977, p. 22). Nevertheless, even though such a direct commission has not been established, the fact that Thomson’s Cyprus publication is ‘dedicated by permission’ to the Lord High Commissioner – whose official portrait appears in the original publication – suggests a form of endorsement by the newly established British Administration of Cyprus. This informs many observations and arguments in this discussion.

Further, the paper takes into account the perceptions about the status of, and the real or perceived qualities of the medium. John Tagg’s Foucauldian theoretical perspective on photography together with Christopher Pinney’s more empirical, anthropological study of photographic practices in India provide a very useful framework of analysis of Thomson’s project in general and the analysis of Thomson’s portraits of Cypriots in particular.

Finally and almost inevitably, the paper examines the complexities that emerge from attempts to define Cypriot identity. In Thomson’s narrative Cyprus, Cypriots and Cypriothness appear to be caught between east and west.
Photography as Document

Before deliberating Thomson and his Cyprus project it is useful to discuss photography and those characteristics of the medium that set it apart from other forms of documentation and representation. Because of the natural, chemical processes involved in photography, the medium in its infancy was seen as an accurate and value free method of recording the world. The most effective articulation of this perception of photography is provided by Barthes who, in the early 1980s, explained that every photograph is almost co-natural with its referent and it thus acquires a special status as a system of representation:

‘Painting can feign reality without having seen it. Discourse combines signs which have referents, of course, but these referents can be and are most often “chimeras”. Contrary to these imitations, in Photography I can never deny that the thing has been there’ (Barthes, 2000, p. 76).

Despite this idea being widely accepted, particularly during the nineteenth century, it was gradually understood that this is not all there is in the photographic image. It was gradually made evident that the photograph is also telling of the photographer’s perception of whatever ‘thing’ is placed in front of the lens. After all it became clear that different photographers produced different photographic records of the same thing. As Sontag put it,

‘as people quickly discovered that nobody takes the same picture of the same thing, the supposition that cameras furnish an impersonal, objective image yielded to the fact that photographs are evidence not only of what’s there but of what an individual sees, not just a record but an evaluation of the world’ (Sontag, 1979, p. 88).

Nevertheless, this perceived semiotic superiority of the photographic image over other systems of representation meant that the medium acquired a special status as a method of documentation. Of course it needs to be said, here, that the medium’s privileged status was acquired only partly due to its intrinsic characteristics; notably the natural, chemical processes involved in the production of a photographic still. Its use within privileged institutions such as the government, the police and the hospital plus the connotations which went along with such use, played at least an equally important role in the construction of such perceptions about photography. Tagg describes photography’s privileged status as a document, or as guaranteed witness, and attributes this special status, partly, to its adoption and use within institutions of authority:

‘It has been argued that this insertion of the “natural and universal” in the photograph is particularly forceful because of photography’s privileged status as a guaranteed witness of the actuality of the events it represents. The photograph seems to declare: “This really happened. The camera was there. See for yourself.” However, if this binding quality of the photograph is partly enforced at the level of “internal relations” by the degree of definition, it is also produced and reproduced by certain privileged ideological apparatuses, such as
scientific establishments, government departments, the police and law courts. This power to bestow authority and privilege on photographic representations is not given to other apparatuses, even within the same social formation – such as amateur photography or 'Art photography' – and it is only partially held by photo-journalism' (Tagg, 1988, p. 160).

During the second half of the nineteenth century and at a time of rapid social change the recognition of the photographic image as evidence was closely related to the expansion of the state and the development of institutions and practices of discipline and control along the lines of prisons, the police, asylums and hospitals, and the emergence of different areas of knowledge through the formation of new social and anthropological sciences like criminology, psychiatry, comparative anatomy, germ theory and sanitation; knowledge that would provide new forms of exercising power on the social body (Tagg, 1988, p. 5).

Arguments and evidence relating to these areas of expertise would circulate only within specific circles and among experts and, therefore, would form specialised discourses. Tagg points to the effects of such expert discourses on those subjected to scrutiny, notably the 
working classes, colonised peoples, the criminal, poor, ill-housed, sick or insane who were subjected to a scrutinising gaze, constituted as the passive or 'feminised' objects of knowledge and instituted as incapable of speaking, acting or organising for themselves (ibid., p. 11).

If the coupling of photography and evidence was related to the effort of the state in industrialised countries to exercise more effective control on the social body we can immediately see why during the same period it would be employed in surveys of distant lands, particularly colonies of European powers. The camera, seen as a 'scientific' apparatus, would bestow a particular power to the white European over newly acquired land and people and would be used to record, classify and buttress control over these. Upper class Europeans, serving as colonial government officials, or at other times acting under the labels of the traveller, ethnographer or anthropologist, would embark on their cultural safaris in the Middle East, Africa and Asia and bring back their specimens in the form of the photograph. The motives for such practice were closely related to those driving other colonial practices like the setting up of institutions of social control, geographical mapping, population censuses, the introduction of identification cards, police records and fingerprinting: all enabling the colonial power to acquire knowledge of and classify and control the colonised.

The Photographer of Kings: Thomson’s Short Biography

John Thomson was born in Edinburgh in 1837, two years before the emergence of Daguerre’s photographic system, the first patented photographic system. He was the eighth of nine children of the tobacconist William Thomson and Isabella Newlands. Out of the nine children in the family only two survived into manhood; John and William (Cowan, 1985, p. ix). Richard Ovenden, author of a book on the life and work of John Thomson, gives a detailed account of his development into, probably, the most celebrated photographer and amateur geographer of his time,
and his account is the main source of the information provided in this section (Ovenden, 1997).

Thomson’s modest background did not guarantee him a University education despite the fact that he was born during a period in which Edinburgh was enjoying its cultural and scientific heyday. Ovenden reports that by 1851 Thomson had become apprenticed to an optician and scientific instrument maker and that in the course of 1856–1858 had attended the Edinburgh School of Arts gaining the ‘Attestation of Proficiency’ in Natural Philosophy, Junior Mathematics and Chemistry (ibid., pp. 2-3). Ovenden also asserts that Thomson was quite a strongly religious person throughout his life; a conclusion drawn because of a thorough knowledge of the Bible exhibited in his writings and because in his letters he urged his wife to attend church regularly (ibid., p. 2). He was elected as an Ordinary Fellow of the Royal Scottish Society of Arts in 1861 and Ovenden believes that Thomson came to be interested in photography because of his participation in scientific circles which included many photography enthusiasts (ibid., pp. 4–5).

At about that time Thomson decided to join his brother who had moved to Singapore in 1859 and set up as watchmaker. He had certainly arrived before June 1862 because on the twelfth day of that month Thomson advertised his photographic services in a local newspaper (ibid., p. 6). Thomson used Singapore as a base for his extensive travel along the islands and the mainland territories of Malaya and Sumatra (ibid., p. 7).

In September 1865 Thomson travelled to Bangkok where, with the help of the British Consulate, he was able to gain an audience with the Siamese Royal Family. He spent a lot of his time there producing what Ovenden described as ‘stunning formal portraits’ of the King, his family and his court (ibid., pp. 8–9). He also used Bangkok as a base for further journeys, the most important of them being a four month rough journey from Siam to Cambodia which began in January 1866. The journey, which was ‘eased’ by a letter from King Mongkut, was fruitful. Thomson became the first photographer to visit Angkor, the heart of the ancient Cambodian kingdom and one of the most important archaeological sites of the world (ibid., p. 10).

He arrived in the Cambodian capital, Phnom Penh, in March of 1866 where again he seized an opportunity to produce photographic portraits of political leaders (ibid.). Thomson’s writings about Cambodia reveal a

‘typically European disregard for native cultures and sensibilities ... he regarded [Cambodia] as a “miserable remnant of ‘Khamain’”, and he repeat[ed] his imperialist accusations concerning the “listlessness and apathy” of the native peoples’ (ibid., p. 10).

Among Thomson’s surviving images of Phnom Penh predominate the portraits of the King of Cambodia, Norodom, and the royal family (ibid., p. 10). From there Thomson returned to Singapore, through Bangkok, and then back to Britain at around May–June 1866 (ibid., p. 11).

Throughout his stay in Britain he used his Far East photographs and experience to establish himself as photographer and geographer. His activities and successes at this period included being elected as a fellow of the Ethnological Society of London as well as a fellowship of the Royal Geographical society. He presented papers to ethnological and geographical conferences, published
in both the British Journal of Photography and the Illustrated London News, and exhibited his photographs. His stay in England provided him with two further achievements: the publication of his first book, early in 1867, with the title *The Antiquities of Cambodia: A Series of Photographs Taken on the Spot* and meeting his wife to be, Isabel Petrie (ibid., pp. 11–13).

In 1867 Thomson returned to the Far East where he stayed until 1872. Initially he used Singapore as his base but he soon established a very successful portrait studio in Hong Kong. From there he travelled extensively into China to produce an extensive body of work that would enhance his profile as the photographer of the East and afford him a number of very successful publications and his fame as a traveller photographer. During this period he married Isabel Petrie, worked as a correspondent for The Illustrated London News and used his contacts with British officials to produce portraits of the most senior Chinese politicians and government officials (ibid., pp. 13–20).

Between his return to Britain and his death in 1921 Thomson did not embark on a photographic expedition abroad other than his Cyprus journey. In this period he established himself as a portrait photographer of the British elite and the Royal Household including Queen Victoria. In 1881 Thomson was awarded the Royal Warrant as ‘Photographer to Her Majesty Queen Victoria’. He also gave lectures and published his *Street Life in London* with photographs of the working classes and the poor, which is considered one of his most important contributions to photography (ibid., pp. 21–43).

Conclusively it could be argued that Thomson’s professional development rested on colonialist and orientalist assumptions about what ‘discovering the East’ might mean and to what purpose such a task might be undertaken. His interest in the East could be seen as part of an overall worldview about past and current civilisations, cultural decay, and the task of imperial powers to halt such decay in the east. Political prescriptions about what governing the East should be about were part and parcel of his project, even if unwillingly so and these are assumptions that, as shown here, might have fed into his work on Cyprus.

**Thomson on Photography**

In his introduction to his two volumes on Cyprus first published in 1879, Thomson reveals his perception of photography; a perception consistent with the dominant discourse on photography of his time:

> ‘I thought that, after all, I would wait and see things for myself, and pursue my original plan of exploring Cyprus with the “camera”, taking views (as impartial as they were photographic) of whatever might prove interesting on the journey’ (Thomson, 1985, p. xxii).

For Thomson, therefore, photography was synonymous to impartiality. Furthermore, the quote betrays a contradiction of purpose. On the one hand it declares that there is an intention to record what subjectively appears interesting. On the other hand, however, it asserts that the record was to be impartial as it was photographic. Thomson’s views on photography were expressed in more
detail in a lecture he gave in Cardiff on 24 August 1891 and published in the Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society. The text which reads like a celebration of the ‘scientific’ and therefore objective nature of photography includes the following extract:

‘The camera affords the only means, with which I am acquainted, of portraying visible objects with scientific accuracy. Every photograph taken with an achromatised and corrected lens is a perfect reproduction to scale of the object photographed, as seen from the point of view of the lens’ (Thomson, 1891, p. 669).

He then proceeds to indicate the inefficiencies of the means of representation that photography replaced in the field of exploration:

‘It is quite impossible to illustrate by pencil, with any degree of accuracy, or to describe in a perfectly realistic manner, scenes and incidents by the way as to render them of permanent value. Lack of time and opportunity constrains the gifted traveller, too often, to trust to memory for detail in his sketches, and by the free play of fancy he fills in and embellishes his handiwork until it becomes a picture of his own creation’ (Thomson, 1891, p. 670).

For Thomson, then, the photographic image is a perfect and objective reproduction of whatever object, scene or incident is placed in front of the lens. It is free of the imagination of the operator since, for Thomson, it is the lens that has a point of view and not the photographer.

The most fascinating, and probably, the most revealing passage in this same text is a paragraph through which Thomson advocates for the introduction into the photographic process of an anthropometric system in the form of a measuring rod:

‘In order to obtain a basis of measurement for any object to be photographed, a very simple device may be employed. If the object be ethnological, to wit, a racial type, where it is necessary to take a full face and profile view of the head, or a series of overlapping views of a number of types of the same family; a rod marked with one space of definite measurement will supply the required authority. This rod should be so placed in relation to the head, that it will fall into a plain bisecting the cranium about the ears for full face, and the nose for profile. The rod must then be photographed with the type, and the result will give a basis of measurement’ (Thomson, 1891, p. 672).

The above extract reveals a preoccupation with racial types and the quantification of external characteristics, which is in line with observations made by Pinney on the use of measuring grids (in the background of photographs) and other anthropometric systems in nineteenth-century India (Pinney, 1997, pp. 50–71).

Pinney suggested that the use of such systems of measurement was linked with ideas about the readability of physiognomy, which derived from the work of Lavater in the second half of the eighteenth century:

‘Lavater suggested that individuals’ moral beauty could be judged on the basis of external characteristics, what he called their ‘corporeal beauty’, and he “went back to the ancient
search for occult analogies between physical characteristics, moral qualities and animal forms, attempting to reduce physiognomics to an exact science’. Certain structural features of the face were codified in a system which permitted the literal and precise “reading” of character and disposition from external features’ (Pinney, 1997, p. 51).

Pinney went on to indicate that physiognomy when employed within a European context would link external bodily features with individual character whereas when used to study the non-westerner the body would be seen to signify collective character. Thus, much of colonial portraiture in India was underpinned by notions of ‘type’ and ‘typicality’ (Pinney, 1997, pp. 52–53). Thomson did not use, in Cyprus, an anthropometric system like the one advocated in his 1891 lecture, but, he was, nonetheless, as will be shown further down, pre-occupied with typicality, external bodily features and their semiotic value.

Decay at First Sight

Thomson’s Cyprus project would certainly have political utility for the colonial government and it is unlikely that Thomson was unaware of this. Thomson arrived at Larnaca port on 7 September 1878, three months after the Cyprus Convention was signed between Britain and the Ottoman Empire on the 4th of June of the same year, which gave control of Cyprus to Britain (Ovenden, 1997, p. 21).

In his introduction to ‘Through Cyprus with the Camera’, Thomson appears conscious of the potential political utility of his Cyprus project:

‘The photographs have been printed in permanent pigments, and therefore, while they supply incontestable evidence of the present condition of Cyprus, they will also afford a source of comparison in after years, when, under the influence of British rule, the place has risen from its ruins’ (Thomson, 1985, p. xxii).

Not incidentally, the very first image in the book and the text that accompanies it, places emphasis on neglect and decay. The image depicts a rundown area of the sea front of ‘Larnaca Marina’. According to the accompanying caption, when he first encountered it from a distance, Larnaca charmed Thomson with its ‘peculiar Oriental beauty’ and its ‘brilliant domes and minarets’. On closer inspection, though, his perception was altered:

‘But the scene rapidly loses its proportions, and when we have once cast anchor off the Marina the town is disclosed in detail, deprived of the illusory charm of distance.

Rude jetties invade the sea, while the shore bristles with wooden piles, the wrecks of landing stages, or waterside cafes. Larnaca, indeed, looks as if it had been groping its way seawards, with a thousand antennae, in search of purer air or social reform. Nevertheless, its old-world aspect, its rich colours, its quaint architecture, and even its decay, all tend to render the place one of the most picturesque of Levantine ports.

Stone buildings and sculptured porches bear evidence of the wealth and prosperity which in some measure have outlived three centuries of Moslem rule’ (ibid., plate 1).
Decay and stagnation, then, are emphasised here. Larnaca is described as picturesque but still decayed and neglected by its Ottoman rulers. This emphasis on decay sets the scene that allows for a clearly political statement to follow, in the very last paragraph of the caption, which refers to a future revival that Larnaca in particular, and – by implication – Cyprus in general, will enjoy because of the British occupation:

‘During the brief interval which has elapsed since the British occupation much has already been done to improve the condition of the town, and the people, rejoicing in security, have taken heart, and prophesy that a fair city will soon rise over the debris of Citium’ (ibid., plate 1).

An argument repeated in the second image of the publication, which again depicts a section of the ‘Larnaca Marina’ and its caption reads:

‘There are now a number of hotels in the Marina, as well as Greek boarding establishments, where the traveller may be comfortably lodged at a small cost. When the island was transferred to British rule speculators flocked to Larnaca, and companies were started in London for the immediate development of Cyprus. The place was to be raised from the dust, and become an Eastern El Dorado’ (ibid., plate 2).

Such arguments appear elsewhere in the text. But what is more interesting is that an almost identical discourse is employed by Sir Garnet Wolseley himself. The Lord High Commissioner kept a journal about his appointment to Cyprus with entries covering the period between 19 July 1878 and 31 December of the same year. The original journal is kept at the Record Office at Kew and was published by the Cultural Centre of the Cyprus Popular Bank in 1991 (Cavendish, 1991).

In an entry on 24 July 1878 Wolseley describes his first impressions of Famagusta:

‘There is an air of decay about the place that tells one that it is an apanage of Turkey’s Sultan. Wherever one goes here is the same: the face of the island is stamped with relics of a past prosperity that has been destroyed by the Moslems. It is said that wherever the horse of the Turk treads nothing will ever grow afterwards, he can pull down and destroy but he is not only incapable of creating but he cannot even succeed in keeping alive the creations of others ... It is no wonder that the Christians should rejoice at our coming to relieve them from an oppression under which they have groaned so long’ (Cavendish, 1991, p. 10).

Both Thomson and Wolseley highlighted decay while making reference to the island’s more affluent past. At the same time, Ottoman maladministration of Cyprus is used by both observers as a justification of British rule on the promise that it will revive Cyprus and bring relief to the population.

What comes out of this is an interesting alignment of Thomson’s narrative with that of the representative of colonial rule in Cyprus. This adds further to the argument that Thomson’s visual and textual record of Cyprus should not be consumed as a mere documentation of nineteenth-century Cyprus but more as a cultural and political product of its time and context.
People as Types

Whereas with the examples provided above there is a need to scrutinise the text accompanying the photographs to understand Thomson’s perceptions of Cyprus, it is when he turns his lens on the people that his photography becomes more telling. In his book he includes eight individual portraits along with a dozen group portraits. In total, photographs of people make up about one-third of the images printed in his Cyprus publication.

Most of the individual portraits are half-length studies of Cypriots who appear to be photographed outdoors and set against plain walls. The need for sufficient light, given the poor light sensitivity of the plates used at the time, is probably the reason for such a choice of setting. Nevertheless, this removes the individuality of the subject as it becomes separated from a cultural context and looks like a mere specimen on display.

Another immediately evident commonality among Thomson’s Cypriot portraits is that his sitters tend (with rare exception) to look away from the camera. Their gaze is usually directed at a low point either left or right of the camera lens. It might be the case that Thomson, through instructing his sitters to look away, was attempting to make his apparently highly constructed portraits look more natural.

These postures are also revealing of the set of relations between photographer and subject. Thomson’s control over the direction of the gaze indicates that the photographer was in control of the photographic process and, by implication, was exercising power over the photographic subject. The subject would not look back at the lens which was scrutinising him/her and, therefore, was not an equal partner in this relationship. As a result, Thomson’s sitters would be transformed into objects to be observed and scrutinised and in Tagg’s terms were constituted as passive and were ‘feminised’.

It is useful, here to return to the photographic technology employed by Thomson. Gray, without making specific reference to Cyprus, explains that Thomson’s preferred method was the wet collodion, a process cumbersome in operation that required exposure times between 5 and 30 seconds and processing while in the field (Gray, 1997, pp. 167–175). Cowan states that in Cyprus Thomson used dry collodion emulsion, which was still cumbersome and slow (Cowan, 1985, pp. xv, xvii).

The above tells of a slow, staged and certainly not spontaneous photography. It is therefore very easy to imagine Thomson orchestrating each scene to its finest detail. His Cypriot subjects almost certainly had never faced a photographic camera before they were photographed by Thomson. No local vernacular or commercial photography had emerged as yet and only a handful of travelling photographers, focusing mostly on antiquities, had preceded Thomson. The Cypriots that posed for Thomson, then, had no previous experience or knowledge of how to be photographed and would have no other option than to rely on Thomson’s instructions on how to do it.

Hajimichael also makes a point of Thomson’s photographic process being slow and suggests that ‘most of his images and narratives were carefully created re-interpretations of life and history.
as he saw it, through a colonial eye, in Cyprus during autumn 1878’ (Hajimichael, 2006, p. 75).

Hajimichael takes the argument a step further as he suggests that people were used and re-used by Thomson as actors:

‘For instance, the young woman in a European dress, in plate 59, also appears in somewhat different “peasant” clothing in plate 9. The old woman featured in plate 9 also appears in plate 18, this time with an even younger woman by her side ... Conjecture can lead us to assume some people were in a sense “posing” for Thomson, in different forms of dress. Perhaps these people may have had a small financial incentive or payment from the photographer himself’ (Hajimichael, 2006, p. 75).

The titles and the accompanying text also provide an insight into the photographer’s perception of his sitters. The subjects are treated as representative of a particular social grouping: a ‘Cyprian maid’, a ‘priest’, a ‘Cypriote boy’, a ‘mountaineer’, a ‘beggar’, a ‘woman of the labouring class’, and so on. These title descriptions along with the absence of references to the names of the sitters are revealing of Thomson’s preoccupation with typicality. Individuality is ignored and in its place an emphasis is put on representativeness and collective characteristics.

This preoccupation with collective character is also characteristic of the text in Thomson’s rather long captions that accompany each of the photographs. For example the woman presented in plate 20 ‘is a typical woman of the lower orders in Cyprus’, the woman represented in plate 8 is ‘an ordinary type of the women of Cyprus’ and a man appearing in plate 10 is ‘a powerful and picturesque specimen of his race’. These descriptions, like the images themselves, emphasise physical characteristics, which appear to represent a kind of collective character.

The very use of the word specimen when referring to individual human beings reinforces the argument that Thomson is involved in an exercise of scrutiny of the colonised on behalf of the coloniser. And the references to social types can be seen to constitute an attempt to create a social map of Cyprus; an attempt to fragment and classify Cypriot society in a way that would provide knowledge and, in Taggs terms, possibilities of control useful to the Empire.

**Gender, Descent and Philhellenism**

Thomson’s descriptions of external features reveal differing concerns for each of the genders. Women are described in terms of beauty and men in terms of strength. Nevertheless, both are essentially linked to Classical or European descent and, by implication, civility. For instance ‘Cyprian maids’ are described in the text accompanying plate 8:

‘Their complexions are generally fair, though bronzed by exposure, their features regular, and the colour of their hair varies from light brown to black. Some of them, notably those living in the mountainous districts of the island, are not unworthy descendants of the Cypriote maids of classic fame. The native beauty of the race is, however, seen at its best in the children, for the women, before they have reached maturity, are sent out to work in the
fields, and are thus early trained to a life of toil. The result is that they lack much of that grace that comes of gentle nurture…” (Thomson, 1983, plate 8).

The image of an old female bread seller (plate 7) is similarly captioned:

‘In the features of this old dame, who earns her living by selling bread in Larnaca, there still linger traces of youthful comeliness. Her thin locks are silvered with age, and the years, as they dragged heavily along, have furrowed her brow. Yet her eye is clear and bright, and wears a look of calm contentment; it is the blue eye met among Cypriotes of European origin. She might, indeed, pass for an old Scotch crone, or the decent owner of an apple-stall at the corner of some London street’. (ibid., plate 7).

The Cyprian maid is, for Thomson, fair and beautiful by nature. Despite the fact that nurture obscures this beauty, Thomson is convinced that his contemporary Cypriot women are ‘worthy’ descendants of Classical Greeks. ‘Racial beauty’ works here as a link between nineteenth-century Cyprus and classical civilisation. Also, the features of the old bread seller, her blue eyes in particular, link ‘Cypriotes of European origin’ with northern Europeans. Therefore Thomson places Cypriots, or sections of Cypriot society within a European physiognomic realm.

As mentioned above: whereas women are described in terms of beauty, men are described in terms of physical strength. Consequently, body structure becomes central and essential in the descriptions of male sitters. The description of a photograph of two Cypriot peasants (plate 10), in which Thomson quotes from an earlier visitor of Cyprus, is a good and interesting example of this:

‘In the language of Lithgow, who visited Cyprus more than two hundred years ago, “The people are strong and nimble … civil, courteous, and affable, and notwithstanding of their delicious and delicate fare they are much subject to melancholy; of a robust nature, and good warriors if they might carry arms.” It is evident … that the modern Cypriote has inherited the attributes of his ancestors. He is strong and nimble, affable and courteous, and has a frame whose power and development would adorn the ranks of the finest regiment. The two men represented in this picture were selected at random from a throng of peasants, such as may be seen any day in the streets of Larnaca. The man on the right, standing erect in his native attire, was a powerful and picturesque specimen of his race. He was tall enough for a life-guardsman, and has the broad chest and muscular frame that belong mainly to the mountaineers of the interior. He was a native of an inland village, and had been down to Larnaca with produce. He had a fine, open, expressive countenance, and nothing would have afforded him greater pleasure than to have acted as the guide and protector of any stranger who desired to visit his country home’ (ibid., plate 10).

Plates 39 and 40 are half-length studies of two ‘Mountaineers’. The descriptions that accompany them are also good examples of the emphasis placed on body structure. Consider the following extracts:

‘The villagers are a robust race, as may be gathered from the two following photographs, the first of which represents one of the chief people of the place, a man who deserves to be
rendered famous for the kind manner in which he welcomes the stranger that may enter within his gates. As soon as he learned that I had determined to make the ascent of Mount Olympus (Troodos) he volunteered to act as a guide; nor did he show the slightest token of wavering, although, a storm was evidently brewing when we started' (ibid., plate 39).

And, also:

‘Another Highlander figures in this plate – a tall, bony man of a most obligingly good-natured disposition. He, however, looked a bold, determined character, whose massive hands and muscular frame would stand him in good stead in carrying out any resolve of good or evil’ (ibid., plate 40).

There is a common pattern in these three extracts. On the one hand, Cypriot men are described as strong, powerful, robust, courageous and potentially good warriors. They are capable of both good and evil. On the other it is stressed that they are of good nature, civil, courteous, hospitable and ready to protect strangers. Note that such characteristics of Cypriot men are, as in the case of women, attributed to ancestry.

I would argue that these observations seem to be closely linked with political concerns. This intense preoccupation with body structure reveals an anxiety about the potential threat that Cypriot male subjects were posing on the empire. Note that Cyprus had only very recently been acquired and its status as a colony was still unclear; as were the attitudes of the natives towards the new rulers. Despite this, the 'discovery' of a gentle and civil character came to provide reassurances that, at least, the Christian or Greek population could instead be classified as a potential ally.

But, I think more is revealed from the extracts presented above and I would like to return to Thomson's preoccupation with the ancestry of his Greek Cypriot subjects; the idea of Hellenic descent, interestingly, being a racial/genetic one here (i.e. observed and confirmed through female beauty and male body structure). Thomson appears to be ideologically in line with the nineteenth-century Philhellenic Movement, which occupied the radical wing of the Romantic Movement. Herzfeld notes that an idealised image of Greece was entertained by nineteenth-century European Philhellenes but points out that Europeans, 'though largely receptive to the attractions of Classical Greek culture, were not uniformly impressed by the modern Greeks' claim to represent it' (Herzfeld, 1986, p. 3). While many dedicated Europeans like Lord Byron would sacrifice their lives for the philhellenic cause, others, like Fallmerayer, dismissed the claim that their contemporary Greeks descended from the ancient Hellenes and rejected even the 'very notion of Greeks as Europeans' (Herzfeld, 1986, pp. 75–76).

Thomson, while fitting Cypriots in this wider nineteenth-century discussion about the origins of modern Greeks, was at the same time identifying himself with the philhellenic argument. He expressed his admiration for classical Greeks while at the same time he discovered them in the persons of his contemporary Greek Cypriots who after all were living in a land which enjoyed classical fame. It is already clear from this discussion that the Muslim or Turkish
population of Cyprus is excluded from this narrative. Further down, Cypriot Muslims are shown to have been treated quite differently.

**Backwardness**

Despite Thomson’s apparent Philhellenism and his sympathetic attitude towards Greek Cypriots, he did not fail, on several occasions, to express his cultural and class superiority and his perception that his contemporary Cypriots were inferior and primitive. Villagers depicted in plate 42 are described as ‘simple-minded peasants’ and are presented as incapable of adopting simple measures that would prevent the destruction of their crops by animals.

In another instance (plate 56) Cypriot villagers are described as superstitious folk whose beliefs have ‘endowed some of these [church] effigies with marvellous attributes – with the power of healing the sick, of casting out evil spirits from those possessed, and the like’.

Also, Cypriot villagers lived in houses that were deemed inappropriate for the standards of a European traveller (plate 34). Thomson acknowledged that ‘these rustic abodes charmed the eye with their picturesqueness’ but as he states they were ‘certainly not calculated to promote the health of their occupants’ as they ‘lacked ventilation and the simplest sanitary devices’.

A final example of Cypriots appearing as backward and superstitious is drawn from the caption alongside plate 20 which depicts a woman of the labouring class:

‘This is a typical woman of the lower orders in Cyprus; one who to a powerful physique, well-formed features, and dark eyes, adds an expression of unflinching resolution. It was some little time before she could be persuaded that neither sorcery nor witchcraft were practised in the mysterious operations of photography; but, at last, the desire to see her likeness overcame her scruples, and she faced the camera with statuesque immobility’ (Thomson, 1985, plate 20).

Furthermore, it appears that Thomson ignores the existence of Cypriot elites and focuses on the poor, on the peasants, beggars, water carriers and village priests. Katsiaounis makes reference to the presence of a Cypriot elite consisting of tax-farmers or ‘lay Kocabasis’ in nineteenth-century Ottoman Cyprus. These were wealthy men who received their privileges from the Pasha. According to Katsiaounis this ‘tax-farming bourgeoisie’ was made up exclusively of Greeks who were ‘allocated an increasingly important role in the administration of Greek communal affairs, such as taxation, health and education’ (Katsiaounis, 1996, p. 14). The following quote from Katsiaounis is telling of the outlook and lifestyle of this elite class:

‘In manner and outlook there was not much to distinguish the older Greek Kocabasis from the Turkish Agas. At the top of the commoners’ scale the Greek merchant magnates and tithe-farmers mixed with the Turkish aristocracy in salons and exclusive clubs, such as the luxurious Yeşil Cazino in Nicosia. The reminiscences of E. Paraskeva include a vivid
Neither the members of this elite, nor the clerical one, were represented in Thomson's 'social mapping' of Cyprus. Focusing on the 'lower' classes resulted in the construction of a narrative of a sympathetic, but culturally backward people that needed to be modernised, or saved; a narrative, which allowed plenty of room for justifying British presence on the island. The photographic portrayal of local elite would obscure such a narrative.

Ethnic Representations

As already hinted above Thomson appears to be pre-occupied photographically with the Christian population of the island and tends to ignore the Muslim population. This is made evident from the clothing of the sitters and Thomson's text which, as was shown above, makes reference to Cypriotes of European origin and links his photographic subjects with classical Hellenism.

Plate 16 includes a Muslim Cypriot who appears to have been photographed accidentally. The photograph depicts a 'Native Group' in Nicosia. The caption is quite revealing:

'A friendly-disposed crowd of spectators had gathered round the mosque to witness the process of photographing the exterior of the building, and while pious moslems held themselves aloof, a large number of native Greeks volunteered to sit for their portraits; those selected were deemed fair specimens of the inhabitants of Nicosia.

The turbaned Turk in the distance was introduced into the picture accidentally. He was leaving the mosque, and, as he halted for a second to view the proceedings, was unconsciously portrayed' (Thomson, 1985, plate 16).

Native Greeks volunteered to be photographed and were seen by Thomson to be friendly. On the other hand Turkish bystanders 'avoided' to be photographed and held themselves aloof. It could be the case that Muslims would have avoided the camera for religious reasons. But it could also be suggested that Thomson felt more comfortable with the Greek population of the island and demonstrated a preference to Greek Cypriots as photographic subjects.

Apart from referring to Thomson's philhellenism as a rather obvious possible explanation of this preference it could be argued here, that this is also likely to be related to political concerns and a difference in perception about which of the two major groups was potentially an ally or an adversary of the new ruler of Cyprus. The status of the island was still unclear. If anybody other than the British could claim sovereignty over the island it would have been the Ottomans. Also, the future of the Muslim population of the island was uncertain. This fluid set of relations between the current and the former rulers of the island might account for a lack of trust between the colonial traveller photographer and Turkish Cypriots.

Given another opportunity, elsewhere in his book, Thomson was even more explicit in his references to ethnic group loyalties to the new rulers. Villagers in one of his group portraits seemed,
according to Thomson, ‘ready to stand by their English masters’ and were presented to express concerns about the status of the island and the rumoured continued involvement of the Ottomans in the administration of Cypriot affairs.

These arguments were introduced into the text accompanying a photograph (plate 42), which depicts a group of villagers who ‘assembled one evening in front of the principal house there’ to discuss community matters. The image is organised in a way that creates the impression that the group was ‘captured’ while deliberations were going on and was oblivious of the presence of the photographer; an impossible task considering the long exposure times that Thomson’s photography required. Long exposure times, as already explained earlier, required sitters to keep still for a considerable period of time and a photograph in which more than a dozen villagers appear ‘frozen’ would call for a high degree of involvement and orchestration by the photographer. That said, Thomson reports on the deliberations from the point of view of a non-interfering observer. The discussion, according to Thomson, shifted from mundane community matters to the general politics of Cyprus:

‘The villagers spoke hopefully of the new order of things, and to a man seemed ready to stand by their English masters, although in truth they knew little about them, and disquieting rumours were abroad that the Moslems were still in some way mixed up with the administration of affairs’ (Thomson, 1985, plate 42).

The extract is revealing of Thomson’s understanding of the potential alliances between each of the two main communities and their new English masters. Katsiaounis refers to the set of relations, during that early period of British rule, between the Greek elites and the British, on one hand, and between the Turkish elites and the British, on the other; sets of relations that could account for perceptions such as those expressed by Thomson:

‘For a while the factions of the Greek establishment joined ranks, and demonstrated their loyalty to the new power in the land. They were keen to exploit the opportunity and expand their influence in the face of the Turks, who were now fighting a rear guard action in defence of what rights they could preserve from the old Ottoman order’ (Katsiaounis, 1996, p. 78).

Whether or not such loyalty was also demonstrated by the Greek peasants or the city poor is unclear and rather unlikely. However, this demonstration of loyalty by the Greek establishment seems to have given enough reasons for the colonial government and for Thomson to classify Greeks, in general, as allies. So this discrepancy in representation between Greeks and Turks might be explained in terms of the establishment of trustworthy relationships with those considered to be potential allies in contrary to those seen as potential adversaries of the British Empire during these early stages of colonial rule.
I hope it has been established by now that Thomson's rather positive attitude towards Greek Cypriots has both political and ideological roots. As shown earlier, through observations made about external features and female beauty Thomson links the Greek population of the island with classical Greece and western civilisation. It is clearly stated, therefore, that they genetically and culturally belong to the sphere of the occident rather than that of the orient.

Thomson makes such links when describing the landscape of the island as well. This is a landscape that would strike a Northern European visitor as characteristically Middle Eastern and 'oriental'. In spite of that, Thomson identifies, photographs, and highlights European features of the Cypriot landscape emphasising the historical links of the island with classical Greece and Europe. At the same time he sets these descriptions of architectural features of the island's past against descriptions of the Cypriot architectural landscape of his time in a way that reads like a constant juxtaposition of a glorious European past and a dilapidated Oriental present.

For instance:

'The streets of Larnaca are narrow, and, as a rule, devoid of pavement, recalling in their general aspect the older quarters of Alexandria, or Cairo. The houses, however, are more European in style than those of Egypt, a peculiarity which they possibly owe to the period of the Lusignan kings of Cyprus' (Thomson, 1985, plate 5).

Plate 12 depicts Nicosia from the city wall; a point of view that Thomson considers advantageous. Palm trees and minarets mark the landscape:

'Nicosia may be seen to greatest advantage from the summit of its wall. In the distance rises a forest of tapering minarets, that contrast well with graceful palms, and with the undulating lines of foliage that mark the sites of the gardens of the metropolis' (ibid., plate 12).

Such a description is worthy of a cityscape that would appear generally ‘Oriental’ (note the emphasis on the ‘forest’ of minarets and the palm trees). Thomson, though, turned his attention to two buildings of religious, cultural and historical significance that at the same time allowed him to highlight the island's links to Europe. The first is the Cathedral of St. Sophia (plate 14) about which Thomson writes:

'The Cathedral of St. Sophia, now used as a mosque, is a noble edifice, which carries one back to the period of the Lusignan princes, whose mutilated monuments may be seen within its walls ... It is fortunate that Moslem economy, or, perhaps, a lack of fanatical zeal, has preserved to us so much of this fine specimen of early Gothic architecture' (ibid., plate 14).

The second building is the church of St. Nicholas (plate 15), which Thomson compares with the ‘ramshackle architecture of the capital’.
‘What could be more striking than the contrast of the two such styles as have been presented face to face in this picture? The one Gothic, the other Turk mudine if we may so denominate it!’ (ibid., plate 15).

Descriptions of other Cypriot towns do not escape the pattern. Kerynia for instance is described (plate 23) as ‘little beyond a village’ but, nevertheless, its classical Greek origins are highlighted:

‘The importance attached to the town in olden times is seen in the massive fortifications that guard the entrance to the port. It is supposed to have been founded originally by Doric colonists under Praxander and Cepheus and, even at a late period in its history, it was jealously guarded and kept open for the reception of food supplies from the mainland to support the garrisons in the mountain forts of St. Hilarion, Buffavento, and Cantara’ (ibid., plate 23).

Despite this glorious past Kerynia appears to Thomson’s eyes as Oriental and primitive (plate 24):

‘The houses in this part of the town are built of stone and roofed in with clay, and where they fringe the port their sanitary arrangements are of that simple order which prevails everywhere among Oriental and primitive communities’ (ibid., plate 24).

And on arrival to Famagusta Thomson observes:

‘Famagosta [Famagusta] lies in the bight of a great bay, on the south-east of the island, and not far from the ruins of ancient Salamis, a place which, according to Censola, was used by the Christians as a quarry when they built Famagosta, about eight hundred years ago. But Famagosta boasts a history much more ancient even than this: for it stands on the site of Arsinoc, and was renamed by Augustus Fama Augusti (Ammochostos). The city was overthrown by the Turks in 1571, and was so left by the invaders that its siege appears to have been an event of yesterday. It is a place of ruins, a city of the dead, in which the traveller is surprised to encounter a living tenant. It, however, affords shelter to some six hundred Turks, whose wretched abodes are found scattered among the ruins of old Gothic churches and chapels’ (ibid., plate 49).

Thomson was, evidently, influenced by nineteenth-century Orientalist discourse; a discourse which he employs in his text. But, it appears that Thomson was facing some difficulty in placing Cyprus in either the sphere of the ‘Orient’ or that of the ‘Occident’. Cyprus, because of its geographical position and its recent history, could be placed in the sphere of the ‘Orient’. Yet, at the same time the island’s Classical fame and its Greek-speaking Christian population deemed such an exercise complex and problematic. Thomson discovered a Cyprus, which would simultaneously stimulate the Orientalist and the Philhellenist. As a consequence Thomson’s text reads like a constant juxtaposition of everything western to everything eastern; everything Occidental to everything Oriental; everything Greek to everything Ottoman. And the current post-Ottoman state of the island would be judged against a more glorious Greek or European past.
This juxtaposition between classical Greece and the ‘Orient’ is not unusual in Orientalist discourses. Said, in *Orientalism*, presented several examples derived from western literature where the inferiority of Islam, and what was seen as the Orient in general, was demonstrated through comparisons to an ideal classical Greek standard. Consider Said’s reference to Carl Becker as one example:

‘Islam, for example, was typically Oriental for Orientalists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Carl Becker argued that although “Islam” (note the vast generality) inherited the Hellenic tradition, it could neither grasp nor employ the Greek, humanistic tradition; moreover, to understand Islam one needed above all else to see it, not as an “original” religion, but as a sort of failed Oriental attempt to employ Greek philosophy without the creative inspiration that we find in Renaissance Europe’ (Said, 2003, pp. 103–104).

Said, later in his book, draws parallels between Becker and another late nineteenth-century Orientalist, Theodor Noldeke:

‘Thus Noldeke could declare in 1887 that the sum total of his work as an Orientalist was to confirm his “low opinion” of the Eastern peoples. And like Carl Becker, Noldeke was a philhellenist, who showed his love of Greece curiously by displaying a positive dislike of the Orient, which after all was what he studied as a scholar’ (Said, 2003, p. 209).

Such juxtapositions between the Orient and classical Greece are not a phenomenon that characterises nineteenth-century Orientalist thinking only, but persist well into the twentieth century. Said, quotes from another scholar, Gibb, who at around the middle of the twentieth century stated that ‘Oriental philosophy had never appreciated the fundamental idea of justice in Greek philosophy’ (Said, 2003, p. 281).

**Conclusions**

Thomson’s Cyprus expedition is a key moment in the history of representing Cyprus. Both the historical moment and the medium of representation rendered Thomson’s project a very popular source of imagery of late nineteenth-century and early colonial period Cyprus. This paper highlighted the disconnectedness between the mostly uncritical contemporary consumption of Thomson’s images and historical realities.

It has shown that Thomson’s photographs are much more than documents of a Cypriot past, but that they are, in fact, the product of complex political, ideological and cultural concerns of his time and that the context within which he operated, notably colonialism, was instrumental in shaping the vision of Cyprus that his photographs construct.

Both his text and imagery emphasised decay and Thomson employed a narrative of salvaging: the new British rulers would bring about positive change and prosperity. When dealing with people Thomson emphasised physical characteristics over culture and typicality and collective
character over individuality. His portraits, given the long exposure times needed at the time, were highly orchestrated interpretations of everyday life and settings.

Furthermore, and almost inevitably, Thomson engaged in a discussion about the cultural orientation of the place and its people. Cyprus, though, proved to be a non-straightforward case. It was a geographical, historical and cultural territory that would ‘resist’ a straightforward categorisation and placement within either cultural sphere. Thomson apprehended a land which in his Western eyes fulfilled the criteria for being classified as Oriental, but even so it was full of the scattered remnants of European heritage. It was a society in transition, leaving behind its Ottoman past and already experiencing emerging Greek nationalism and a process of Hellenisation. Its population mix of Christians and Muslims, or Greeks and Turks, further enhanced the complexity of attempting to define Cyprus and Cypriotness through a clear-cut classification system.

Cyprus, and by extension Cypriot identity, was already caught in an endless negotiation and renegotiation of its character and definition that other observers have very effectively described (see Papadakis, 2006 and Karayianni, 2006). This contest involved overwhelming external influences such as colonialism and Greek and (later) Turkish nationalisms, and a variety of internal forces and trends including the emergence of a local modernity that would later add yet another bipolar axis of defining a culture; that of modernity as opposed to tradition.

It seems that Cyprus was a uniquely grey area, unwillingly so at the time. It was a place and culture that would not fit into a cultural grid that opposed two distinct cultural spheres in a clear-cut way. This ‘dual character’ of Cyprus would deem the employment of such constructs, as binary oppositions, in the process of describing a cultural realm ineffective. Thomson’s narrative is full of comparisons between his contemporary post-Ottoman Cyprus with a past classical and European one. He appears to have found it challenging to culturally classify the island and this explains his ambiguous gaze, which casts Cyprus as a cultural hybrid; what another traveller photographer, Williams of the National Geographic magazine, would term ‘half-oriental’ about forty years later.
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Refugees and Citizens: The Armenians of Cyprus
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Abstract
This article explores themes raised by Peter Loizos in his work with refugees post-1974 in Cyprus. Using examples from the experiences of Cypriot Armenians over the twentieth century, comparisons and connections are made with these themes, particularly regarding the reconstruction of narratives of meaning and belonging following disruption. Armenians have dwelt at length on the defining transformation of the 1915 Genocide but many other kinds of disruptive changes preceded and followed this most radical one, continuing into the present. Physical and economic instability of host countries, including Cyprus, has precipitated continued displacement and migration for many Armenians. This continually creates a kind of demotic cosmopolitanism that is an openness to the world based upon a diasporic people’s juggling of identities, seeking a rootedness in a particular place alongside connections across time and space.
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Peter Loizos devoted much of his academic career to an engaged consideration of the plight of refugees, in Cyprus and around the world. To Loizos, a refugee was much more than the sum of his or her troubles and his work reveals the complexity of life after the trauma of displacement as well as the many ways in which individuals absorb and transform the difficulties and opportunities faced. Through heart-rending experiences, a person not only survives but rebuilds and reconnects in varied ways.

Narratives of memory and identity inform the present, particularly in disruptive contexts of forced migration, of exiles and refugees. These narratives are themselves multi-layered and often ambiguous, nesting within each other and allowing for varied interpretations on individual and collective levels. In Appendix 2 of The Heart Grown Bitter Loizos examines ‘Comparisons’, looking at how such narratives are disturbed, reworked and woven back into the lives of refugees. These comparisons will be continued with examples of Armenian refugees in Cyprus in the early 1920s, post-genocide, and in 1963–1974. While the excerpts of micro-histories here are not meant to be representative of all members of the Armenian community of Cyprus, itself diverse from an insider’s perspective, they serve to demonstrate and extend the points made by Loizos.1

1 The excerpts following are taken in part from my earlier fieldwork in the 1980s as well as interviews and
The ways in which narrative associations can change and transgress boundaries over time are explored here, tracing connections to earlier periods and other places, including the influences of neighbours and of old and new colonisers. Formal institutions often demonstrate a more directed and directive narrative and identity, strategic forgetting and tactical remembering, while households more generally reveal the processual nature of culture and the lack of discrete boundaries around any one group. The stories that follow here demonstrate the continual process of moving – across borders, over time, through ideas and ideals – as Armenians have made their homes in Cyprus.

The Absence of Peace: The Presence of Wars and Other Disruptions

What is the ‘natural’ state of human life? As Loizos points out, there is a desire to see stasis as normal and yet since Robert Nisbet, Eric Wolf and others in the late 1960s, an increasing number of social scientists have taken change and disturbance as norm. While Armenians have dwelt at length on the defining change of the Genocide (primarily 1915), it is impossible to ignore the many other kinds of changes that preceded and followed this most radical one, continuing into the present. Being a survivor, a refugee, a sojourner, displaced person – all these are common identities for many Armenians at one point in their lives, continuing today with Armenians from Armenia working for years in foreign lands, including Turkey.

When Astrid and Gaspar Aghajanian married in the 1940s, she was a teacher and he had become the first Armenian judge under the British Mandate in Palestine. Gaspar’s family had been living in Jerusalem for centuries and were part of the kaghakatsi (people of the city) community there – in contrast to the relative newcomers, the refugees from World War I and earlier conflicts. Born in Albestan, Astrid was a child survivor of the Genocide, as her mother hid herself with Astrid under a pile of dead bodies until they could escape by night to a Bedouin camp.

Both Astrid and Gaspar took advantage of the changing educational opportunities available to peoples of the Middle East, some provided by colonial governments or by missionaries, others by local institutions emulating the new patterns. As soon as their two daughters were born, other
changes emerged with the birth of the state of Israel. Gaspar lost his job and connections. Unprotected and vulnerable in their own land, they began a migration to Britain where they hoped Gaspar could pursue his law career. However, stopping en route in Cyprus, health problems intervened and they settled in Kyrenia where Gaspar found a job through his multilingual abilities. Insecurity followed them through the 1950s and the armed struggles in Cyprus for Enosis but they raised their daughters there and built a home that housed Gaspar’s prized possession, his library.

In 1974 they were forced from that home, leaving with only a small suitcase, expecting to return within a day or so. The library and all other possessions were lost when the family was not allowed to return. Astrid and Gaspar went to England to join their daughters and once more started with nothing, creating a home, working when and as possible. The man who had once been at the top of the law profession was reduced to writing letters pleading for justice for his own lost property. He began to buy books again. She began to grow food for their table.

The disruptions that Astrid and Gaspar experienced over their lifetimes were shared around the Armenian communities of the Middle East. Armenians who came to Cyprus in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, sought stability from pogroms in their homelands. These people were temporary refugees and most did return home, only to be later killed or forced to resettle elsewhere. The ‘norm’ for Armenians has been far from stable and this has continued into the twenty-first century where wars in Iraq and Syria, for example, have unhinged the safety of all minorities in the region. Armenians are again considering their options, if they are afforded the time, or fleeing to the homes of family abroad.

At present, displaced Armenians have another option, that of migration to the Republic of Armenia. Only twenty years old, this new homeland has attracted a number of Armenians fleeing disaster in their home countries. While it was not the geographic homeland of their own ancestors, it has become today the symbolic homeland of Armenians around the world, even as its own native Armenians migrate or live elsewhere as sojourners for economic reasons. Parallel narratives of homeland develop. For most of the twentieth century, the home in the old country was a tangible loss, a powerful image that one could still smell and taste. This now contrasts with the emerging story of a new, independent state of Armenia capable of receiving refugees itself, one which is becoming a homeland for all Armenians, whether originally from that territory or not.4 While the old country was spoken of as close to Paradise, the symbolic value of ‘homeland’ now is centred more on normalcy, protection, security and continuity. It is expected to protect language and history and provide a space for someone to continue to be Armenian. Cyprus too was regarded as a safe haven at one time but then itself became a cauldron of civil war and disruption.

4 Sossie Kasbarian discusses criticism of a diaspora institution as it ‘brackets’ the diaspora and ‘fortifies’ Armenia (2009b, p. 87). See Pattie (2004) for examples of changing attitudes within the diaspora towards the Republic of Armenia, beginning with the mid-century ‘repatriations’.
As Loizos points out, the international political context is clearly necessary to understanding the displacement and tragedies of local people and the lives of the refugees themselves make this impossible to ignore. For the Aghajanians and many other Armenians, international disputes and their local fallout, disruption and being displaced was their ‘normal’ over their lifetimes, though they never accepted it as such. In spite of this, Astrid was encouraged by a film they had seen where an Armenian couple had lost everything but an apple seed that they kept and planted when they began again.

Relative Deprivation: Material and Symbolic as well as Physical

While the loss of the Aghajanians’ homes was a great financial loss, they more often spoke of the loss of the library and of the garden they had carefully tended. These were the symbolic heart of the home and the notion of either of them being trampled, torn, perhaps burnt was unbearable. The Armenian neighbourhood along with the schools, church and businesses were lost in 1963 when Nicosia itself was divided. Neither at that time nor in 1974 were Armenians targeted as a group in danger of losing their lives. To this degree, the deprivation of those years is relatively less than that of their Greek and Turkish Cypriot neighbours. However, as Loizos points out for the Argaki villagers, the loss of certain personal objects as well as communal landmarks creates a perpetual black hole in the middle of the process of rebuilding. Some places and objects carry more meaning than others for individuals and for groups.

Sossi Bedikian, former teacher and headmistress at the Melkonian Education Institute, wrote a regular column in the Armenian language Paros newspaper about events and people from the past. In March 1999 she described the old church on Victoria Street and the customs of the holy days during the 1940s. Concentrating on Easter week, her rich description indicates how these customs would have stimulated a combination of the senses and, most importantly, have included the performance of ritual, beginning with the special preparation of Lenten and Easter foods and the preparation of palm branches at home. The incense and candles of the ‘Night of Tears’ on Maundy Thursday lasted until late at night and should have been attended having fasted. The floral decoration of Jesus’ tomb, eating lentils with vinegar on Good Friday, playing a game with painted eggs and other activities all were part of the common domain – that is, everyone participated. By 1999 she concluded that what used to bind Armenian Cypriots together is part of the past, as one consequence of the Turkish invasion. Although a number of rituals and customs

---

5 The Aghajanians, like other Armenian families, also said they were bereft at losing their photographs. Yiannis Papadakis mentions photographs as significant and symbolic losses among Cypriot Greeks and Turks (e.g. 2005, p. 100).

6 Surp Astvadztsadzin was built in Venetian times and given to the Armenians in Cyprus by the Ottoman government in the sixteenth century. Following the loss of that church, Armenians held their services in a Greek church until the new church on Armenia Street was built. It is called by the same name.

7 Easter rituals and customs around the Armenian world have diminished, both in number and in the people in any
of Easter week continue to the present, her point is that the post-1963 dispersion both within Nicosia and away from Cyprus meant that the Armenian community was never again as wholly and tightly bound together in participation as one body. The common space that had delineated and promoted this was gone.

The schools and church were indeed rebuilt after some time but the buildings left behind were not only well-loved, they were the centrepieces of the community, places where people gathered on a daily and weekly basis, informally as well as for ritual life-cycle events. The space itself represented a physical presence and social interaction, the glue of the community. When the Troubles began in Nicosia, the shared courtyard between church and schools was where people gathered, then staying in the buildings to wait until they were persuaded to go to the southern side of the new demarcation. Elsie Utidjian’s family was one of the deghatsi, the ‘native’ Armenian families who could trace their roots in Cyprus back several centuries. Their home, like those of many Armenians, was just up the street from the church. She had recently graduated from the English School and was working as a secretary at the British Council. During the crisis she was asked to take charge of the phone in the church office, passing messages from people in the crowded courtyard to those now on the ‘Greek side’ of Nicosia, helping to coordinate the movement of a whole community.

Elsie remembers that her phone messages were not only between Armenians but, due to her own connections through several years of British Council work; her calls were also with officials on both the Turkish and Greek sides. She was in touch with the office of Vice President Kuçuk for information about when it was safe to allow people to go through the surrounding streets to visit relatives or pick up something from their home. Kuçuk’s office would also call her to warn them when no one should leave the compound or enter from outside. Some Armenians living farther away from the centre were able to stay in their homes during that initial period. As Loizos notes, in such a crisis, it is the elderly who are often most reluctant to leave, though they may be seen as the most vulnerable. In this case too, a number of older people tried to stay on much longer than the others, until finally persuaded by family members that they must join them. Elsie had to relay messages between the families and their elder relatives, remaining in their own homes.

Elsie’s own home, along with others around the church and school, was caught in the cross-fire between Greek and Turkish Cypriots and thus unsafe. After December nights in a bare classroom without heat, Elsie decided to go to her home and take some blankets. She used the back door, thinking that if people saw her taking things away, they would assume that they were giving up and moving. As she did this, she also began taking their photo albums out – one each day – leaving them with an Armenian neighbour who had remained, her own home being a short distance up the street that ran by their back door. Later Elsie wondered, as she still does today, why...
she felt that these photos were the most important things to save — there were many other possibilities. But she methodically delivered them and some months later, when the neighbour was also moved to the southern neighbourhoods of Nicosia where Elsie and other Armenians had settled, the photographs were reunited with their thrilled owners. It turned out to be the only thing that remained from their past life as their house was stripped of everything, soon after they left it. ‘Not even a wastebasket remained’ they discovered when they returned to take things, accompanied by British soldiers. The photographs then took on added importance. So many people had lost this precious piece of personal history. While it did not put bread on the table, the photographs were irreplaceable and a tangible link with what had been lost.

Refugees as Bereaved Persons

In his consideration of grief and the refugee’s state of mind, Loizos perceives the ways in which the reaction to wrenching loss of home and land is often similar to losing a loved one. Of course for many Cypriots in 1963 and 1974 both loved ones and homes were lost. But Loizos here focuses on the ‘situations of disruptive change’ (1981, p. 196). Using the work of Peter Marris, he looks at the aftermath of the destruction of attachments, ‘whether to persons or patterns of meaning’ (ibid., p. 197) and highlights the link between what appears to be a ‘conservative’ effort to preserve what has been lost and a contrasting pressure to adapt to the new circumstances.

While there are cultural traditions everywhere to attend to the grief brought on by loss of life, coping with the loss of traditions themselves, land and home is far less structured. Often it is complicated by political forces wishing to forge their ambitions on the sorrow. Many individuals tend to their wounds privately, though some also turn to more public fora to work through their own grief. One such person in the Armenian community was musician Vahan Bedelian who settled in Cyprus in 1921. Bringing with him the same violin that had saved his and his family’s life during the genocide years, Bedelian’s goal was to induct as many people of all ages as possible into various musical groups. Conductor, violinist, and teacher, he began a mixed-age choral group in 1922, less than a year after their arrival as refugees. The chorus and a band played every Sunday in the church courtyard — a ‘fanfare’. I heard this from many sources but for Armenians today, this is a small shock. People who had witnessed and survived the genocide were singing, playing.

---

8 Yiannis Papadakis writes of the power of lost photographs — for the owners and for those who come across them in the newly vacated homes. Asking how long it must take to make someone else’s home your own, he points to the discovery of photo albums and the lives they represent as one of the triggers of unease in this transition (2005, p. 99).

9 Vahan Bedelian and family were able to flee Adana ahead of the deportations and found space in Aleppo to house the family, some of them remaining in hiding throughout their stay. Bedelian supported the family by teaching the violin and playing occasional concerts. They returned to Adana around 1918–1919 and remained there until the end of the French Mandate, leaving with a number of other families who also settled in Cyprus.
instruments, making music together only a few years later, in a new country, with very little remaining of their old possessions, status and presumably, psyches intact. It was Peter Loizos who pointed out to me what then became obvious – Bedelian was creating community amongst and between a broken people. This joining together to create something external to themselves, something that could not be created alone grew quickly and became a standard part of daily life in Nicosia. The creation of the music, the re-claiming of old skills, the remembering of old tunes and composition of new ones must have at least been therapeutic and probably, in a physical sense, integral to strengthening people and building relationships.

Like the football team, Gaydzak, active around 1930, the choir, band and orchestra provided an opportunity for the refugees to gather, to engage in physical activity (whether sport or music) and produce something that gave pleasure to themselves and others. The wisdom of getting weary bodies and minds moving may have prodded Bedelian and others, but no one mentioned this. It was the love of the sport or the love of music that was ever present in the narrative.

The choir, band and orchestra performed regularly in the courtyard of the church and in the club across from it, the central civic space mentioned above. Performing both Armenian and classical European music, these groups did not reproduce what the refugees had left behind, although many had had some western musical training, like Bedelian. Nor were these ensembles a continuation or integration of the refugees into an ongoing musical tradition among the deghatsi Armenians. Indeed the groups made possible a quicker integration of newcomers with the older community as both groups took part, though the refugees far outnumbered the others. Community had been lost in the homelands through the genocide and had been disrupted in Cyprus with the arrival of constant and overwhelming numbers of newcomers – unknown, poor (in outward appearance), unconnected.

The crucial aspect of Bedelian’s work was to create a new set of meaningful relationships through the music-making – something which was made possible through a focus not on the people themselves, their similarities or differences in past or present, but rather on a shared desire to create something meaningful (and indeed beautiful) together. While the singing and playing of music should not be seen as a substitute for grieving, it did provide some of the comfort and attend to the need for companionship and sharing of experience that was otherwise missing.

Loizos points to the spontaneous weeping, the recitations of things lost (1981, p. 198), the deep anxieties that accompany change, particularly when it is violent and disruptive with no clear acknowledgement of its finality. Marris observes that the process of grieving can really only take place when the loss is acknowledged as final, and then both the mourning and the eventual rebuilding begins as people begin to seek the restoration of meaning in their personal lives. For at

---

10 Bedelian was also the choirmaster of the church, taught at the Melkonian Educational Institute, the Turkish Lycee, the Cyprus School of Music and the National Odeon, as well as instructing hundreds of private pupils from each ethnic community.
least a generation, Armenians hoped for a return to their lands, believing that justice must win out somehow. By 1963 and certainly 1974, they were assuring their Greek neighbours that they must accept the loss rather than waste time hoping for what would, in their experience, never happen. However, this ‘wisdom’ took many years to accumulate. Bedelian adopted his new land with appreciation for the security it offered him to pursue what he saw as his mission in life – spreading the love of music, for him, the ‘international language’.

**New Identifications**

This growing identification with Cyprus as home (contrasting and in parallel with ‘homeland’), took root at different rates among the refugees. The degharsi saw themselves as Cypriots of long-standing, perhaps thinking in terms of family/kin, class, education, church as dominant aspects of who they were. The Eramian family provide an example of the ability to blend village life (in Deftera) with the urban multicultural life of Nicosia, being at home in both places: Speaking Greek and Turkish, as well as Armenian, English and French and with many family and business links outside of Cyprus marked them as different but no less Cypriot – or Armenian.

The refugees though of themselves as associated with particular towns, such as Adana, Zelifke, Mersin, Gessaria, Marash – as well as family, church and for many, craft or training. Still, as the world around them changed, so too did ideas about what it meant to be Armenian – and indeed, what it meant to be a subject of Britain and then a Cypriot. As Loizos witnessed for the refugees of Argaki, while the original space is not forgotten, local identities change quickly with dislocation, neighbourhood and even village becoming part of a regional identity. In the case of the Armenians in Cyprus, the refugees’ arrival in the early twentieth century was part of an international rather than local disaster and its aftermath included intellectuals, priests and political leaders working to construct a single identity for a dispersed people. Armenian Cypriots learned this new identity through their schools, church, poetry, media and other informal means. While they remained most comfortable with people originally from their old towns, people who knew them as they had been pre-genocide, pre-catastrophe, they also learned consciously to identify with other Armenians less obviously connected to their particular past.

And with time the newcomers also became Cypriots. Refugees who remained in Cyprus came to love the island. Some of these, like Bedelian above, did so more quickly than others, investing themselves wholly in the new circumstances. After some years when Armenians began to have spare time and money, they ventured to the Troodos Mountains in summer and to Surp Magar Monastery in the Kyrenia Range for special occasions and picnics. One man, another refugee, went well beyond this pattern as he explored every inch of the country, doing detailed

---

11 Migliorino (2008) provides an international context for this transformation while comparing local transitions in Syria and Lebanon post-World War I. Pattie (2012) discusses the multiple ways in which these directives, created by an international consensus, were performed and embodied locally.
research into his new home. Kevork Keshishian became fascinated by Cyprus itself, the land and its history, the peoples and the physical environment. While others made themselves comfortable but kept their eyes on a distant horizon, Keshishian made an early commitment to Cyprus, inspired initially by the decision of William Wier, headmaster of the American Academy in Larnaca, to let the young Keshishian off from school to accompany visitors around the archaeological and historical sites of Salamis, Famagusta, Nicosia, Larnaca areas. After graduation, and financially unable to leave for further education, Keshishian rode his bicycle around the island, sleeping in dry riverbeds and monasteries, while gathering the information that would lay the foundation for his life’s work, the writing and rewriting of many editions of Romantic Cyprus, a detailed guidebook to the island.

While others had written about Cyprus from different angles: illustrated anecdotes, chronologies or travel writing, Keshishian’s book was the first guide in the western tradition of Baedekers or Michelin. Taking note of the trend towards mixing historical interest with cultural, Keshishian took care to describe what he observed of the peoples of the island as well as popular tourist sites and many lesser-known places. Keshishian was also a man proud of his Armenian heritage, his family’s town of origin (Sis) and all things Armenian. This combination of the local, the parochial along with the ability to fit into new situations and be agile enough to assimilate innovative ideas, technologies and information is common among Armenian refugees and migrants, continuing today. Ruth Mandel writes about the demotic cosmopolitanism of Turks and Kurds in Germany, contrasting with the elite model of a cosmopolitan – a lifestyle choice of the ‘bourgeois urban sojourner’. In the latter model, a certain aesthetic preference is expected, as is a network or multiple networks of people who are able to travel at will and (often) consume similar high-end goods. The cosmopolitanism of refugees and immigrants is different, but no less effective in terms of what Mandel calls the acquiring of ‘multiple cultural competencies’ (2008, p. 50).

The Cosmopolitan Refugee

The Cypriot Armenian community practices a variation of this cosmopolitanism, neither elitist nor, as in the case of Mandel’s example, ‘implicitly disvalued’. Rather the cosmopolitanism of the Armenian minority in Cyprus, both historic and contemporary, refugees and deghatsi, is an openness to the world that comes from a diasporic people’s juggling of identities, seeking a rootedness in a place alongside connections across time and space. Despite this, as noted in Mandel’s work, cosmopolitanism comes with its own anxieties, often distrusted as not fully local or genuine. Indeed Armenians in Cyprus sometimes wonder how the majority truly views them and occasional glimpses of this erupt in times of crisis.\(^\text{12}\) As Kasbarian observes and as I discovered

---

\(^\text{12}\) Kasbarian alludes to such a moment when a Cypriot Greek man’s letter (from London) accused 100% of the Armenians as voting against the Annan Plan, igniting numerous protests from Cypriot Armenians and concern that this letter represented a broader band of opinion against them as a minority (2009, pp. 179–180).
in earlier generations, the Armenian minority shares an intimate and complicated past with the Cypriot Turkish population. The more recent (now over a generation) merging with the Cypriot Greek population has taken different paths. By 1974, a large portion of Cypriot Armenians had already been refugees for eleven years, finding their own way through their losses and rebuilding. The discovery and inclusion of these fellow refugees by the Cypriot Greeks came late but is much appreciated. Previously, Armenians and Turks had been co-minorities under the British and then alongside the Greek majority post-independence. In a divided Cyprus, Armenians came to realise their marginalisation as a small minority where their multilingual skills were not nearly as important as speaking educated Greek (which most lacked) and personal connections with Cypriot Greeks.

Several factors complicated this change. Armenians had been a successful minority under the British Empire during a period when the global financial market allowed a relatively small business to prosper beyond its national borders and the ability to speak English (and often French) were useful in obtaining government work. Mandel’s demotic cosmopolitanism worked well in these circumstances as many Armenians were self-employed or running a business or workshop which employed others of different ethnic groups. Acquiring and passing on new skills and technologies, knowing enough of a variety of languages to converse easily, maintaining networks of family, compatriots and colleagues around the world to gather current ideas and information, all this brought advantages for a sustained period, even after the disruptions of 1963. Nevertheless, what had worked well in a smaller-scale marketplace and with a variety of neighbours and ruling classes became increasingly marginal and outdated. These changes were underway but increased in speed and scale with the radical displacement from the old neighbourhood, church and schools. A new generation became more fluent and better educated in Greek. Turkish continued to be spoken in private, often passed on to the next generation through favourite television programmes. Armenians continued to feel both Cypriot and Armenian but many noted that the flags flowing around them were mostly not Cypriot but Greek mainland flags and wondered whether the majority definition of ‘Cypriot’ included them as well.

For Cypriot Armenians, Cyprus is home. It is also their state and primary civic attachment. Another land may be a historic homeland – western Armenia – or a current idealised homeland (the Republic of Armenia). However, the ‘place’ that acts as a foundation of meaning, a homeland, can be as small as a school, rather than a country. Kasbarian writes that the Melkonian Educational Institute in Nicosia acted both as exemplar and endorser of ‘cosmopolitan values’ (2009b, p. 89) and as another kind of ‘homeland’ with its own diaspora of students who have a

---

13 Leading up to the independence of Cyprus, the smaller minorities (Armenian, Maronite, Latin) were given the opportunity to choose whether to be part of the Greek or Turkish division of government, both framed as religious groups. When during earlier fieldwork I asked how this decision had been made, I was faced with incredulous reactions – how would Christians choose other than to be part of another Christian group?
primary identification with the school. Throughout its many decades, the Melkonian was home to boarders from around the world, particularly the Middle East, many of them refugees from civil unrest, war or economic deprivation. During the 1990s the student body included a minority of Cypriot-born Armenians, along with those from Greece, Bulgaria, Russia, Lebanon, Syria, Iran, Canada and the USA. This enclave within the Cypriot Armenian community served as a constant reminder of the bonds of diaspora and of their own refugee past.

**Integrations and Transformations**

Loizos ends *The Heart Grown Bitter* with the experiences of two men. One settled in Cyprus, having left Asia Minor in 1922, just as the main group of Cypriot Armenians had done. Fifty years later he still dreamed of his natal village and kept in touch with others displaced and living elsewhere. His wish was to join them as the relationships remain the last remnant of place. The other man, an Argaki villager whom Loizos considered normally worldly-wise, wondered why he and his fellow Cypriots had not yet returned home as surely happened after other wars (1981, p. 187). His Armenian neighbours could have answered this question for him — and as Loizos discerned, the villager too could have answered the question after some consideration. Nonetheless attachment and hope continue. So too does a certain melancholy, about which Yael Navaro-Yashin writes movingly, brought about by living with certain objects, without others, in a particular space, not another and especially, living without one’s significant Other but not being able to mourn due to the circumstances under which the loss took place.

‘When the person who has been lost (or spared) is one who belongs to the community of the so-defined “enemy”, the loss is not symbolized as a “loss”, and therefore it is not grieved over. Sovereignty and the making of distinct political communities (as well as the identification of “internal enemies” or “traitors”) do not allow for the ritualized mourning of persons lost to the other side of the divide or those of a different political affiliation. The feeling of loss, not cognitively registered, can therefore generate melancholia, a psychical-subjective state where the object of loss is largely unconscious to the identity of the mourner and where, therefore, the loss is irredeemable, ambivalent, and lingering’ (2009 p. 16).

For the group and for the individual, the building of memory and the creation of narratives of meaningfulness, the forgetting and the remembering, are created through the senses, through shared spaces and particular moments, registered and unregistered. They are also given shape by the more formal directives of public life whether overtly political or in the guise of education or even entertainment. The private and the public are woven together, assuming different shapes at different times. As Yiannis Papadakis remarks in the case of Cyprus ‘... it is indeed difficult to draw a distinction between private or public or collective stories’ (2006, p. 14). Throughout his work, Peter Loizos consistently turned to these issues. In *Ottoman Half-Lives* (1999) he notes that managing memories not only involves interaction with one’s own individual and collective past
but, in particular for refugees, with the receiving society, as well as with the most important
Other(s). Loizos also took care to show the diversity within the group, the divisions, conflicting
decisions and even differing memories. The shaping and managing of collective memory by
institutions and political rhetoric can be a powerful and effective route to a semblance of social
continuity but for long-term adjustment to the new surroundings and situations, a particular
obsession from the past or a narrow view of identity can become an obstacle to the future.

For displaced people, for refugees, for Cypriot Armenians as for the people of Argaki, the
receiving society provides an environment for new growth that can be enabling or inhibiting – or
more likely both. As Jonathan Boyarin points out, the integration of newcomers – or any Others
– in a society is transformed by the way in which the state conceives of its claim to the shared
territory. If based on primacy, on a prior claim, on earliest inhabitation, then the newcomers will
always remain ‘Other’. Yet, a nation might interpret its past as including everything that has
happened and everyone who has lived on its territory. This, Boyarin says, sounds more inclusive
but has its own hierarchy or what he calls ‘hierarchal inclusion’ as contrasted with ‘egalitarian
exclusion’ (1994, p. 18). One can learn excellent Greek or Turkish, work alongside Greek and
Turkish Cypriots – but if one is Armenian, one cannot be Greek or Turkish. One can be Cypriot
but this is more meaningful the more it is shared as a real category. Mandel concludes her
examination of the anxieties of this demotic cosmopolitanism by also questioning the framework
of the host society, the structure and attitude of the state and its dominant majority, creating a
space for the ‘reluctant cosmopolitan’.

A reluctant cosmopolitan. An anxious or sometimes melancholic citizen. One who belongs,
who feels an attachment to where he or she is, to the surrounding people, to a shared history and
home – but who also lives with a multitude of possibilities and connections, who has an awareness
of another place or places, a deep relationship with people farther away. This is perceived as both a
burden and a gift – like so many things, neither terrible nor wonderful – but both at different
times. The world-openness of the reluctant cosmopolitan becomes the key to finding a new home
when necessary, starting again with or without the suitcase or the single apple seed.
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Abstract
This article continues the story from where Peter Loizos’ celebrated study left off. It looks at how Turkish Cypriots experienced life in the mixed village of Argaki/Akçay from 1955 to 1974 and explores their relationships with their Greek Cypriot neighbours during the periods of tension and crisis in Cyprus. It also produces an ethnographic description with some narrative about intercommunal relations in the village of Argaki.
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Introduction

An Overview of the Political Conflicts in Cyprus

Before examining the main theme which looks at aspects of how Turkish Cypriots lived in the village of Argaki/Akçay, where the Greek Cypriots were the demographically dominant group during the conflicts in Cyprus, this paper briefly reviews the political conflicts in Cyprus, from 1878 to 1955, and from 1936 to 1974.

The chapter draws on Sant Cassia’s (2005) account of a brief history of inter-ethnic relations in Cyprus to clarify the periods of conflicts mentioned above. Cyprus, which is the third largest island in the Mediterranean region, consisted mainly of a Greek-speaking Christian Orthodox population until it was seized from the Venetians by the Ottoman Turks in 1571. In 1878, Cyprus was transferred to Britain, and from that year onwards, Greek Cypriots began campaigning for a political union with Greece (enosis). In the 1950s, an armed struggle was mounted against Britain by EOKA, a Greek Cypriot nationalist secret organisation. EOKA’s aim was to achieve enosis

1 When the article discusses in general terms the period 1955–1974 the Greek Cypriot armed group is referred to as EOKA but when talking about the period between 1955–1960 the Greek Cypriot armed group is identified as EOKA A. In the 1960s the Greek Cypriot armed group is referred to as the Greek Cypriot militia or Greek Cypriot paramilitaries but from 1967 until 1974 the Greek Cypriot armed group reorganised itself and became known as EOKA B.
but Turkish Cypriots did not accept being reduced to a minority status in a potentially Greek state and insisted that they should also be given the right to form a union with Turkey (taksim). To counteract the Greek Cypriot nationalists who were in favour of enosis, Turkish Cypriot nationalists constructed a Turkish Cypriot underground organisation in 1955, named Volkan (later called TMT – the Turkish Resistance Organisation). In the book Cyprus Reviewed, Michael Attalides gives us an idea of how the Greek Cypriot nationalists’ movement affected the recent history of Turkish Cypriots on the island. Attalides argues that ‘the Greek nationalists’ movement played an important role in the recent history of Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus and their transformation from a religious minority to strategic ethnic group’ (1977, p. viii).

Most relevant to this paper on interethnic relations in Argaki is the 1956 to 1974 period, following Sant Cassia’s account. When intercommunal fighting started in the summer of 1958, both EOKA and TMT attacked not only the members of opposing ethnic groups but also members of their own groups. EOKA killed left-wing Greeks for being traitors and TMT killed left-wing Turks for being in contact with left-wing Greeks, who were not in favour of enosis with a conservative Greece. This fighting continued until 1960, when a compromise was reached between the two communities. Regardless, Greek Cypriots were dissatisfied with the 1960 constitution as it gave the Turkish Cypriots more power than they expected. For this reason, the relations between the two communities worsened and attacks followed in 1963 by Greek Cypriot militants against Turkish Cypriot villages, which continued for a number of months. Then, early in 1964, Turkish Cypriots were driven from their villages resulting in 25,000 Turkish Cypriots becoming refugees. Violent conflicts resumed in 1967 when Greek Cypriot nationalists and the military dictatorship of Greece began a campaign against President Makarios because they believed that their effort to achieve enosis had been betrayed by the state. The same year, Turkey threatened to invade Cyprus because Greek Cypriot paramilitaries were continuing attacks on Turkish Cypriots. The USA, however, diffused the situation.

In the early 1970s there were two dominant views among Greek Cypriots: those who supported immediate enosis and those who were in favour of it in theory but not in practice. Those who were in favour of immediate enosis staged a coup against the Republic of Cyprus on 15 July 1974, and established a puppet regime under the leadership of Nicos Sampson, an anti-Turk nationalist and an ex-EOKA gunman. Cyprus had been captured by the Greek military junta. On 20 July 1974, Turkey defined its role as a Constitutional Guarantor Power and allegedly intervened in the Cyprus conflict on the island to restore the previous constitutional order as well as to protect Turkish Cypriots.

The village of Argaki has been studied extensively by the late Peter Loizos – a British anthropologist of Greek Cypriot origin. Loizos admits that due to difficulties he had little contact with the Turkish Cypriots. He explains this in his various writings. In The Greek Gift (2004, appendix 2, p. 304), Loizos writes of the political situation between 1968–1970 as being ‘delicate’, and he intimates that he thought it would not have been helpful to Argaki Turkish Cypriots if he
had ‘shown too much interest’ in them – hinting of trouble from EOKA B militants. In his later works, he attempts to show a ‘bittersweet’ picture of pre-1955 Greek–Turkish relations in Argaki, but he says little about the years from 1955 to 1974. There are indications of tensions and incidents, but few details. In The Heart Grown Bitter, Loizos gives a short account of Greek–Turkish relations in Argaki, and he clearly explains why he had little contact with the Turkish Cypriots. He says:

‘I decided not to draw attention either to my research or to the Argaki Turks. If the EOKA hawks thought I was especially interested in what the Turkish minority in Argaki was thinking, they might intimidate either them or me, and block my future work. So while I always kept my eyes and ears open for anything which concerned the Argaki Turks, I never intensively interviewed them, which explains why I am unable to present their views in any detail’ (Loizos, 1981, p. 42).

Peter Loizos carried out his study with the Greek Cypriot community in the village of Argaki. He tried to get an idea of what their living conditions were like at certain periods, but as he was unable to study the Turkish Cypriot community to the same extent, the part of the story concerning Argaki Turkish Cypriots remained incomplete. My task, therefore, as a Turkish Cypriot, who grew up in Argaki during this period, is to add to the record, to correct the inevitable weakness of Peter Loizos’ work, and to extend the ethnography of both Argaki village as well as the wider issue of intercommunal relations in Cyprus during the periods of tension and crisis.

Methodology

The participants in this research are all Turkish Cypriot villagers from Argaki. In all, I conducted nine qualitative in-depth interviews (five men and four women) in 2007, which took place in the houses of each informant. In order to analyse the events more objectively I interviewed a small section of villagers with roughly equal numbers of left-wing and more nationalist perspectives. The informants were chosen from different generations and included ages varying between young and old who experienced other periods of time in the village of Argaki. They were all aged between 49–89 years. Four of them were aged between 73–89 years and five of them between 49–67 years. Five of them were retired from various jobs such as builder, teacher and farmer, but the remainder were still working as builders and seasonal labourers. All except two of them were originally from Argaki.

Although my study is limited to nine interviews, and I am aware that ideally it should have included more, the fact is that there were few Argaki Turks in the village – about 65 in total – and the members of each family were located in the same area. I, therefore, chose one or two members from each family who had experience of life with their Greek neighbours during the periods of my research. In these circumstances I did not consider it vital to conduct further interviews because I believed that more or less the same data would be retrieved from the other Argaki Turks who still
lived there. I have confidence that the quality of those interviews undertaken is what matters most. All interviews took place in 2007 – not in the 1960s or 1970s. We should also bear in mind that in the past, because of conflicts, constraints and threats, the Argaki people were not able to explore their feelings as candidly as in 2007. After the border crossings were opened in 2003, Turkish Cypriots had more freedom to talk, tell their stories from the past without inhibition, and feel secure in doing so. I did my utmost to minimise the limitations of my study as outlined above.

Conflict and Outcomes

Intercommunal conflicts do not happen in a pre-determined pattern with certain outcomes. A number of social, historical, political, economic, cultural and other factors seem to be crucial determinants. Moreover, the outcomes vary a great deal and depend on the personalities of the individuals involved in the conflict as well as on structural and demographic factors. Sevgül Uludağ (2006) argues in her book Oysters with the Missing Pearls: The Untold Stories that Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots lived together in peace and solidarity in the mixed villages of Stroncilo, Lapatoz and Trachonas. In the case of the mixed village of Trachonas, where 18 Turkish Cypriot and 18 Greek Cypriot families used to live together before 1974, it is stated that Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot villagers helped and protected each other. A Turkish Cypriot man, Ahmet Altan Deniz, who was interviewed by Sevgül Uludağ, explores his memories in this village and says:

‘in those times in Trachonas, there was no “Turkishness” or “Greekness”. People were people, neighbours were neighbours ... If I helped someone, I was just helping a neighbour or my neighbour was helping me ... It was not helping a Greek Cypriot or a Turkish Cypriot’ (p. 215).

Ahmet had two Greek Cypriot friends, Gogo and Despo. He says that

‘when the conflict began in 1963, Gogo and Despo came to me and said they had decided to stay with me. I said “of course my house is your house”. Just then someone from Ortakeuy (Ortaköy) came. They wanted to kill my Greek friends but I didn’t let them. I helped them go to the Greek part’ (p. 217).

Likewise, in the village of Argaki, where Greek Cypriots were the demographically and economically dominant group, it is stated in the narratives that Turkish Cypriots were ‘spared’, and even protected by their Greek Cypriot co-villagers during the periods of tension and crisis in Cyprus. This was largely due to the following important social factors:

a. the importance of political ideology:
   The strong Left was positive towards Turkish Cypriots and most of the time they tried their best to support them during the conflicts in Cyprus.

b. the fact that the Turkish Cypriots were marginalised, poor and very few in number:
   As there were few Turkish Cypriots and they were completely unarmed, they had a non-
threatening political profile in the village. They did not have any connection with TMT or any other nationalistic movement and they never made any threats against EOKA or supporters of Makarios in the village.

c. **the significance of family ties and kinship:**

Peter Loizos mentioned in his work *The Heart Grown Bitter* (1981, pp. 70–71) that some EOKA members and supporters of Makarios in Argaki – the most important component of which consisted of members of the communist party, AKEL – had kinship ties as well as very good relationships in that village. They helped and supported each other during conflicts in Cyprus. For instance, during the coup, Argaki EOKA B members did not allow EOKA B members from other villages to arrest relatives who were supporters of Makarios. Hence, the good relationship and family bonds between Argaki EOKA B members and leftists enabled them to help and support the Turkish Cypriots and keep them safe from any attack or violence by EOKA B.

### Connecting Theories of Ethnic Relations to the Case of Argaki

The crucial sociological perspective which can be broadly applied to the case of Argaki is conflict theory which highlights the importance of divisions, unequal distribution of power and struggle or, tensions between dominant and disadvantaged groups, examining how relationships of control are established and continued for a long time. In this case, it is important to consult the pioneers: Donald Horowitz, Michael Mann, Herbert Blumer, Émile Durkheim, Ari Sitas and Peter Loizos to understand the conflict in Cyprus, beyond the obvious connection.

Horowitz (1985) outlines the complex processes of production and reproduction of ethnic conflict in society. He argues that much of the tension between ethnic groups emerges from group comparison. He points out that people evaluate their abilities/worth relative to other people, and as group identity is often central to individual identity, their self-esteem is strongly influenced by a comparison of ethnic group to others. He claims that in ethnically divided societies, power is also an end in itself, for two reasons: it confirms group worth, and it ensures group survival. Horowitz divides ethnic groups and regions into those that are backward and those that are advanced. Advanced groups have benefited from education and non-agricultural employment and backward groups are less well-educated, less wealthy and are stereotyped as ‘indolent, ignorant and not disposed to achievement’ (p. 227).

In Cyprus, Greek Cypriots were deemed the advanced and wealthy group who mostly benefited from education, whereas Turkish Cypriots were the backward group who were less wealthy and less educated. In the village of Argaki the situation was similar to that of Cyprus as a whole; the Argaki Turks being poor and less educated. Most of them were employed in agriculture or on building sites and their living conditions were tough, whereas Argaki Greeks were the advanced group who were better-educated and wealthier.
When it comes to the specific application of a Cypriot village, Argaki, – although certainly affected by the broader climate of the Cyprus conflict (1963–1974) – was dissimilar to other villages at that time and managed to avoid the ‘ethnic cleansing’ of the kind we see in other places: in Cyprus then, and now in other parts of the world. In The Dark Side of Democracy, Michael Mann defines ‘ethnic cleansing’ as the attempt to create mono-ethnic populations for a given political unit. This is not necessarily murderous, and may more often involve assimilation. Mann sees ethnic cleansing and democracy as having an elective relationship with each other in two respects: first, most democracies develop on the basis of relatively mono-ethnic populations, and second, democracy carries the possibility that the majority might use power over minorities (2005, p. 126).

Mann claims that

‘murderous cleansing occurs where two ethnic groups make a claim to the same territory; where one ethnic group feels threatened but also capable of eliminating the other; and where sovereignty breaks down amongst an unstable geopolitical environment that usually leads to the war’ (p. 126).

In the case of Cyprus, Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots made a claim to the same territory. EOKA militants claimed that Cyprus belongs to the Greeks, and they wanted political union with Greece. On the other hand, Turkish Cypriots were the group who felt threatened and established TMT, an underground Turkish Cypriot organisation, to protect themselves against EOKA militants. They did not accept being reduced to minority status in a potentially Greek state and insisted that they should be given the right to form a union with Turkey (taksim).

The ethnic conflict in Cyprus did not escalate into total murderous cleansing. It was partial and this was fulfilled by EOKA B militants supported by the military regime in Greece in 1974. The murderous cleansing by EOKA B was against both Turkish Cypriots as well as Greek Cypriot Communists. In the Argaki case, the Turkish Cypriots were not exposed to any ethnic cleansing or mass killing because of the social factors mentioned earlier.

In addition to these factors, ‘local humanism’ and an ‘ethic of reconciliation’ as Ari Sitas (2008) termed it, seem to have played an important role in saving Argaki Turks from murderous cleansing. Sitas discusses these two concepts considering the Cyprus case. He argues that the Cyprus conflict in some villages did not result in murderous cleansing because of self-restraint and this speaks of local humanism. For instance, in the mixed village of Argaki ethnic cleansing did not occur after the coup and invasion despite the existence of core constituencies and militants who were ready to push the society beyond an already dangerous situation.

Sitas claims that local humanism was the most important factor which prevented ethnic cleansing during the periods of conflict in Cyprus. He gives occasions of humanistic relationships between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots such as the guards who left the prison camp’s door open; the soldiers who stole food and water to give to imprisoned women and children; the soldiers who shot high rather than low; co-villagers who came in the thick of the night to warn of an attack.
According to Sitas, if local humanism can be properly understood and its cultural formation can be explained, it can provide a ‘third space’. To him such humanism is a reflection of the common way of life shared by people in towns and villages before the troubles began. Sitas argues that this kind of humanism is directly related to Cypriotism and the struggle primarily of the working class and peasantries seeking a better life for all.

Loizos, in his argument about the norm of village solidarity, gives examples of the village of Argaki/Kalo, revealing that in one form it is the dogma that Argaki/Kalo village is the best village in Cyprus; in another it is that Argakites/Kalotes do not allow themselves to be divided by the fanaticism of party politics; in another it is that violence of any kind within the village should be prevented; or it is that a man would be insane to quarrel with his relatives over politics; in another form, it is the deliberate definition of areas of activity as ‘non-political’; and in another it is the statement that certain areas must not be coloured by party politics. Loizos points out that in Argaki/Kalo, the norm of solidarity emerged and persisted because most of the villagers saw their futures linked to that village as a whole and they set cautious limits regarding the use of national politics within it (2004, p. 291).

Émile Durkheim, who is associated with functionalism, was concerned primarily with how societies could maintain their integrity and cohesion in the modern era, when things such as shared religious and ethnic background could no longer be assumed. Durkheim also argued that social acts had an independent existence greater and more objective than the actions of the individuals that composed society and could only be explained by other social facts rather than, say, by society’s adaptation to a particular climate.2 In the case of Argaki, Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots managed to maintain their integrity and unity although this was not fulfilled in all mixed villages of Cyprus during periods of unease and adversity on the island. The crucial factors which led the Argaki Turks and Greeks to social unity were the existence of local humanism and solidarity in the village. As an illustration, there was a strong solidarity between Turkish and Greek individuals. They cultivated their lands in collaboration with one another. They helped each other whenever one of them was in need of help. They made bread and cookies at Easter and Bayram festivals, sharing the same village oven.

Another sociological perspective which helps us to understand the ethnic relations between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots in the village of Argaki is symbolic interactionism, which plays an important role in microsociology and social psychology. Herbert Blumer, who coined the term ‘symbolic interactionism’ outlined this perspective, arguing that people act towards things based on the meanings they give to them, and these meanings stem from social interaction and are modified through interpretation. Blumer (1962) claimed that human interaction is mediated by

---

the use of symbols and signification, by interpretation, or by finding out the meaning of one another's actions.³

Symbolic interactionism helps us to explain the social relations and involvement between Argaki Turks and Greeks. In the village of Argaki, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots always kept face to face contact in their daily lives. Not only the ageing Argaki Greeks and Turks, but also the younger generation had stayed in touch in the village through good and bad times. For example, they were together in the citrus fields picking the oranges, on construction sites building houses, and sitting on balconies making lace during the summer time. While interacting with each other, Argaki Turks and Greeks became involved in an exchange of languages, traditions and customs. They were also together in the cafes playing cards and discussing the social issues concerning their daily lives. In turn, interaction and a two-way active engagement with Greek Cypriots allowed Turkish Cypriots to be protected from violence during the periods of tension and crisis on the island. As an instance, their Greek neighbours helped them to travel to their work in safety, provided them with food, and informed them of possible dangers during anxious periods.

Analysis and Findings

The interviews I conducted with Argaki Turks have revealed the following findings:⁴

Security and Insecurity of Argaki Turkish Cypriots

As there were only a few Turks among the Greek Cypriots in the village of Argaki, the fear of being killed by EOKA members was predominant among them. Before 1974 they all felt insecure at certain times.

In 1957, when the Turkish Cypriot doctor, Erol from Morphou, was murdered by EOKA members, the Argaki Turks were also afraid of being killed by EOKA because their village was very close to Morphou and they thought that the same thing might happen to them. Another incident which made Argaki Turks feel insecure occurred in 1958, when one of the EOKA members set fire to the mosque, which was immediately extinguished by Argaki Greek leftists. Mukhtar, Behlül Hüseyin, remembers the incident and recounts it as follows:

‘it was a Sunday night in summer and the daughter of Peter Loizos’ uncle was getting married. All the villagers, Greek and Turks, were at the wedding party and the village was quiet. One EOKA member, who was drunk, took advantage of the situation and set fire to the mosque.’

⁴ The interviews conducted for this research have been translated from Turkish into English by the author.
This unpleasant event made the Argaki Turks afraid of being killed by EOKA. Nevertheless, the effort by the majority of Greek villagers to extinguish the fire, reassured them to some extent.

The security of Argaki Turks was entirely in the hands of their fellow Greek villagers since Argaki was completely surrounded by Greek villages. As they lived far from other Turkish villages the only people who could help them maintain their lives in a peaceful atmosphere were the Argaki Greek Cypriots. Most of those interviewed claimed that their safety against external dangers was mostly safeguarded by the leftist Argaki Greeks during the periods of conflict in Cyprus. Akif Ismail Hodja related that

‘in 1974 the Greek soldiers from Greece came to Argaki and stayed for a few days. During their stay they said to the Greek villagers that they wanted to kill the Argaki Turks, but the leaders of the village such as Thomas, Phani Varellas and the other villagers did not let them kill the Argaki Turks.’

Akif Hodja continued his story:

‘Argaki Greek Cypriots warned the Greek soldiers that if they touched any Turk in the village, they would fight against them. Because they had good relationships with Turks and they did not want them to be killed.’

Ayşe Hüseyin, another female Argaki Turk, expressed how thankful she was towards her Greek villagers when she said,

‘during the conflicts Argaki Greek Cypriots used to visit our houses and warn us constantly about the danger outside our houses, and tell us not to let our children go out until the EOKA members from different places leave the village. They did not want us to be killed by EOKA members.’

Argaki Greeks were so determined to ensure the security of their Turkish counterparts that when the Turkish lorries came in 1964 to take the Turkish villagers, the Greeks would not let the Turkish authorities take them away. They promised that they would shelter the Argaki Turks and supply them with food. The offer by the Greeks was accepted because of the good relationship which existed between them. It was a strong enough reason for the Turks to stay in the village. Argaki Greek Cypriots did not let their Turkish Cypriot villagers down and they kept their promise until they themselves had to leave the village. They never permitted an EOKA member or a Greek soldier to touch any Turkish villager and those Turkish villagers who contributed to this study declared their gratitude towards Greek villagers and avowed never to forget the effort they made to protect them and supply them with food during the violence. Ali Hodja, one of the older Argaki Turkish Cypriots, remembers this:

‘we had always good relations with our Greek villagers. They supplied us food during the conflicts. For instance, one of the Argaki villagers, Bafidis, used to bake bread for Argaki villagers and give the bread to Argaki Turks.’
Friendship and Support between Argaki Turks and Greeks

The Argaki Turkish Cypriots interviewed each declared that they had good relationships with their Greek Cypriot counterparts and almost all of them had close friendships with their Greek neighbours. They used to share some activities together and helped one another whenever they needed anything. A case in point was one villager, Müsteyde, who used to make lace with her close Greek friend, Maroulla when they came home from work. They would labour in the fields during the daytime and crochet lace together in the evenings after they had finished their dinner. Sometimes, they continued their lace-making until midnight. Müsteyde remembers those evenings and reminisces:

‘My best friend in the village was Evribivi [Bebi] daughter Maroulla. I used to share everything with her, my problems, happiness and my secret things. We used to go to work together, and when we came home from work in the evening, we used to crochet lace all night long. While working we used to talk about our future life.’

Akif İsmail (Hodja)’s friend, Andrea Polyviou, helped him to meet a girl from Argaki and get married. Akif Hodja also used to have a partnership with his Greek neighbour, Yiorgos Chango. Together they grew watermelons, melons, and different kinds of vegetables. He explained his partnership in his own words saying,

‘Yiorgos and I were very good friends. We used to help each other whenever we were in need. We never tried to cheat each other. Our partnership was the result of our good friendship. During our partnership, as we respected each other, there was not any problem between us. We used to grow mainly watermelons, melons and vegetables. We shared everything equally among us without trying to cheat each other.’

Another Argaki Turkish woman, Ayşe Kemal, used to bake bread, and cheese pastries (pilavuna, gulluri) in a big outdoor oven (fourno) with her Greek neighbour, Andromachi during the Easter and Bayram holidays. Salih, one of the young Argaki Turks, used to eat and drink with his Greek friend Sotiri in the evenings.

The friendship between Ayşe Hüseyin and Agathe Guchobi was closely bound and very sincere. It was moving to hear from Ayşe Hüseyin that her Greek neighbour, Agathe, helped her to carry her injured son in her arms and run to the neighbouring village, Zodhia – one mile away – to take him to hospital in Nicosia. When Ayşe Hüseyin remembered this moment, she burst into tears sobbing.

‘I will never forget that moment and Agathe’s help, all my life.’

Some Argaki Turks did not have close personal Greek friends in the village, but simply had Greek acquaintances from their workplaces. They claimed that relationships with their Greek colleagues were very good and furthermore they explained that they never had any arguments or fights with them. Their friendships were based on mutual respect and a feeling of kinship with one another.
Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots in the Mixed Village of Argaki

There was also mutual solidarity between Turks and Greeks in Argaki. As sample cases, Akif Ismail (Hodja)’s neighbour, Sofoulla Chango, used to let them keep their meat and other foods in her refrigerator during the summer as her Turkish neighbours did not have one. During the conflicts of the 1960s, Phani Varellas used to take Argaki Turkish workers to their workplaces in his bus, making sure the roads were safe beforehand. Ali Hodja used to help Thomas, the manager of the co-operative society, with clerical work when he came home from work in the evenings.

In 1959, the clerk of the village cooperative society, Bibi, assisted Akif Hodja with a loan from the cooperative bank to pay off his father-in-law’s debt. If Bibi had not helped him at the time, his father-in-law would have had to sell his land to pay his debt. Akif Hodja was grateful for Bibi’s help.

During the war in 1974, Argaki Greeks and Turks continued to support and help each other. In particular, the Greek Cypriots assisted the Turks in meeting their daily needs during the clashes. By way of illustration, Bafidi’s wife, an Argaki Greek, used to bake bread in her large outdoor oven (fourno) and she would give the bread first to the Argaki Turks, even though she knew that she would encounter some complaints and threats from the neighbouring villagers. She used to take the risk and support her Turkish villagers and never left them without bread during the war.

In 1972, when there was a conflict between EOKA B members and supporters of Makarios, it was difficult and dangerous for Turks to provide for their own needs because EOKA B had set up road blocks. During this period, Argaki Greeks opened their grocery shops to the Turks so they could obtain supplies. The Greeks did the same again in 1974, opening the doors to their stores so that Turkish neighbours would not suffer from hunger. One of the grocers was Pantelis; he never refused to open his shop door to Turks.

**Travel outside the Village and its Hazards**

From 1963 to 1964 it was dangerous for Argaki Turks to travel outside the village or to go to work because Greek Cypriot militia set up barricades on the roads and would search the vehicles. If they found Turks in any of the vehicles, they would arrest them and sometimes kill them.

In 1963, Ali Hodja’s wife, Fezile, was taken to hospital in Nicosia after burning herself whilst baking bread in the outdoor oven. As she had recently given birth, she needed to nurse her baby, so an Argaki Greek Cypriot, Phani Varellas, used to help by regularly driving the infant with its grandmother in his bus to take the baby safely to Fezile. Because of the road blocks set up by the Greek Cypriot militia it would have been dangerous for Fezile’s mother to make her way to the hospital alone. On their way to hospital one day, they were stopped by a Greek Cypriot soldier. That particular soldier wanted to kill Fezile’s mother but Phani Varellas prevented it. He explained the situation, and finally, managed to persuade the soldier not to kill her.

In 1963, when fighting broke out, Argaki Turks had difficulties getting to work. One Argaki Turk, Ali Hodja, had a problem reaching Dhekelia where he worked because the roads were barricaded by Greek Cypriot militia, and any Turk who was captured might have been killed.
Argaki Turkish Cypriot workers were lucky to some extent because Phani Varellas, who transported them in his bus, would make sure there were no roadblocks set up on the route before starting out. Ayşe Kemal's husband, however, was not as blessed as the Argaki Turks. In 1964, while he and eighteen other Turkish workers were travelling from Engkomi (Tuzla) to work, they were stopped by Greek Cypriot soldiers and killed. If Ayşe and her husband had lived in Argaki at that time, he possibly would not have been killed.

During the same year, Argaki Turkish youngsters had to forego their studies in Nicosia because it was difficult for them to travel to and from their village due to the roadblocks. Argaki families were also afraid of sending their children to work outside the village such as Erol Abdurrahman's father who worried so much about the dangers of his son leaving the safety of the village that he found Erol a job in the village to be near Greek villagers where he thought he was more protected.

In 1964, one Argaki Turk, Derviş, was fortunate to be spared his life. Derviş was arrested by members of the Greek Cypriot militia whilst outside the village but luckily he was not executed immediately. As soon as Argaki Greeks learned of his arrest, their own EOKA members searched for him and rescued him.

Growing up in the Village

I grew up in Argaki and am a descendant of the original Argaki Turks. My mother, Bahire, also hails from Argaki but my father, Akif Hodja, originated from Limnitis. I have not only heard about intercommunal relations but I have also experienced them at first hand with my Argaki Greek friends for four years – and this knowledge has, in the main, prompted me to undertake this study. In this research, I have purposefully not explored my personal experiences much because it is my aim to give an objective account of intercommunal relations between the Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots in the mixed village of Argaki. Nonetheless, I do remember good times as well as others when life was not so rosy. To give an example, in 1974 there were a few occasions when, as I walked through the village to the ‘kafeneio’ with my brothers, Greek Cypriot youths would call us names and throw stones at us, but we soon changed our route to the café and avoided them.

The Argaki Turks that I interviewed for this study all originated from Argaki with the exception of Akif Ismail (Hodja) and Ali Hodja, although their wives were from the village. The younger participants were all born in Argaki and grew up with their Greek neighbours and friends in the village. They experienced similar things at different times. As children they played all sorts of games in their quarters, and when they grew up they worked together in the citrus orchards as fruit pickers. It was not only in the citrus orchards where they worked together but also in other workplaces such as on building sites and in carpentry shops in the village.

One of those interviewed, Erol Abdurrahman, declared that he used to work with Greek friends for a Greek master builder and did not encounter problems at work. Clarifying his case he said:
‘While I was working with my Greek friends for a Greek master builder, I was not confronted with any problems. The Greek master used to treat us equally and never made me feel isolated or segregated among the Greek workers.’

Another participant who shared the same experience was Erol’s wife, Zeliha. She was employed with Greek friends as a workhand picking citrus fruit, carrots and beetroot. Zeliha said that the work was difficult at times, particularly labouring in the fields in the wintertime when her hands would almost freeze while weeding the carrot fields. Zeliha also told me that the living conditions of her family were not as satisfactory as their Greek neighbours; namely, they did not have electricity in their house. They used to press their clothes with an iron heated over a coal fire. She remembered growing up without a TV set at home and the family used to go to their Greek neighbours to watch movies on their television.

Ayşe Kemal’s family had inferior living conditions in comparison to other Argaki Turkish families. As mentioned earlier, Ayşe had lost her husband during the fighting in 1963 when he was murdered by Greek Cypriot soldiers on his way to work. As a consequence she had to move from Tuzla, her husband’s village, back to her own village of Argaki where she worked hard to bring up her five children. Life was indeed tough for her in Argaki without a husband. However, it was perhaps not as difficult as she expected because her Greek neighbours supported her by finding jobs for her children. They also helped her family to integrate into village life. At first, it was not easy for her children to adapt to the village because they did not understand the Greek language. Her eldest son, Salih, had a problem with one of the Greek boys because he did not speak Greek, but then he learned the language and he made many Greek friends.

The Argaki Turks were not as fortunate as their Greek co-villagers in terms of education. Sometimes they did not have a teacher in their school for weeks. There were occasions when they were taught by a temporary ‘teacher’, who was an educated person but not a qualified teacher. This, together with the fact that they did not have access to full-time education due to violent periods throughout the island, affected their future studies in a negative way. Additionally, because there were so few Turks in the village, Turkish teachers did not want to travel to Argaki, and were afraid of being killed by Greek Cypriot militia on their way there.

It can be concluded that, in the village of Argaki, Turks grew up alongside their Greek friends and neighbours peacefully without any serious incidents. Argaki Turks were not exposed to any attack, isolation or segregation and they never feared being killed by the Greeks in their village. Having said that, I record below some occasions when frightening things were said and done by individuals in the village, and the lives of Argaki Turkish Cypriots were often adversely affected by the wider conflicts on the island.

**Living with the Greeks**

Although Argaki Turks did not have any crucial problems with the Greeks of their mixed village, a few unpleasant incidents happened, which did not involve any direct attack or violence. Mukhtar
Behlül described one event in 1958 when Argaki EOKA members did not speak to the Argaki Turks in the village for a week. He said,

‘the Turkish Cypriots never learnt the real reason why this was so because it remained secret among the EOKA members’. He added, ‘in the same year, one of the village’s EOKA members set fire to the empty mosque in the village but the supporters of Makarios extinguished the fire immediately and helped the Turks to repair it.’

Another disagreeable incident happened in between 1958 and 1960, when one of the Argaki Greek Cypriots, Petros Paly, tried to incite his friends to kill Argaki Turks and throw them into a well. As soon as other Argaki Greeks heard of it, they immediately told Paly to keep quiet and not talk of killing Argaki Turks again.

One of the older Argaki Turkish participants interviewed, Akif Ismail (Hodja), stated that his father-in-law had a problem with one of the Argaki Greek owners of a water pump. This incident happened in 1963, when his father-in-law came back to Argaki from Limniti. He had planted an acre of black-eyed beans in summer but he was not given access to water to irrigate his plants. As a result, his black-eyed beans dried out and died. The Greek village leaders did their utmost to convince the Greek Cypriot owner of the pump that he should allow the Turkish farmer to use the water, but they were unsuccessful.

In 1972, the EOKA B member Kikas was murdered. Assuming that their leader had been killed by Turks, the Argaki EOKA B members used to swear at Turks in the village whenever they saw them. One of the participants in this study said that her mother used to do her shopping at a store belonging to an EOKA B member but he was so unpleasant to her that she became frightened and stopped going.

Having unearthed the above incidents, it must be said that there were many good stories which verified the strong solidarity and relationship between the Turks and the Greeks in Argaki. One such example is Mukhtar Behlül Hüseyin, who advocated that in 1963, some EOKA members wanted to come to Argaki to kill Turks, but the Argaki Greeks did not allow them to enter the village. Each Argaki Turkish informant interviewed during this study attested that during the conflicts in the 1950s, the 1960s and in 1974, their Greek neighbours helped them to obtain food and made them feel safe in the village. Even the Argaki EOKA members sometimes visited the Turks and attempted to alleviate their fears during those periods of conflict.

The Argaki Turks were fortunate to have supportive, friendly Greeks in the village. According to Argaki Turkish participants, the Greeks always tried their best to ensure the security of Argaki Turks in times of conflict, and they proved this by protecting them from external dangers at certain times. An illustration of this was in 1974 when soldiers from Greece wanted to kill the Argaki Turks, but Argaki Greeks did not permit it. Young Argaki Turkish informants stated that they had a peaceful life with their Greek friends when the village was still mixed. To quote a young Argaki Turk, Salih, he said,
I had a good relationship with my Greek friend, Sotiri. We used to play backgammon in the coffee-shop and go out for a drink.

The younger Argaki Turks declared that they had never been exposed to any isolation, degrading treatment or segregation by the Greek landlords or Greek masters while they worked in the fields or at their workplaces. They were always treated equally. They emphasised that there had not been problems between Turkish and Greek workers.

As mentioned earlier in the paper, Argaki was not the only village where Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots lived in peace and solidarity during times of conflict in Cyprus. There were also other mixed villages such as Stroncilo, Lapatoz, and Trachonas, where two communities shared the same experiences. Sevgül Uludağ corroborates this in her book Oysters with the Missing Pearls: The Untold Stories, where she writes about how Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots lived together peacefully in those mixed villages throughout violent periods on the island.

It can be ascertained from the quotes of the Argaki Turkish people who participated in this study that they led a peaceful life with the Greek villagers in spite of fearing for their safety on occasions. On the whole they seemed content to have helpful and non-racist Greeks living in their village. Argaki Turks greatly appreciated the Greek villagers' support and loyalty. However, in 1974, the situation overturned and the Argaki Turks were unable to help the Greeks remain in the village or protect them from external dangers as their Greek villagers had done in the past for them. Following the displacement of Argaki Greeks, the Turks displayed their loyalty towards the Greeks by taking care of sixty elderly Greek villagers who stayed behind in Argaki to tend their animals. They not only took care of those Greek villagers but they also saved two youths and one elderly Greek villager from being arrested by Turkish soldiers.

Ayşe Kemal reported that her father saved an elderly Greek woman called Kadisi, from being arrested by Turkish soldiers. She explained that

'Because Kadisi was so scared, she used to stay in our house after the Greeks had been displaced. One day, a Turkish soldier asked my father if he had any Greeks staying in his house and he admitted that Kadisi was with us. He then regretted telling the soldier about Kadisi because the Turkish soldier wanted to arrest her. Thankfully, my father persuaded the soldier not to arrest Kadisi by explaining how the Greek villagers used to protect us from Greek soldiers and from EOKA members.'

Akif Ismail (Hodja), recounted that he saved two young Greek Cypriots, Phidia and Stephanie, from being arrested by Turkish soldiers. He went on to say that

'while Phidia and Stephanie were trying to cross the border to go to Astromeriti, they were caught by Turkish soldiers. I was with the Turkish soldiers to help them communicate with Greek civilians when those young Greeks from Argaki were captured. I immediately stopped and explained to the Turkish lieutenant that those young Greeks were from my village and they had never let the Greek soldiers and EOKA members harm any Turks in
Argaki. After I had described the good relationships that Argaki Turks and Greeks had fostered, the Turkish soldiers allowed the young Argaki Greeks to cross the border to Astromeriti.

**Living without Greeks**

Living without Greeks was not so easy for Argaki Turks in the beginning. Most of the Argaki Turkish people interviewed claimed that they were mostly disappointed with the Turkish Cypriots who moved in from other places. Although they no longer lived in fear of attack by Greek soldiers or Greek Cypriot militia, and lived in better houses which their Greek neighbours had asked them to move into until they returned, they were not as comfortable as they expected to be.

The Argaki Turkish women interviewed were especially unhappy with all the Turkish Cypriot refugees in the village. One of the women, Ayşe Kemal, complained that

> the refugees were always jealous of us because we lived in Greek houses and also had Greek properties.

Another Argaki woman, Müsteyde Behlül, was really disappointed with the new Turkish Cypriot residents. Feeling profound sadness she sighed,

> my family's house was broken into many times by the new refugees and they had stolen my valuable jewellery; a Cyprus five pound note (pendo lira), which my mother had given to me, and all the lace I had made with my close Greek friend, Maroulla.

She was very upset as she re-examined her feelings for the new Turkish Cypriot villagers. She was particularly distressed about the lace items stolen by the refugees, because she had lost not only her lace but also the only mementos she treasured of her close Greek friend, Maroulla.

Most of the Turkish women from Argaki who were interviewed, said that after the Greeks had left the village it was impossible for them to go to their own fields by themselves because they did not feel as safe as when the Greeks were living there before. They also stated that it was not as easy as it used to be in the past to leave their doors open during the summer time. Müsteyde says,

> before 1974 we [Argaki Turkish women] used to go to our fields without [being] accompanied by our men, but after 1974, as there were soldiers all around the village, this was not possible.

Another Argaki Turkish woman, Zahiye, agreed saying

> we were going to our fields alone as females without feeling fear inside before 1974, but now we are afraid of going to our fields alone as a woman.

An elderly Argaki Turkish woman, Ayşe Kemal protested that after 1974, when the refugees came to Argaki, she thought life would be better, but the refugees disappointed them. She did not want to believe that Turkish Cypriot refugees could be so angry and jealous of them. She
emphasised that when the refugees first came to the village, they treated them as if they were their enemies. She argued that she found it difficult to understand the attitudes of refugees towards them.

**Conclusion**

This study has raised questions with implications to debate, i.e:

- To what degree is the particular nature of the Argaki ‘story’ a result of the geographical and demographic isolation of the Argaki Turkish Cypriots?
- To what degree did the Argaki Turks’ feelings of fear concern Greek Cypriots – who were the majority in the village – and was it directly related to the demographic structure in the village or to exterior perils?

To consider the first point we can comment that intercommunal conflicts do not all adhere to a similar predetermined pattern. The outcomes depend on individual personalities, and on structural and demographic factors. The strong left-wing group in Argaki was positive towards Turkish Cypriots and always supported them during periods of conflict in Cyprus. In addition, some EOKA members who were friends or relatives of this group also made them feel secure because Argaki Turks maintained non-threatening political profiles in the village since they did not have any connections with TMT or any other nationalist movements, they were completely unarmed and they had never made any threats against EOKA or supporters of Makarios in the village. As Loizos stated in his book *Iron in the Soul* (2008, p. 18), EOKA people said there were no traitors in the village and this included the Turks. Turkish Cypriots in other mixed villages were not as fortunate as Argaki Turks. As often happened in 1964 in villages with populations of mostly Greek nationalists, the Turkish Cypriots might have found no Greek supporters and perhaps been driven out or would have decided to leave.

In the case of Lefka, where the Turkish Cypriots were the demographically dominant group, it was the Turkish Cypriots who expelled the Greek Cypriots in 1958. It is, therefore, not all about Greeks, or Turks, as cultural groups, but about nationalists and demographics in both groups.

To reflect on the second point, the Turkish Cypriots – a minority in national terms – were also the minority group in many mixed communities. In such situations it was prudent for them to avoid fighting and to try to live peacefully with the majority Greek Cypriot population. This was valid for Argaki Turks, too, but their feelings of fear did not arise because of any Greek Cypriot neighbours’ negative attitudes or treatment towards them. Apart from a few unpleasant incidents caused by Argaki EOKA members, it was the enemies from outside Argaki, such as the non-Argaki EOKA members and Greek soldiers who raised their fears of being killed. Their Greek Cypriot neighbours had never made them feel isolated or frightened. They had tried to reassure them and make their lives more comfortable during periods of tension and crisis in Cyprus.
We can argue that at the grass roots level, the patterns of traditional coexistence of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots have never been totally interrupted. Even at the most critical of times there has been surprising evidence of this as supported by the relations between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots in the village of Argaki. It is impressive to observe that these two communities in the mixed village managed to pursue their good relations without causing serious harm to one another during tense periods of crisis on the island.
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Through the Anthropologist’s Lens  
– A Retrospective on the Work of Peter Loizos

ROGER ZETTER

‘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 *leitmotiv*.

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
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 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 discretely 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 … “talleporithikame, 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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Notes from the Balkans: Locating Marginality and Ambiguity on the Greek-Albanian Border

SARAH F. GREEN

Perhaps nothing can capture so vividly the sense of fractality, that Sarah Green employs here as a theoretical concept, as the notion of the border, which is one of her key interests. ‘Fractal’ is a term which originated in physics to describe shapes which replicate themselves across different scales, then migrated into the social sciences: a fjord on a map has a shape full of jagged edges, focus on a part of it and a similar shape will appear, come even closer and the same will take place, and so on. Draw an ethnic map of the Balkans and it will show a mixture of peoples, come closer to the level of the region and you will see the same, come closer to the level of the village and a mixed pattern will again emerge – or at least it would, until the violent ‘ethnic cleansing’ campaigns of the twentieth century. Modernity, however, predicated upon ideas of purification and essentialism, as Green explains, could not tolerate this. Yet, it did not manage to eradicate it either. And what is a border? Theoretically, it is endlessly fractal: each side can always claim or contest part of the border itself, slicing it into thinner and thinner pieces towards its centre, yet never reaching the end of the process.

A border is also a site of the paradoxical: it belongs neither to one nor the other; it divides and unites; keeps apart and brings into contact. Though she does not develop this idea in precisely this manner, in trying to ‘make sense’ of the place, Green often resorts to paradoxical statements in her sophisticated discussion on margins: ‘an odd combination of ambiguity and ordinariness (or the lack thereof)’; ‘neither one thing nor another, or alternatively altogether both one thing and another’; ‘things being the same and different’.

The difficulties the Balkans has with ‘fitting in’ provide the theoretical challenge for Green, a social anthropologist, to productively reflect on a variety of key concepts of the social sciences: modernity, post-modernity, development, change, nations, borders and multi-culturalism, among others. The book’s richness emerges from the wide theoretical net that its author casts, backed by meticulous ethnography, often in the form of interesting stories, though sometimes the detail can get overwhelming and a reader may occasionally get lost. One is tempted to excuse this by attributing it to a conscious stylistic strategy of the author. For this is precisely her point: the Balkans as a site of intense (conceptual and empirical) disorientation. And, finally, what does the etymology of the term ‘disorientation’ itself reveal?

YIANNIS PAPADAKIS
Lisa Dikomitis’ book *Cyprus and its places of desire: Cultures of displacement among Greek and Turkish Cypriot refugees* is one of the best ethnographies written on Cyprus in recent years. As an ethnographic account of Greek and Turkish Cypriot refugees who were displaced following the 1974 war in Cyprus, it provides a fine continuation of Peter Loizos’ work with refugees in Cyprus. One could argue that close to four decades after the island’s de facto partition, the refugees from both sides have moved on with their lives and recreated their sense of belonging and community in their new localities. But as Dikomitis shows this is only part of the story: the refugees are still engaged in place-making in an ongoing effort to create a sense of home away from home while, at the same time, retaining a strong sense of attachment to what they left behind.

The study is a comparative ethnography of two communities of refugees (a Greek Cypriot and a Turkish Cypriot), the Larnatsjiotes who were displaced from Larnakas tis Lapithou (an exclusively Greek Cypriot village) in 1974 and now live scattered in different parts of the south, and the Kozanlilar who were displaced at the same time from a number of neighbouring villages in Paphos and resettled in Kozan (the Turkish name for Larnakas tis Lapithou).

The book is an attempt to shed new light on a number of key questions regarding refugees, displacement and belonging: How do refugees create and recreate a sense of place through time? What is the role of borders in such processes? How do the senses of belonging that result from such processes, enhance, complicate, or potentially prevent reconciliation and peace? Though the book is clearly anthropological in its overall approach to studying the issue in question, the author draws on a diverse literature which crosses disciplinary boundaries. Having said this, the book is theoretically informed yet accessible, which likely will increase its appeal among a non-academic audience.

The fieldwork for the study extended over a period of six years and coincided with the opening of the checkpoints in 2003, allowing Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots to cross over to the other side of their country which was inaccessible to them for close to three decades. This coincidence provided Dikomitis with an unparalleled opportunity to study the refugees’ return visits to their homes and to spend two extensive periods living and doing fieldwork in Larnakas tis Lapithou/Kozan. Her own familial connection to the topic of her study – her father is a refugee
from Larnakas tis Lapithou – allowed her to live in the homes of her refugee relatives and to explore their understandings and feelings, their memories and hopes as these unfolded in the intimate conversations she had with them. Needless to say, her staying with relatives was not without its challenges. For instance, her decision, at some point, to live and carry out fieldwork in Kozan among the Kozanlilar created tension among some of her relatives who saw this as betrayal.

Dikomitis utilises ethnographic, qualitative methods to gather her data with much of it coming from close observation and informal conversations. Whether in people’s homes or during their visits across the border, Dikomitis provides the kind of ethnographic detail which helps highlight the texture of people’s feelings and understandings. Her use of what she calls ‘mental maps’ (these are maps people drew of their village from memory) allowed her to further engage with people and to explore place-making and memory productively.

Dikomitis’ book is deeply personal. Without any narcissistic tendencies, she inserts her own personal story in the ethnographic narrative in a way that enhances our understanding of the study and its particular unfolding. Her ability to write her own subjectivity in the ethnography and to reflect on her own hybrid identity – as both Cypriot and Belgian and in that sense both an insider and outsider – allows us to evaluate her role as ethnographer in the production of anthropological knowledge. Her ability to critically reflect on her positionality enriches the book and our understanding of the complex negotiations between ethnographer and people that shape much of the fieldwork experience and the ethnographic outcome.

The book consists of an introduction, a conclusion and six substantive chapters. In the first chapter (‘Nothing compares to our village’), Dikomitis explores the memories that the refugees from Larnakas tis Lapithou have of their occupied village and their pre-1974 life there. The chapter highlights the clear sense of injustice that the Larnatsjiotes feel for being the victims of the Turkish occupation.

In Chapter 2, titled ‘A Crack in the Border’, Dikomitis highlights the emotional intensity experienced by the Larnatsjiotes who visited their homes for the first time after the opening of the checkpoints. The idealised image they had of their village was shattered during these return visits where they found among others, destroyed churches, desecrated cemeteries, and strangers living in their homes.

The Larnatsjiotes’ experiences from these return visits are further explored in the following chapter titled ‘Pilgrims and Tourists’. Dikomitis describes these return visits as ‘pilgrimages’ and documents the Larnatsjiotes’ attempts to reconstruct their sense of community through different religious and secular rituals they perform (e.g. visiting religious sites or cemeteries, lighting candles). What they cannot have in the south since they are scattered throughout different places, the Larnatsjiotes attempt to create through their coincidental encounters with one another in their occupied village. This behaviour of the Larnatsjiotes (which is also reflected in that of most Greek Cypriot refugees who similarly engage in pilgrimages when they cross over) contrasts with the behaviour of most Turkish Cypriots who cross for a variety of different reasons (e.g. to work, to
obtain government documents or for medical reasons) and not just to see the homes they left behind in 1974. For Dikomitis the Turkish Cypriot visits are more of the ‘tourist’ type (e.g. shopping, visiting touristic places or going to restaurants), much akin to what one does when one visits another country.

In Chapter 4 (‘Under one Roof’) Dikomitis engages with different readings of the ‘border’. For Greek Cypriots, the ‘border’ is clearly a problem. They do not recognise it as a legal entity because it does not separate two recognised states. Crossing the border to visit one’s occupied village is not an easy decision for many Greek Cypriot refugees who do not wish to grant any form of recognition to the north; hence the refusal of many to cross. On the other hand, for Turkish Cypriots the border is a necessity which ensures their safety from the Greek Cypriot majority. But, as Dikomitis shows, the border also serves as a commercial frontier. Among the Greek Cypriots who cross, there are some who do so in order to shop for certain goods that they can find cheaper in the north while for Turkish Cypriots it is an opportunity to buy goods which are not available in the north. But despite its fluidity and contrary to common sense assumptions about contact, the border has helped strengthen and reify the ethnic stereotypes of one community about the other. As Dikomitis explains, many Greek Cypriot refugees who crossed over emphasised in their accounts the ‘backwardness’ of Turkish Cypriots (as compared to Greek Cypriots) and similarly Turkish Cypriots often pointed out the greediness and selfishness of Greek Cypriots. These various readings of the ‘border’ de-essentialise its meaning which is characterised by oppositional understandings as well as contradiction, ambiguity and paradox.

In Chapters 5 and 6, the author describes the life of the Turkish Cypriots who currently live in Kozan. Dikomitis shows us how the Kozanlilar have created a sense of community and home in Kozan despite being refugees from the south themselves. The Annan Plan which Greek Cypriots rejected included in its provisions the return of the village to Greek Cypriots. This, as Dikomitis explains, created a sense of insecurity and uncertainty among the Kozanlilar and encouraged them to re-emphasise their own refugee identity which was in many ways downplayed in the past in line with the official Turkish Cypriot narrative which underscores the permanency of the status quo. But unlike Greek Cypriots, the Kozanlilar accentuate their refugee identity to show that they have already suffered enough as refugees and are unwilling to move yet again. This is indeed an important point that Dikomitis makes: the Kozanlilar are not indifferent about their origins and their villages in the south as Greek Cypriots often assume; on the contrary, they make distinctions between themselves and the locals where they currently live while their nostalgic stories about their villages in the south oppose the official Turkish Cypriot rhetoric which stresses the need to forget their villages and homes in the south. Their refugee identities allow them to remember not only where they come from but to also lay claim to their current home.

The problem is, Dikomitis concludes, that both the Larnatsjiotes and the Kozanlilar consider the same place to be their home. For the former it is where they come from, the place of their origins and where they lived until they were forcibly displaced. For the latter, it is also their home,
their current home, which they do not wish to abandon in light of a future political settlement. As Dikomitis poignantly puts it: ‘They want to live under one roof with the Greek Cypriots, but in two separate rooms of the same house’, p. 136.

At the beginning of the book Dikomitis asks in reference to Larnakas tis Lapithou/Kozan: ‘What sense of belonging does the attachment to this particular village generate for the Larnatsjiotes and the Kozanlilar?’, p. 19. This is a question that shapes much of the author’s description and analysis throughout the book. She shows that the village is a ‘place of desire’ for both the Larnatsjiotes and the Kozanlilar and what it comes down to is a question of justice. For the Larnatsjiotes, justice has not been served, despite the fact that they can now cross and visit Larnakas tis Lapithou: Since they can only visit their homes as ‘tourists’ and since they continue to be refugees their suffering has not ended. For the Kozanlilar, justice can only be served by recognising their suffering as refugees, which started before 1974, as well as their current right to stay in Kozan. The book concludes that ultimately, the sense of injustice and suffering that both groups feel needs to be recognised in a potential future political settlement.

The book is highly accessible and readable without unnecessary jargon and makes a great read for anyone who wishes to understand something more about the contemporary lives of refugees in Cyprus. Admittedly, when I came to Chapters 5 and 6 of the book (the two chapters that focus on the current lives of the Kozanlilar in Kozan) I felt that there was some kind of discontinuity from the previous chapters which were more directly engaged with the book’s main theme. In these two chapters Dikomitis discusses the everyday lives of the Kozanlilar and how they reproduce a sense of community in Kozan through class, gender and age. Retrospectively, and after finishing the entire book, I realise that these two chapters do, indeed, add significantly to the book’s overall argument and, moreover, offer us an opportunity to have an ethnographic glimpse into a contemporary Turkish Cypriot community in the north, something quite rare in the ethnographic record of Cyprus.

At a time when ethnographic monographs are almost exclusively read by academics, ‘Cyprus and its places of desire’ offers an engaging ethnographic narrative with a literary flavour that will likely appeal to a wider audience. I highly recommend it to both scholars and students of the anthropology of Cyprus and to all who are looking for a fresh, fascinating look at one of Cyprus’ still pending issues.

Spyros Spyrou
This is a simple yet daring book. It is simple in that it attempts to explain the basics of the Cyprus problem to those who have no background knowledge and endeavours to do so in an even-handed way. Yet, it is daring because the details and sophisticated nature of the Cyprus problem is a minefield for those attempting to write such a book, as there is the constant threat that any interpretation by the author will make some readers take offence, deeming the author biased. In addition, writing such a book is a challenging task, since those with knowledge of the issues of the Cyprus problem will want more intricate details whereas the author has attempted to make a book that is interesting and accessible to anyone. By and large, the author has succeeded and made a book that is interesting, informative, and of use to those with no background in issues linked with the Cyprus problem.

Following the introduction, the book is structured into five chapters. Chapter 1 deals with the elementary background information on Cyprus, explaining the basic historical, ethnic, and political history of the island of Cyprus. This chapter gives a good overview of Cyprus, allowing readers to have a rudimentary background in issues related to the Cyprus problem, including knowledge of such influential political figures in Cyprus as Archbishop Makarios and Rauf Denktash. Chapter 2 explains the political history of Cyprus from the set-up of the Republic in 1960 to the events of 1974. Chapter 3 describes the political division of the island since 1974 and the many attempts to negotiate a solution to the Cyprus problem. Chapter 4 is dedicated to key issues under discussion regarding solutions on the island, such as the possibility of a federal solution, property issues, and the expulsion of settlers from Turkey. The final chapter 5 focuses on the issues that current and future settlement efforts will have to deal with.

Despite the strengths of the book, there are some elements that make it less successful than it could have been. My first reaction on reading the book’s title is that it is arrogant sounding. I later learned that ‘What Everyone Needs to Know’ is a series, so although it seemed to me a rather arrogant and condescending title, the title is not really the author’s fault, but I suspect there are others like myself who find the title of the work quite odd/awkward.

A major weakness of the book is the general lack of visual information. While the front cover is very attractive and the short length of the book is appreciated, it was rather astounding that there are only two maps and no tables or figures to be found in the book. As a quantitatively-minded
social scientist, I was hoping to see more visual representations of data on many of the topics that are discussed in the book or important topics that could be debated, such as the population of the island, comparisons of levels of development of the two major political entities on the island, and the various figures for estimating the population size of the settlers from Turkey. On occasion, the author does write about public opinion polls and such references would have been obvious things to illustrate by using tables or some other graphical expressions of data. However, such accompaniments are missing and make it a somewhat weaker book than it would have been if some tables, charts, or even cartoons had been added. As a result, the book is prose, uninterrupted by visual information.

There could have been additional records included in the book to make it a little more informative and allow readers to refer back to facts and figures from time to time. For example, a table with the dates of the presidencies of the two political entities on the island would have been good to allude to once in a while. A timeline would have also been appreciated, highlighting the major political events linked with the island. I would have liked to have seen mini-biographies for some of the major political actors on the island (apart from the short ones given in the text for Archbishop Makarios and Rauf Denktash) since it would probably have strengthened the book and made it a more self-contained introductory reader for the Cyprus problem.

There are some difficulties with language that I encountered, some of which is unavoidable and this is why anyone writing on the topic of the Cyprus problem almost always faces issues of language, as the author acknowledges in the introduction. For example, the author writes of a political entity on the island without referring to it as the ‘so-called’ or by delimiting the acronym with quotation marks. These very subtle cues will make anyone who is familiar with the Cyprus problem suspect prejudice, either wrongly or rightly and it can be appreciated that any author who writes on this issue will come under fire for whatever language is adopted and readers will imagine bias, just based upon the peculiarities of the language used in referring to basic things on the island. While the author concedes some difficulties with language usage linked with the Cyprus problem, he does not explain the logic behind why someone in Cyprus may disagree with ‘TRNC’ being referred to with or without quotation marks. Unfortunately, the author did not attempt to educate more thoroughly readers about the language and complications in using language in reference to the Cyprus problem. It seems that this would have been a good opportunity to inform readers about the problems and challenges that even the language of the Cyprus problem occasions.

One oddity that I found was the reference to ‘gypsies’. I was under the impression that this word was considered antiquated and/or derogatory, although the author used it several times without educating the reader as to what the proper language ought to be when referring to this group of people. The author gave up a chance to enlighten people in respect of the correct term to apply here, although choosing this word may indeed have been an editorial choice by Oxford or its proof-readers/editors, so it may not actually be something to be blamed on the author.

A shortcoming that I found in the book is that there is the tendency to boil down the
conflicts between the communities as purely a function of ethnicity. The author repeatedly refers to positions or attitudes that are either ‘Turkish Cypriot’ or ‘Greek Cypriot’. The difficulty in this is that it frequently treats the ethnicities as monoliths with uniform attitudes on aspects of the Cyprus problem. This is one of the risks of the simplification of the explanation of the Cyprus problem; attitudes and positions are many times explained in reduced terms, overlooking the variations of opinion that exist within the communities. Cleavages in opinions within the different communities are largely passed over.

There are many people who will find the book useful. It would obviously be helpful to diplomats and undergraduate students, or indeed anyone interested in learning the fundamentals of the Cyprus problem. I could envisage that this book would be attractive to people vacationing in Cyprus, if they are interested in the Cyprus problem, although it may be a difficult read for those without a social science background. In general, this is a decent straightforward reference book that those working on issues related to the Cyprus problem would most likely want to have at their disposal. I can imagine also that this book would be beneficial to those who teach courses that would entail discussions of the Cyprus problem with undergraduate students, although it may be a bit too basic for use in post-graduate courses on conflict, unless it is merely used as a starting point with more in-depth texts to support it.

All-in-all, the main weakness remains the lack of supporting visual data, but this is a worthy and interesting book. The idea of making a short and readable book that provides a basic introduction to the Cyprus problem is a good one and the author has succeeded in making the book come to life.

Craig Webster
This book is a welcome inter-disciplinary contribution on Cyprus. The title implies that the focus here is on the state of Cyprus and, without doubt, post-independence years are at the 'heart' of the edition. Regardless, the book embraces many works that go beyond the strictly-speaking Cypriot state. Indeed, the volume ends up covering Cyprus as a whole and the wider Cypriot economic, social, political, even cultural landscape. With Cyprus at the spotlight and limited comparative contribution in its entire, this book is destined to have a Greek-speaking audience that is almost exclusively interested in Cypriot affairs. However, this is a rare inter-disciplinary collection on the island’s affairs, which is relevant to a diverse number of disciplines but with an added focus on politics and international relations, not least due to the thematic centrality of the Cyprus problem. In this regard, the main readership here is a variety of scholars focusing on Cyprus, but those coming from a politics background will enjoy a far more interesting reading of the book as a whole. All the same, some of the contributions deviate from ‘traditional’ academic writing (taking into account pieces that have an added diplomatic or personal ‘flavour’ to them, for instance, part one, chapter 5 and part two, chapters 9 and 15) and, in this context, the edition opens up to a slightly wider audience too.

The volume is structured into five different sections. The first part is on Greek-Cypriot ‘society’, which incorporates a study of the bi-polarity of the party system (chapter 1), an investigation of media (chapter 2) and a critical contribution on how public discourse has impacted political competition in relation to European integration (chapter 3). In the rest of the section issues of identity are touched upon in reference to the political game (chapter 4), the 1974 war (chapter 5) and language policies of the Republic (chapter 6).

Section two, which is by far the longest one, debates a series of aspects of the Cyprus issue, covering: the diplomatic background at different stages of the conflict (e.g. chapters I, 6 and 10); various matters of the Republic of Cyprus, such as constitutional provisions (chapter 2) or the failure of bi-communal co-operation (chapter 4); the role of domestic actors, such as Makarios (chapter 9) or AKEL (chapter 13), but also external players, including Greece (chapter 6), United Nations (chapter 11) or the USA and Great Britain (chapter 14). Particularly interesting are the studies on the Turkish Cypriots (chapters 7 and 8) and the more theoretically-informed contributions (chapter 16).

The third part contemplates the relevance of the European Union (EU) to the country by focusing on the role of the EU on the Cyprus issue before (chapter 1) and after accession (chapter
The following ‘economic’ section concentrates on the Greek-Cypriot economy and how this is affected by EU integration (chapter 1) or the recent global financial crisis (chapter 2). The section concludes with a chapter that takes the interesting form of policy suggestions for the economy of a reunified country.

To finish, the book closes with a section on cultural matters, which reflects on Greek-Cypriot education (chapters 1 and 2) but also literature (chapter 3) and the illustrative arts (chapter 4).

This is a timely addition to the literature on Cyprus that is overall welcome. From the onset, an important weakness is the rather unclear and unjustified focus of the edition. In an effort to establish a link to the timing of publication and the fifty-year anniversary of the Republic, the title of the book suggests a focus on the state of Cyprus. Nevertheless, this is not followed throughout the edition, which hosts a variety of works on aspects falling outside of strictly-speaking state matters (and, indeed, makes the book far more interesting). In this regard, a clearer introduction of the focus, scope and limitations of the edition would have gone a long way towards a more explicit ‘roadmap’ for the reader.

That said, it is this effort to bring together different aspects of the domestic Cypriot mosaic, such as society, economy and culture, that is noteworthy and a rare contribution to an over-politicised literature on the island. Also, particularly welcome is the increased attention paid to more recent years, which have been marked by the European integration of the country and are still a comparatively ‘virgin territory’ of research. In this regard, the empirical input of the edition is often significant. Besides, it is also very refreshing to see works from a diverse range of authors, including academics, politicians or journalists.

Despite addressing a broad range of topics, it is fairly obvious that the majority of studies in the edition are preoccupied with the Cyprus issue (to a varied degree). Of course, this is somehow expected in a domestic scene that is dominated by the inter-communal dispute. Yet, this focus on the Cyprus issue, despite contributing to the understanding of the conflict and its evolution, often overshadows other aspects of domestic affairs. For example, chapters on party competition (section one) extensively debate the importance of the Cyprus issue but fail to provide any insight on other cleavages of the political debate (e.g. economy, the EU). At the same time, the investigation of the Cyprus problem – the single most popular topic of the literature on the country – restricts room for original contribution to the knowledge.

A particularly neglected topic in the edition is that of the Turkish Cypriots. Besides a few (undeniably fascinating, i.e. section two) studies exclusively devoted to the Turkish Cypriots, there is a serious lack of discussion of the issue. Instead, there is an increased focus on the Greek-Cypriot side (not least because of the monopolisation of the Republic by the Greek Cypriots), which nonetheless provides for incomplete accounts of several aspects of Cypriot affairs – for example, it would have been far more interesting to investigate economic or social matters on both sides of the ‘Green line’ (e.g. section on ‘society’ completely overlooks the Turkish Cypriots. In contrast, part two, chapter 17 on political competition is a remarkable example of successfully threading together the investigation of both communities).

What is also interesting in the edition is that contribution often lies in the personal viewpoint of the author (e.g. chapters written by politicians). But, this does not come cost-free: many chapters that rely heavily on personal experiences are victims of bias, which undermine the argument
credibility. In other instances, serious writing and structural problems and often lack of appropriate introduction of sources not only limit the quality of the argument but also the opportunities of readers to expand on their reading.

All in all, this is a noteworthy collection of essays on Cyprus, which does not come free of limitations, most importantly an unclear focus, pre-occupations of the mostly Greek/Greek-Cypriot authorship and often bad writing practice. Nevertheless, this is overall an empirically rich and rare inter-disciplinary contribution that succeeds in shedding light on a wide range of matters in the Mediterranean island.
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