

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'. In discussion with Raymond Firth, Peter Loizos considered the pros and cons of studying the village his father came from, which he had only visited once before he entered the LSE. In the event, he was treated as an 'insider', even if he remained, in some ways, a British professor to his relatives. Loizos mulled over the implications of these relations time and again in writing and in teaching, integrating for example the 'native anthropology' question as a staple part of his renowned 'anthropological methods' courses at the LSE.

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