READING THE PARATEXTS OF THE CYPRUS CONFLICT: POLICY, SCIENCE, AND THE PURSUIT OF 'OBJECTIVITY'*

Olga Demetriou

Abstract

This article addresses the way in which 'the Cyprus conflict' post-1974 has been constructed in studies that straddle the academic/political divide. Since their inception, analyses of the Cyprus conflict have striven to produce accounts that are insightful, impartial, yet at the same time engaged. The article focuses on authors who have had an impact on wider Greek-Cypriot public perceptions beyond academia and analyses their treatment of impartiality and engagement. What such works have in common, the article suggests, is the fact that they attempt to navigate the space between political analysis and political involvement, and therefore, the tension between impartiality and engagement is of primary importance in the interpretation of the discourse each deals with. Genette's concept of 'paratexts' is used to argue that strategies of managing the tension between impartiality and engagement as well as further tensions arising from it are evident in paratextual material, emphasising what perhaps might not be directly stressed in the text.

> But just as, in the present state of History, any political mode of writing can only uphold a police world, so any intellectual mode of writing can only give rise to a para-literature, which no longer dares speak its name.
> Roland Barthes, Writing Degree Zero (Barthes, 1999 [1953], p. 28)

Introduction

The concept of objectivity has been at the heart of postmodernist debate since its inception, and the conclusion that no analysis can be completely impartial no matter how scientific, long considered foregone. From this debate emerged a figure of the reliable/truthful scientist as one who is aware of their partiality and makes this awareness part of their commitment to science. Through acknowledging that this

possibility is probably the most promising avenue for academic debate to continue making inroads through increasingly complex questions, this article seeks to examine different forms in which acknowledgment of such partiality may take. By looking at both academic and more lay studies of the Cyprus conflict post-1974, it argues that despite such differences, when it comes to analyses of highly politicised issues such as this, one question that eludes the debate is the extent to which understandings of 'partiality' are intertwined with the choice between adopting the views of one or the other side. Without claiming impartiality for itself therefore, the article seeks merely to provide a critical assessment of how partiality due to an author's ethnic origins comes to be considered self-evident in vastly divergent works in the field which have in differing ways had an impact on the Greek-Cypriot public domain.

The Paratext as Threshold of Negotiation

Literary and cultural studies generally intersect on the theme of the production and reception of texts, with cultural norms or discourse being read as text.[1] Yet the importance of textual material in social research calls for a need to pay more attention to the social science text as text.[2] This article is the outcome of such an effort, where texts on the Cyprus problem, which have arisen out of a political science methodology (albeit applied in different forms) were examined for their treatment of the separation/cross-fertilisation between politics and science.[3]

The article deals with studies that exemplify this cross-fertilisation. While both 'politics' and 'science' have multiple meanings that span a range of concepts my primary aim in looking at these texts is to look for the ways in which the authors try to steer a course in the gap between being engaged researchers (and therefore, in different ways, 'doing politics') and being objective researchers (and, in different ways, 'doing science'). In addressing this issue, I borrow from literary theory to argue that the best place to uncover the link between ideological and scientific discourse is the paratext – that is, the text beside the text. In this way, the article explores the ways in which paratextual material belies the 'objectivity' that some of these scholarly texts purport to uphold. This is symptomatic, I further argue, of what, taken to the extreme, may be called a para-literature, whereby political and intellectual modes of writing interlace each other perpetuating the political discursive conflict on the level of analysis, including academic analysis. In other words, I try to explore what it is 'in the present state of Cypriot History' (to paraphrase Barthes) that renders analyses of politics political projects in themselves. In this process I examine the paratext as a device that helps uncover the structures through which the tension between politics and analysis is maintained.

According to Gerard Genette, 1997 [1987] the paratext is all that surrounds the main text: including titles, prefaces, footnotes, pseudonyms, and illustrations. My application of the notion here returns the 'paratext' from the literary to its socio-political context, from which Genette appears to have been inspired:

> "like in the words parafiscal and paramilitary the prefix suggests a threshold", he explains, "[it] indicates at once proximity and distance, similarity and difference, interiority and exteriority … a thing which is situated at once on this side and on that of a frontier, of a threshold or a margin, of equal status and yet secondary, subsidiary, subordinate, like a guest to his host, a slave to his master" (Genette, 1991, 271n).

It constitutes

> "a zone not just of transition but of transaction … [Because it is] more or less legitimated by the author, [it is] the privileged site of a pragmatics and of strategy, of an action on the public in the service, well or badly understood and accomplished, of a better reception of the text and a more pertinent reading – more pertinent, naturally, in the eyes of the author and his allies" (ibid., pp. 261-262).

In other words, the politics of the paratext rests on the authorial power guiding the practice of reading. In texts belonging to genres of social science, I would propose that the threshold the paratext marks is often that of objectivity. At stake in this politics is therefore the legitimation of the author's point of view as objective. This threshold of objectivity, I want to argue, is a conscious negotiation on the part of the authors between their own understanding of their subjective positioning and that of the objective analysis they are expected to present. In the texts I examine this negotiation is particularly pertinent because subjective positioning is not necessarily viewed in negative terms, but rather in terms of 'engagement'[4] – an engagement which is often presented as enhancing the insights presented. Thus, the paratext acts as the author's first gauge of 'objectivity' and 'engagement' in the text's journey into the public sphere.

Indeed, while this negotiation may also be found in the text per se, I would argue that the paratext is particularly interesting to look at because it is here that certain rules of formality or style can be transgressed. For example, in the dedication or acknowledgments text (see below) the 'author' is transformed into a social person with familial, friendship, or professional connections. In the footnotes one can relegate overly technical and/or predominantly personal information. In this information the negotiation between objectivity and engagement that is often already imbued in the text is made more apparent. This negotiation, I argue, lies at the heart of most political science studies of the Cyprus conflict and has by now become the characteristic of a discourse one might even call 'para-literary'.

Para-literary Politics and Cyprus

Barthes argues that "power or conflict … produce the purest modes of writing" (1999, p. 20) where language signifies commitment above all (ibid., pp. 26-28). Para-literature comes into being when intellectual and political modes of writing find themselves "in a complete blind alley … [leading] only to complicity or impotence, which means, in either case, alienation" (ibid., p. 28), i.e. of literature from its power and writers from the social conditions they write about. This concept of 'para-literature' is useful in pointing out the processes through which a conflict-centred discourse is led into such 'blind alleys'.

In this sense, the Cyprus conflict can be said to have given rise to modes of writing that have made 'purity' seem impossible in the sense that the language of science (signified by 'hard facts') is underpinned by political commitments focused on the cause of an imagined 'solution' to the conflict. This is not, however, solely the case only in the social sciences. Archaeologists and historians for example have argued for Greek or Turkish origins of the island and its people in antiquity (Karageorghis, 1982; Ortayli, 2007). On the other hand, seeking to break with this legacy, new forms of writing have appeared that instead abdicate the academic debate and seek to break out of the 'blind alley' using humour and ridiculing those 'hard facts', while equally guided by the imagination of a(nother) 'solution' (Papadakis, 2005). What seems problematic is not necessarily the lack of 'pure' literature which, I would argue against Barthes, is untenable. It is rather the fact that despite analysts' best efforts to answer the engagement/objectivity conundrum for decades now, Cypriot conflict studies are still plagued by the equation between partiality and ethnic origin.

This is not to say that such efforts have been futile. A number of discursive devices and themes pervading the literature have indeed been insightfully scrutinised. As recently pointed out, analyses of the Cyprus problem are often driven by the question of 'who is to blame' (Papadakis, 2005, p. xiii). Alternatively, they may rest their explanatory power on analytic concepts that appear to be, but are not, value-free. These may be terms that conflict-resolution analysts have called 'trigger words', the prime example being 'invasion' and 'peace operation' (Bowman, 2006, p. 124). Yet, less obvious terms can also serve this function: 'partition' and 'border' designate conditions on the ground that actors in the conflict may interpret as pertaining to state-hood and thus argue against or in favour ('border' for the Greek-Cypriot leadership means a 'state border', it can never convey a concept such as 'mental border' and is thus an unacceptable description for the Green Line). Even concepts such as 'democracy', 'law', or the 'international system' (and of course, not least, 'peace') become part of a rhetoric that adheres to specific ways of interpreting the situation and thus become laden with meaning. The making of

such discourses has been the focus of many studies of the conflict (Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis and Trigeorgis, 1993; Bryant, 2001; Constantinou and Papadakis, 2001; Demetriou, 2005; Ramm, 2006; Diez, 2002; Anastasiou, 2002). My point here is not to reiterate these but to emphasise that these prejudgments (in the Gadamerian sense) attend not only nationalist (or even non-nationalist) political rhetoric but also political analysis. Indeed, such prejudgments may be orally unpicked in informal settings but have not seriously been studied in depth, a failure, I would suggest that has somehow helped to render them 'expected', thus naturalising the equation between a researcher's ethnic origins and their prejudgments. Even though the analysis here does not aim to go into this in depth, I do want to show that these prejudgments are evident even in the paratexts of such studies, the objective of which is ultimately the authors' validation of their own subjective point of view.

The texts I focus on are exemplary because throughout the four decades that they span (concentrating the selection to analyses of the post-1974 situation) they have acquired a special place as academic texts in the (primarily Greek-) Cypriot public sphere, a place at the cusp between analysis and political intervention. Because of their placement there, their negotiation of objectivity and engagement becomes doubly pertinent. It is telling of the variability of understanding of these concepts that the main referent of the title in all of them is Cyprus – a signifier wide enough to cover the objectivity of 'truth' ('Cyprus' as a knowable entity) and engagement of ownership (the author's 'Cyprus' as knowledge to impart). The choice of the books presented below is thus guided by a concern to present an indicative sample – it by no means purports to be unique or irreplaceable by others' texts. However as an indicative sample of what has been produced by and through academic discussions on the Cyprus conflict that has crossed over (to variable degrees admittedly) into public debate and policy, the set of texts below covers a wide number of variables. The authors, Michael Attalides, David Hannay, Christopher Hitchens, Niyazi Kızılyürek, and Kypros Chrysostomides, have all played a role in the Greek-Cypriot public political sphere, intentionally or not, yet have all had different kinds of attachments to the Greek-Cypriot community. The texts discussed have all marked important points in their authors' careers yet were written in vastly different political junctures (and it is this quality as substantive texts of argumentation that classifies them apart from other works such as journal articles where similar negotiations may take place). The arguments are all ultimately guided by particular ideologies regarding the solution to the problem, yet come at their conclusions from the perspectives of different fields of expertise and modes of writing. It is in this sense an interesting fact that Hannay's memoir work, Hitchen's journalistic style and Kızılyürek's attempt at initiating public intellectual debate can be compared to Attalides' sociological study or Chrysostomides' legal treatise. Finally, they may have been intended for different audiences, local or foreign, academic and not, yet they have all become indispensable references to Cyprus

conflict studies.[5] It is all the more important to note that such referencing spans the various classifications one may choose for such studies: disciplinary, politically-oriented, or theme-driven. It is primarily these aspects of comparison that make the different ways of balancing engagement and objectivity in these different 'Cypruses' particularly interesting.

<center>**Versions of Cyprus**</center>

The International Politics of Engagement
Attalides' seminal work (Attalides, 1979) serves as a good starting point because of its strict objectivism that leaves little room for the objectivity/engagement negotiation I outlined above. The title Cyprus: Nationalism and International Politics, while free of the linguistic witticism adopted by later writers, which often hint at ideological standpoints (compare, for example Hitchens' alliterative Hostage to History dealt with below or more recently O'Malley and Craig's The Cyprus Conspiracy), is nevertheless geared towards answering the same key question of assigning blame for the 'current state of affairs' (understood in 1979, and from a Greek-Cypriot perspective, as the geographical division that followed the war). And while the author goes to great lengths to steer away from simplified answers, even suggesting that Cypriot nationalism is composed of three different types instead of being a straightforward phenomenon, its paratexts would suggest otherwise.

Thus, while the introduction strives to complicate hitherto-espoused explanations for the benefit of precise analysis, its highpoint is the castigation of an Economist journalist for their "simple … unsophisticated … attribution of causality" when claiming that the 1974 war was the result of "harassment of the Turkish minority by the Greek majority in the 1960s" (ibid., p. x), suggesting that perhaps the book is also a native attempt to rectify foreigners' misconceptions about the problem. In these short lines the researcher becomes 'engaged' and argues in favour for this engagement by pointing out how the findings of the study may be applied. Yet, he stakes this engagement on his native, Greek-Cypriot, identity.

This is mirrored in other paratextual material. The cover of the 2003 re-print (Attalides, 2003) was transformed (one assumes by the publisher) from a questionably neutral map of the island reminiscent of the flag of the Republic minus the olive branch of the 1979 original into a much more politically explicit statement of who is to blame. It consists of a photo showing Archbishop Makarios in amicable conversation with Henry Kissinger, the US Secretary of State in 1974, who personifies for a number of writers, journalists, and Greek-Cypriot lobby groups the face of US responsibility of the north's occupation by Turkish troops.[6]   Indeed Kissinger's statements are cited in the conclusions as exemplary of the shady US policy on Cyprus (ibid., pp. 188-191). In a text concerned primarily with tracing the

history of the division using concrete sociological data – a highlight being table three showing the rise in the total number of Turkish and Greek villages and the decline of mixed ones during the twentieth century (ibid., p. 89) – this ending chapter is one of the few places where the author's personal stake in explaining the conflict (and finding a way out of it) is explicitly acknowledged:

> "An involved observer with some training in detachment cannot wait for the statesmen and politicians to open their archives before attempting to interpret the maiming of a minor but important society … [the facts] present evidence of the dangers to humanity, particularly to that part of it that lives in small and defenceless states and of the arrogantly destructive consequences of the ways in which the dominant of 'imperial' states of the world pursue what their leaders define as their interests. In the process, it was necessary to grapple with the problem of how people living in a country with a potential of satisfying all their real human needs come to behave in most self-destructive ways, caught-up in world power games which they only now begin to understand" (ibid., p. 180, emphasis added).

Objectivity and engagement are articulated in terms of 'involvement' and 'detachment' and their negotiation allows the analysis to move from the calculation of ethnic separation to the moralisation of superpower politics. The point about this rather early work in Cypriot conflict studies is that the paratextual negotiation of objectivity and engagement has clearly struck a chord with the text's audiences over the years, which included not only students and researchers working on the conflict but also the Greek-Cypriot political establishment, which its author later joined as a highly-esteemed diplomat. This is because the negotiation allowed the presentation of a political point as an academic one: that the root causes of the conflict were not so much to be found in the 'nature' of Cypriots, who had for many years lived together in peace, but in the import of nationalism from the motherlands, and the superpower interests in the region. The work thus becomes representative of the tendency in Cypriot studies to use scholarly work for political purposes[7] – even where this use arises not from the text itself but from the environment in which it is received.

In this political mode of writing the predictive and prescriptive scope of the writings is prevalent, and the analysis often takes on the double task of explaining phenomena and their implications for the future, as well as of providing suggestions to policy-makers and social actors for attaining that future. This is true not only of 'native' works but also of those by foreigners, lending the negotiation of engagement and objectivity an 'international politics' dimension whereby the 'native' or 'foreigner' identity of the author is presented as key to reaching a correct balance. Yet in practice, this balance has hardly been attained, leaving instead the equation between 'native' and 'partial' unquestioned.

It is indicative of the prevalence of this politicisation of writing, that it has in fact become a distancing technique to point out one's 'foreign-ness', even in the most political of works. Consider for example David Hannay's remarks prefacing his 2005 Cyprus: The Search for a Solution, an analysis largely borne out of his experiences as Britain's Special Representative for Cyprus:

> "Most of what has been written about Cyprus has been the work of members of one or other of the two embattled communities … As such they are at best distorted by that prism, at worst little better than polemic and propaganda. And the non-Cypriots who have ventured into the field seem to have fallen prey to the same distortions, often appearing as little more than apologists for one side or the other." (Hannay, 2005, p. viii, emphasis added).

The paradigm set here is one where engagement is equated with distortion and that distortion comes to define what is native. What is most problematic about this discourse is that it appears to be a legitimate perspective not only in lay memoir works such as this, but in political research as well. Thus, the wider point raised for academia concerns the absence of questioning native-ness in political science.

The implications of this question can clearly be understood by comparison to the way in which this question of native analysis has been dealt with in postcolonial anthropology. Despite arguments that the debate on 'native anthropology' is on the whole rather futile and has often been misguided (Fabian, 1983; Narayan, 1993; Argyrou, 1999; Hastrup, 1993; Gupta and Ferguson, 1991), the value of the anthropological arguments aired in the debate has been the fact that they have always involved a critical view of 'identity' and its markers, especially those related to power differences, such as ethnicity. In this sense, I think that the absence of similar debates in other disciplines, and especially in political science, where analyses are produced that are often based on anecdotal evidence collected by researchers in their capacity as 'natives' is equally damaging mainly because it 'dares not' acknowledge the political conditions of production of these analyses. Whereas in anthropology it was the debate on 'native anthropology' that ended up reifying 'native' identities, it seems that it is precisely this reification that makes such a debate appear obsolete for political analysis. This is problematic especially when this analysis sets off to examine 'conflicts', by which I mean situations where different 'discourses', 'modes of being', or 'understanding of the world' are opposed to one another. Thus, what is at stake for me in examining such modes of writing from the prism of 'objectivity' and 'engagement' is the negotiation of other conflicts through the text: between weak and powerful, victim and perpetrator, coloniser and colonised, righteous and wrongful, knowledgeable and naïve: all summed up in the negotiation between the scientist and the person who is sensitive to the problems he (in the cases examined here) describes.

These insights from postcolonialism are particularly pertinent in the consideration of David Hannay's work because they help illustrate the circularity of the argument being made. By discrediting 'native' interpretations (a claim that essentialises the notion of 'native' rather dangerously) the author attempts to legitimise his own involvement in 'the search for a solution', which has been criticised by local politicians as symbolic of malevolent foreign meddling in Cypriot affairs. This ends up equating 'native' to 'nationalist' and renders outsiders' viewpoints as the first prerequisite for objectivity, something which is nevertheless presented as always under threat of being contaminated by 'native' biases. This circularity indicates, beyond its colonialist presumption (which in itself also helps reify the identity of the coloniser), the 'blind alley' that the search for objectivity represents in Cyprus conflict studies and the role that the notion of ethnic origins has played in leading it there.

Pride and Politics
At the same time both of the accounts cited above indicate that aside from its link to ethnicity, the questioning of objectivity has, to varying degrees, been problematised, yet questions about the conditions of authorship were never explicitly asked. Such questions would include the identification of the position from which one is writing and the audience that one is addressing, the relationship between the authors' social and political positioning, and their analytical conclusions, the extent to which the author's experience of events is the basis on which the validity of the account is claimed, the relationship between the analysts' 'expert' persona and the role they often perform as 'public intellectuals'. These questions are largely about exploring 'native' categories in a critical way, which would almost inevitably have led to reflexivity entering the discussion. However, in not being explicitly addressed, this inquiry was foreclosed, even before the work of reflexivity had begun.

Kızılyürek's *Ολική Κύπρος* [Cyprus as a Whole], one of the most discussed works amongst Greek-Cypriot analysts (academics and intellectuals) at least, of the Cyprus conflict, written in 1990, is indicative of such a reflexive attempt because it opens with the following disclaimer:

> "This book is not a scientific monograph. Even though it contains texts, which could form the basis of scientific work, the book in its totality is a collection of thoughts born mainly on the occasion of studies, speeches, and interviews." (Kızılyürek, 1990, p. 9).[8]

Considering that the book was published in Nicosia, in Greek, by a non-academic press, and that apart from the mentioned interviews, presentations and commentaries, it also contains excerpts from an analysis published earlier in Turkish that drew on Marxist theory to explain the development of Turkish-Cypriot

and Greek-Cypriot nationalisms (Kızılyürek, 1988), the emphasis placed in this statement (of being political and proud of it) is noticeable. Its aim, I would argue, is not simply to cast the book as 'non-academic' but rather to set-up a distinction between 'scientific' (epistemonikés) and 'non-scientific' analyses. It is thus an epistemological claim about this particular work that also alludes to the conditions of epistemology on the Cyprus issue (i.e. the conditions of production of knowledge about the Cyprus problem, which also implies a contemplation of how this knowledge comes to be). This claim is made explicit in the following sentences:

> "I tried to write this volume using the little Greek that I have and a lot of help from my Greek-Cypriot friends. This is, I believe the most substantial message.
> You will find here the opinions (apópsis) of a Tukish-Cypriot writer. At the same time – and this is the most important thing – you will find the mind-set (psicholoyía) and the vexations (provlimatismí) of a Turkish-Cypriot. Because I am still 'idealist' enough to believe that this is the time for the Cyprus problem to be solved within the space of Cypriot intellectual thought (tou pnévmatos ke tis sképsis ton Kipríon). Up until now, we have been talking more about the technical formulae of the solution and less about people themselves and their input." (Kızılyürek, 1990, p. 9, emphasis added).

In making explicit the publication's political aims, this passage clarifies, I think, the author's perception of the distinction between 'scientific' and 'political' writing encountered in the previous quote (note though the absence of the word 'political' there). And it is exactly the need to make this distinction explicit that reveals the blurred background against which the book was written. The insistence on speaking as a Turkish-Cypriot to a specifically Greek-Cypriot audience is also meant to highlight the goals of this intervention, while at the same time providing an explanation for the perpetuation of this blurring of boundaries – the 'analytical' and the 'political' can only be equated in a Cypriot epistemology that is communally enclosed, and from which inter-communal communication is excluded. By initiating such communication, the understanding of 'epistemology' is opened up, yet in order to initiate this process, a self-defined 'non-scientific' but 'political' mode of writing must be adopted.

What the introduction does, in effect, is to announce the entry of intellectual contemplation into the public domain. The phrase "within the space of Cypriot intellectual thought" could also at first glance have been translated as "according to the spirit and the thoughts of Cypriots". But, belying the author's introductory linguistic disclaimer, the phrasing in Greek links the intellectual and public domains; and does so against that of official politics and high-level negotiations. Yet in announcing this entry 'science' is denounced in favour of politics – the boundary is pointed out and adopted through an argument that seems to be asking for its reconfiguration.

The paradox set up in this argument has had wide repercussions on both Cypriot academia and politics. Five years after its publication, it spurred a debate widely-publicised in the Greek-Cypriot media, when the then Minister of Education, argued for the withdrawal of the book from the library of the University of Cyprus, on the basis that it insulted (Greek-Cypriot) 'national interests'. This caused University authorities, as well as a number of Greek-Cypriot intellectuals to take part in the debate, widening it over a range of issues, including the University's autonomy from the government, the limits of freedom of speech, the meanings of 'propaganda' and 'censorship', and the politics of bi-communalism (i.e. the promotion of communication between Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot citizens, at that point still separated by a highly militarised and virtually closed partition line). What seems to have been taken for granted in this debate was the fact that the identity of the author as a Turkish-Cypriot was an integral part of the arguments advanced. Yet the political arguments made in this publication at the time represented the views of an individual, who, within the Turkish-Cypriot community espoused the political views of a relatively small opposition against official Turkish-Cypriot political positions. Furthermore, the author's positions, which promoted greater understanding and concerted political action between the two communities, and which rejected the nationalism cultivated over the previous decades in the two sides, were also espoused by a number of Greek-Cypriot activists and intellectuals, some of whom took an active part in the debate. Thus, paradoxically, of the two introductory remarks the author had made, the separation between 'science' and 'politics' disappeared in the debate, while the equation between 'ethnic' identity and the conflated understanding of political/scientific analysis was reinforced.

Indeed, it is striking that whatever attempts at reflexivity have been undertaken in analyses of the conflict thus far, appear to take as their central point of reference the author's 'ethnic' identity, as if it is this that above all determines their writing and on the basis upon which the analysis should be read and judged. I see this insistence as a social phenomenon in itself, directly linked to the legacy of the conflict and specifically the ways in which 'Turkish-' and 'Greek-' Cypriot identities have solidified over the years.[9] Based on this, I would argue that if print capitalism and nationalism developed in parallel and fed off each other as Anderson postulated (Anderson, 1991), the possibilities of articulating perspectives outside this structure of connection need to be re-thought. The specific book is important in this sense because it uses language (Greek) to address an audience limited by ethnicity and class (Greek-Cypriot intellectuals and analysts) and asks them to imagine their 'other' community by essentialising the ethnicity of its author (i.e. taking his Turkish-Cypriotness as the essence of his identity).

Unacknowledged Legislation
Another way in which the link between ethnic connection and objectivity was made was by supplanting the lack of native-ness with the ability to empathise. In this

sense, one of the most explicit claims to objectivity in analysing the Cyprus problem was made against the claim of 'detachment', yet by an 'outsider'. Hitchen's Hostage to History (originally published as Cyprus) is to date one of the most popular accounts of the conflict, having gone through two new editions under an updated title (Hitchens, 1984, 1989, 1997). Much in the manner of Attalides, Hitchens opens his book by criticising in his preface Nancy Crawshaw's academic analysis (as opposed to the journalistic account of The Economist) of Greek-Cypriot aspirations for enosis as the primary cause for the division of the island (Crawshaw, 1978). He argues that "these consoling explanations make it easier for those responsible to excuse themselves and for the rest of the world to forget about Cyprus" (Hitchens, 1984, p. 10). And he continues to offer his own claim to objectivity:

> "Even from this perspective [having seen the 'desecration of the island's beauty], I have still had the privilege of coming to know and to love another people. I believe that I can be objective about the politics of Cyprus, but I most certainly cannot be indifferent or dispassionate. I have tried to preserve this distinction in the following pages, where I argue that the Cypriots are not, as many believe, the chief authors of their own misfortunes. I believe that I may tell a truer story if I admit at once to a sense of outrage which Durrell and his emulators have been spared" (ibid., p. 28, emphasis added).

The reference to Durrell is to be read, it seems to me, as a criticism of the ethnocentrism that pervades Bitter Lemons, a literary work that centres on Durrell's 'detached' experience of Cypriot politics (Durrell, 1957). Yet I would argue that Hitchens was actually not as impartial as he strove to be – he wrote the book as a direct protest against the invasion of the island, and while conceding early on that "I have no difficulty in sympathizing with Turkish Cypriot fears, and I do not believe that they were manufactured out of thin air" (Hitchens, 1984, p. 40), he does not feel the need to qualify his sympathy with Greek-Cypriot pain – as if the latter was self-evident to a greater extent, as if the key to understanding the conflict is really understanding the legitimacy of Greek-Cypriot nationalism, after it has been purged of the monstrosity of Sampson. In the paragraph that precedes the conclusion to the book he says:

> "… Cyprus remains as the symbol of unresolved Greek and Turkish conflict. It symbolizes, for the Greeks, what Andreas Papandreou has called 'the shrinkage of Hellenism' – the pushing of Greeks and Greek life out of Asia Minor and Constantinople that took place in living memory." (ibid., p. 156).

We are never told what it symbolises for the Turks.

In this sense, I would argue that this study marks a point in Cypriot conflict studies when the potential for popularity began spiralling towards a decreasing stylistic difference between 'analysis' and 'propaganda'. Policy-focused research

thus also turned to explaining (in addition to suggesting) policy positions – and as Greek-Cypriot policy came to rely increasingly on legal norms, so did analysis adopt an increasingly legalistic language. In this sense, it could be said that what began with Hitchens' effort at entering the public sphere as an intellectual – what he elsewhere called an 'unacknowledged legislator' (Hitchens, 2000) – turned into the intellectualisation of state rhetoric through the language of law in order to facilitate its take-over of the public sphere.

One of the best examples of such work is Chrysostomides' impressive Study in International Law, representing a hybrid kind of literature: in form a well-researched academic study, but of yet unmistakably propagandistic content. By 2003, when their author became Government Spokesman, his arguments could easily be read as an explanation of the Republic's government policy. In it, he argues against the Turkish 'invasion' of 1974 and the legitimacy of the 'TRNC'. He also explains the legality of the Republic's EU membership application (still a matter of political debate at that point) and the international legal validity of almost all major Greek-Cypriot policies pursued thus far.

As with Attalides' work, explicit negotiation of objectivity and engagement here is almost absent, and when present relegated entirely to paratexts. In the preface, for example, the author argues:

> "in a primitive society a political problem can be solved (by) … the force of arms … In developed societies of the 21st century, as in mathematics, if a proper solution to a problem is desired, it can only be achieved if based on some elementary axioms or principles" (Chrysostomides, 2000, p. x, emphasis added).

The value-laden qualification 'developed' is juxtaposed to 'mathematics', which here stands for 'scientific purity', making the argument that will be developed appear 'purely' logical. Thus, he then explains that these axioms and principles entail:

(i)   the establishment of the true facts and
(ii)   the ascertainment of the rules by which a problem is to be solved

before concluding this logical progression of thought:

> "It seems, therefore, that by a simple process of elementary logic, if a lasting and proper solution is to be achieved to a problem, principles or axioms cannot be pushed aside, they must constitute its underlying basis." (ibid.).

This conclusion is proven to be watertight by applying and dismissing, in true scientific fashion, the counterargument, namely that realpolitik sometimes clashes

with principles and axioms through the statement that it is "difficult to comprehend why it [realpolitik] must prevail over rules, principles, and axioms" (ibid., p. xi). Pushing this argument to the margin of the preface makes reference to counterarguments throughout the volume almost obsolete, since the reader should be convinced of the author's scientific rigour through this logical presentation of method. Despite this, counterarguments are presented at various points, where reference is made to 'the Turkish viewpoint' mostly represented by Necatigil. An example is the mention of the "position taken by the Turkish side" where the author claims that "it is very indicative that Turkish Cypriot writer Z. Negatigil [sic] attempts to base this argument (i.e. that the state of the Republic of Cyprus collapsed in 1963) solely on Turkish sources, or writers known for their obvious bias towards Turkish allegations" (ibid., p. 97). These arguments are then dismissed as "legal improvisations". This example shows an awareness of how paratextual material, in this case references, can indicate bias. And this further explains the emphasis placed throughout the book on referencing and engaging in depth with international standards of law, international case law, and international legal process – even though Necatigil is one of only two Turkish names in the reference list.

The rightfulness of the Greek-Cypriot position is proven on this basis, specifically concerning the issues that have over the years spearheaded governmental arguments against the other side in the international arena:

(i)   the uninterrupted continuation of the state of the Republic since 1960
(ii)   the illegality of the invasion and occupation of the north by Turkish troops
(iii)   the continuation of the violation of a number of personal rights by Turkey, including the right to property, and freedom from ill-treatment
(iv)   the violation of the Geneva Convention by Turkey with respect to the settling of populations in the north
(v)   the Greek-Cypriot stance in high-level negotiations since 1974, and
(vi)   the application of the Republic for accession to the EU.

Having proven this rightfulness, the book concludes with a re-statement of the point made in the preface, only now in starker terms:

> "Let nobody hide behind the neutral allusion: 'but, there are always two sides and two versions to a dispute'; Nazi Germany also had its own version of events and arguments during the Second World War, only one though, the other [sic] version, was right." (ibid., p. 494).

Finally, the objectivity of the author's position is repeated in the postscript, in which the decision of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of Cyprus against Turkey, which was reached between completion of writing and publication, proves according to the author:

> "that a continuing policy of ethnic cleansing is pursued by the occupant power. The ECourtHR will, most probably, soon have the last word on this fourth Cyprus State Application against Turkey" (ibid., p. 506).

The point made here is that the European Court could in fact have easily agreed with the author not only on the points mentioned in their decision – which indeed found Turkey to be in violation of a number of fundamental human rights (ECtHR, 2002) – but on each and every point made in the book.

In presenting objectivity in these terms, the question of engagement comes full circle – it becomes obsolete, and is thus silenced. Legislation is drafted in to perform the work of truth, but the politics behind the legal positions adopted remain unacknowledged.

Signing Off: The Personal and the Political

One place where the negotiation between engagement and objectivity may most lucidly and succinctly be compared is the dedication page. In each of the works it speaks to the author's politics of this negotiation and in this sense, a brief comparison will help summarise the points I have been trying to make.

Of the five, two in fact have no dedication-proper. Attalides' work lacks a dedication page altogether. The absence, I would argue, can be read as an indication of a lack of attachment to a particular person whose perspective might be seen to have guided the work.[10] This is in line with the author's key message throughout the book, that things are far more complicated than any single interpretation might suggest. It is this lack of attachment that anchors objectivity; in the negotiation between the two, 'detachment' is seen to weigh more heavily than 'involvement', at least in theory (op. cit.).

Kızılyürek has similarly no dedication, but has reserved instead the page for a quote that despite being unattributed, comes from Victor Hugo. It reads in Greek "nothing is stronger than an idea whose time has come". In this case, the quote seems to underscore the urge prevalent throughout for developing new political intellectual thought. A political-literary dedication thus appears much more appropriate than a personal one. But in fact this renders the refusal to adopt an 'objective' viewpoint more legitimate because it is being sanctified by a great author.

In Chrysostomides' work, on the other hand, the dedication page is highly political and speaks most loudly of the author's negotiation of objectivity and engagement. Written in ancient-style Greek, which harks back to the notion of Cyprus' Greek cultural heritage, it signals that the book was written "Patr*í* mn*í*mis h*á*rin", "for the sake of remembering the fatherland". The dedication of the book to the fatherland underlies the point made throughout the book, of the rightfulness of

Greek-Cypriot positions. The dedication signals the basis of this conviction, i.e. that the author belongs to this specific fatherland, but at the same time pushes it to the margin, making it appear irrelevant for the scientific analysis that follows. Yet the trace that remains in the dedication "to the fatherland", I would argue, is a trace of reflexivity in spite of everything: a trace of the author's awareness that this could be read as a nationalist text – a possibility counteracted by the insistence on the righteousness of patriotism and victimhood (of the fatherland in danger of being forgotten).

Interestingly, the two 'proper' dedications in the works examined belong to the two foreign authors. And it would seem that this foreign identity calls for engagement and objectivity to be negotiated primarily in terms of their insider/outsider status.

In Hitchens' account, the dedication page explains that "this book is for Eleni and for Laurence Stern (1929-79)" (1984, p. xi). This brings together the author's personas as engaged insider (married, at that time, to a Greek-Cypriot) and objective outsider (mentored by a respected authority on the issue, who pioneered the specific line of argumentation).

And finally, in Hannay's study, where passionate involvement of any kind is derided, the comparatively lengthy dedication describes a dispassionate involvement that has even so, proved too much: "To my wife, my children and my grandchildren who uncomplainingly put up with my absences even after I was meant to have retired." (op. cit., p. vi). This Cyprus is an imposed professional commitment, making the author's own commitment so professional as to be juxtaposed to the personal.

What Cyprus means to each author is vastly different, yet a first hint already given in these tribute pages.

Conclusion

The works I have looked at here are not the only examples of how objectivity and engagement are negotiated, nor are they the only ones where this is done paratextually. As indication, suffice it to mention counterpart works concentrating on the north, or addressing a Turkish-Cypriot audience: Necatigil, as Chrysostomides insightfully points out (a further trace of his awareness of his own engagement, one might claim) has used legal arguments to promote state rhetoric in the north in a similar fashion (Necatigil, 1993); Harry Scott Gibbon's Genocide Files (Gibbons, 1997), although much more clearly biased than Hitchens, was written as a foreign correspondent's account of the conflict and treads the line

between empathy and exactness; Tony Angastiniotis, who, like Kızılyürek before him, is known primarily as a Cypriot who chose to live in the other side, aims to speak as a Greek-Cypriot to a Turkish-Cypriot audience (even if in addition to a Greek-Cypriot one) (Angastiniotis, 2005; Angastiniotis, 2004); and Vamik Volkan's groundbreaking psychological study is centred on the years of Turkish-Cypriot oppression (Volkan, 1979) and has placed its author since then in an ideal position to advocate political positions abroad using a scientific argumentation basis (Volkan, 2008). Equally, one may argue that this collection merely proposes a mirror image for a Turkish-Cypriot audience where no perfect 'opposition' exists. Instead, Attalides' book could be argued to have shaped Turkish-Cypriot academic discourse to a great extent, as did Kızılyürek's works in English and Turkish – which in turn goes to show that the books examined are not the only works of the cited authors showing this negotiation. One might also look at even earlier studies to uncover different connections (Stephens, 1966; Kyriakides, 1968; Salih, 1968; Markides, 1977). But, in as far as these works are in different ways the hallmarks of the authors' works on Cyprus, they are also the hallmarks of academic engagement with politics and vice-versa.

By looking at these texts I firstly tried to show that political modes of writing need not be confined to obvious types of propaganda – indeed my main argument has been that these politics are often pushed to the margin. At the same time, however, I have tried to argue that this pushing to the margin is indicative of a conscious negotiation on the part of the author between concepts of 'engagement', required for political positioning, and 'objectivity', required for scientific analysis. The literature on the Cyprus conflict has largely been a situated literature, perhaps precisely because its political point of focus has often required the explication of the analysts' political ideology. The boundary between political writing and analytical writing has thus proven very difficult to maintain. So much so that the most successful attempts to uphold it have entailed the abandonment of the claim of objectivity and at points to scientific analysis as well.

Thus, one final point to mention that comes out of the comparison of the paratexts in these works is that the one that appears to be most effective in terms of methodological and conceptual innovation is the one which is most obviously partial – the one that claims a specific standpoint and a specific politics, by sidelining claims to 'objectivity'. It can always be claimed of course, that to take so explicitly a stance against one's own objectivity is to veil the suggestion that one is so objective as to be able to address their own partiality – which is partly the point Hitchens makes also. But I think what both claims are indicative of in the context of Cypriot conflict studies, is that despite the definitions of both 'objectivity' and 'engagement' in academic and/or scientific terms, both remain tightly bound to ethnic understandings of identity. It is in this sense that an intervention that

questions this understanding of insiders and outsiders, in the manner that the anthropological investigation of 'what is native' has done, becomes relevant.

———————————

———————————

Notes

1. An exemplary theme is intertextuality (Allen, 2000), where the techniques of exploring the relation of one text to another have been applied to psychoanalysis (Kristeva, 1980), postcolonialism (Bhabha, 1994), and anthropology (Clifford and Marcus, 1986; Hanks, 2000).

2. Recent debates about the meaning and objectives of literature reviews, the prime example of the treatment of scientific text as text, are indicative of this importance (Boote and Beile, 2005; Maxwell, 2006).

3. This is presented in Demetriou, 2004.

4. Where I use the words 'objectivity' and 'engagement' in quotes, it is to indicate that I refer to the (author's) perception of these concepts rather than to them as free-standing qualities.

5. An exception to this might arguably be Kızılyürek's text, because it is written in Greek, which as one reviewer correctly pointed out raises additional questions. However, the ways in which it compares with the different texts on other grounds mentioned was felt to merit inclusion in the sample.

6. See Hitchens, 2002; O'Malley and Craig, 1999; Yennaris, 2004; and [http://www.lobbyforcyprus.org/press/press2001/Gu260201.htm]. The basis of this claim is the fact that Kissinger had been informed of Turkish plans to attack following the Greek-inspired coup against Makarios and did not thwart them. This thesis, one of Attalides' reviewers explains, was first expounded by Lawrence Stern in 1975, and then by Hitchens in an article preceding the Cyprus book (Parker, 1980), a fact that beautifully illustrates the processes through which a specific discourse developed.

7. Bryant makes a parallel point about Greek-Cypriot education during the colonial period when she says that the main point was to teach truths already known (Bryant, 2004, pp. 129-155). Significantly, she also explains that the purpose was to create ethnic subjects.

8. This quote, as well as subsequent ones, is my translation.

9. Indeed, the very fact that some readers might find the argument facile proves the point, I think, that it has come to be expected that an author's ethnic identity would be of paramount significance to the work produced and the ways in which it is read.

10. The same seems to hold for the acknowledgements, where the four people acknowledged as having read the manuscript (Costas Carras, Niels Kadritzke, Peter Loizos and Tassos Papadopoulos) come from different national backgrounds and political ideologies, and are not responsible, it is emphasised in one of the few witticisms in the book, "for any errors of omission or commission" (op. cit., p. vi).

Bibliography

Allen, G. (2000) Intertextuality. London, Routledge.

Anastasiou, H. (2002) 'Communication across Conflict Lines: The Case of Ethnically Divided Cyprus', Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 39, No. 5, pp. 581-596.

Anderson, B. (1991) Imagined Communities. London, Verso.

Angastiniotis, T. (2004) Voice of Blood. Documentary, Cyprus.

———. (2005) Trapped in the Green Line: "The Story Behind the Documentary Voice of Blood". Nicosia, Rustem Bookshop and Publishing Ltd.

Argyrou, V. (1999) 'Sameness and the Ethnological Will to Meaning', Current Anthropology, Vol. 40, pp. 29-41.

Attalides, M. (1979) Cyprus, Nationalism and International Politics. London, Macmillan Press.

———. (2003) Cyprus: Nationalism and International Politics. Mannheim and Möhnesee, Bibliopolis.

Barthes, R. (1999 [1953]) Writing Degree Zero. New York, Hill and Wang.

Bhabha, H. (1994) The Location of Culture. London, Routledge.

Boote, B.N. and Beile, P. (2005) 'Scholars before Researchers: On the Centrality of the Dissertation Literature Review in Research Preparation', Educational Researcher, Vol. 34, No. 6, pp. 3-15.

Bowman, J. (2006) 'Seeing What's Missing in Memories of Cyprus', Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 119-127.

Bryant, R. (2001) 'Justice or Respect? A Comparative Perspective on Politics in Cyprus', Ethnic and Racial Studies, Vol. 24, No. 6, pp. 892-924.

———. (2004) Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus. London, IB Tauris.

Chrysostomides, K. (2000) The Republic of Cyprus: A Study in International Law. Hague, M. Nijhoff.

Clifford, J. and Marcus, G.E.(eds). (1986) Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Constantinou, C. and Papadakis, Y. (2001) 'The Cypriot State(s) in Situ: Cross-Ethnic Contact and the Discourse of Recognition', Global Society, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 125-148.

Crawshaw, N. (1978) The Cyprus Revolt: An Account of the Struggle for Union with Greece. London/Boston, G. Allen and Unwin.

Demetriou, O. (2004) The EU and the Cyprus Conflict: A Review of the Literature. EUBORDERCONF Working Papers Series. Birmingham, University of Birmingham.

———. (2005) The EU and the Cyprus Conflict: Discourses on the 'Border', the 'Conflict' and the 'EU'. EUBORDERCONF Working Paper Series. Birmingham, University of Birmingham.

Diez, T. (ed). (2002) The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict, Postmodern Union. Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Durrell, L. (1957) Bitter Lemons. London, Faber and Faber.

ECtHR, European Court of Human Rights (2002) Case of Cyprus V. Turkey, Merits, Judgment of 10 May 2001, Appl. No. 25781/94: ECHR Reports of Judgments and Decisions.

Fabian, J. (1983) Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object. New York, Columbia University Press.

Genette, G. (1991) 'Introduction to the Paratext', New Literary History, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 261-272.

———. (1997 [1987]) Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Gibbons, H.S. (1997) The Genocide Files. London, Charles Bravos.

Gupta, A. and Ferguson, J. (1991) 'Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference', Cultural Anthropology, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 6-23.

Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis, M. and Trigeorgis, L. (1993) 'Cyprus: An Evolutionary Approach to Conflict Resolution', The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 340-360.

Hanks, W.F. (2000) Intertexts: Writings on Language, Utterance, and Context. Oxford, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Hannay, D. (2005) Cyprus: The Search for a Solution. London, IB Tauris.

Hastrup, K. (1993) 'Native Anthropology: A Contradiction in Terms?', Folk, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 147-161.

Hitchens, C. (1984) Cyprus. London, Quartet Books.

———. (1989) Hostage to History: Cyprus from the Ottomans to Kissinger. New York, Noonday Press.

———. (1997) Hostage to History: Cyprus from the Ottoman to Kissinger. London, Verso.

———. (2000) Unacknowledged Legislation: Writers in the Public Sphere. London, Verso.

———. (2002) The Trial of Henry Kissinger. London, Verso.

Karageorghis, V. (1982) Cyprus from the Stone Age to the Romans. London, Thames and Hudson.

Kızılyürek, N. (1988) Paşalar Papazlar [Pashas, Priests]: Istanbul Graphics.

———. (1990) *Ολική Κύπρος*. Nicosia, Kasoulides Printing House.

———. (2002) Milliyetçilik Kıskancında Kıbrıs [Cyprus in the Claws of Nationalism]. İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Kristeva, J. (1980) Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art. New York, Columbia University Press.

Kyriakides, S. (1968) Cyprus: Constitutionalism and Crisis Government. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Markides, K.C. (1977) The Rise and Fall of the Cyprus Republic. New Haven, Yale University Press.

Maxwell, J.A. (2006) 'Literature Reviews of, and for, Educational Research: A Commentary on Boote and Beile's "Scholars before Researchers"', Educational Researcher, Vol. 35, No. 9, pp. 28-31.

Narayan, K. (1993) 'How Native is a "Native" Anthropologist?', American Anthropologist, Vol. 95, No. 3, pp. 671-686.

Necatigil, Z.M. (1993) The Cyprus Question and the Turkish Position in International Law. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

O'Malley, B. and Craig, I. (1999) The Cyprus Conspiracy: America, Espionage, and the Turkish Invasion. London, IB Tauris.

Ortaylı, I. (2007) On the History of Cyprus. Keynote speech at the 6th International Congress on Cyprus Studies, Eastern Mediterranean University. Famagusta, 24 October.

Papadakis, Y. (2005) Echoes from the Dead Zone: Across the Cyprus Divide. London, IB Tauris.

Parker, J.S.F. (1980) Review of 'Cyprus: Nationalism and International Politics', International Affairs, Vol. 56, No. 3, pp. 528-529.

Ramm, C. (2006) 'Assessing Transnational Re-Negotiation in the Post-1974 Turkish Cypriot Community: "Cyprus Donkeys", "Black Beards" and the "EU Carrot"', South East European and Black Sea Studies, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 523-542.

Salih, H.I. (1968) Cyprus: An Analysis of Cypriot Political Discord. New York, T. Gaus and Sons.

Stephens, R.H. (1966) Cyprus: A Place of Arms. London, Pall Mall Press.

Volkan, V.D. (1979) Cyprus - War and Adaptation: A Psychoanalytic History of Two Ethnic Groups in Conflict. Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia.

———. (2008) An Addition to the Turkish Translation of Dr Volkan's Cyprus: War and Adaptation, 2008. Paper available at [http://www.austenriggs.org/uploads/ basicContentWidget/1994/ KIBRISenglishvdvdd.pdf], accessed 12 May 2008.

Yennaris, C. (2004) From the East: Conflict and Partition in Cyprus. London, Elliot and Thompson.