

VOLUME 18
NUMBER 2

THE

CYPRUS

REVIEW

A Journal of Social, Economic and Political Issues

The Cyprus Review, a Journal of
Social, Economic and Political
Issues, P.O. Box 24005, 1700
Nicosia, Cyprus.

Telephone: 22-353702 ext 301, 22-841500

E-mail: cy_review@intercollege.ac.cy

Telefax: 22-353682, 22-357481,

www.intercollege.ac.cy

Subscription Office:

The Cyprus Review

Research & Development Centre

Intercollege

46 Makedonitissas Avenue

1700 Nicosia, Cyprus

Copyright: © 2006 Intercollege,
Cyprus.

ISSN 1015-2881.

All rights reserved.

No restrictions on photo-copying.

Quotations from The Cyprus Review
are welcome, but acknowledgement
of the source must be given.

TCR Staff

Editor in Chief: Hubert Faustmann

Co-Editors: James Ker-Lindsay

Craig Webster

Managing Editor: Nicos Peristianis

Assistant Editor: Christina McRoy

Advisory Editorial Board

VOLUME 18
NUMBER 2

THE CYPRUS REVIEW

A Journal of Social, Economic and Political Issues

- Peter Allen**, Ph.D.,
Rhode Island College, U.S.A.
- Vassos Argyrou**, Ph.D.,
University of Hull, U.K.
- Paul Gibbs**, Ph.D.,
University of Middlesex, UK.
- Maria Hadjipavlou**, Ph.D.,
University of Cyprus.
- Yiannis E. Ioannou**, Ph.D.,
University of Cyprus.
- Joseph S. Joseph**, Ph.D.,
University of Cyprus.
- Michael Kammass**, Ph.D.,
Intercollege, Cyprus.
- Marios Katsioloudes**, Ph.D.,
American University of Sharjah,
United Arab Emirates.
- John T.A. Koumoulides**, Ph.D.,
Woodrow Wilson Centre, U.S.A.
- Costas P. Kyrris**, Ph.D.,
Ex-Director of Cyprus Research
Centre, Cyprus.
- Peter Loizos**, Ph.D.,
London School of Economics, U.K.
- Farid Mirbagheri**, Ph.D.,
Intercollege, Cyprus.
- Phedon Nicolaides**, Ph.D.,
European Institute of Public
Administration, The Netherlands.
- Andreas Polemitis**, D.B.A.,
Intercollege, Cyprus.
- Oliver Richmond**, Ph.D.,
University of St. Andrews, U.K.
- Maria Roussou**, Ph.D.,
University of Kent, U.K.
- Sofronis Sofroniou**, Ph.D.,
Intercollege, Cyprus / University of
Indianapolis, U.S.A.

NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

The Cyprus Review is an international bi-annual refereed journal which publishes articles on a range of areas in the social sciences including primarily Anthropology, Business Administration, Economics, History, International Relations, Politics, Psychology, Public Administration and Sociology, and secondarily, Geography, Demography, Law and Social Welfare, pertinent to Cyprus. As such it aims to provide a forum for discussion on salient issues relating to the latter. The journal was first published in 1989 and has since received the support of many scholars internationally.

Articles should be original and should not be under consideration elsewhere.

Submission Procedure:

Manuscripts should be sent to the Editors, The Cyprus Review, Research and Development Centre, Intercollege, 46 Makedonitissas Avenue, P.O.Box 24005, 1700 Nicosia, Cyprus.

Formatting Requirements:

(i) Articles should normally range between 4000-9000 words.

(ii) Manuscripts should be typed on one side of A4 double-spaced; submitted in four hard copies together with a 3.5 inch disk compatible with Microsoft Word saved as rich text format. Pages should be numbered consecutively.

As manuscripts may be sent out anonymously for editorial evaluation, the author's name should appear on a separate covering page. The author's full academic address and a brief biographical paragraph (approximately 60-100 words) detailing current affiliation and areas of research interest and publications should also be included.

Manuscripts and disks will **not** be returned.

(iii) An abstract of no more than 150 words should be included on a separate page.

(iv) Headings should appear as follows:

Title: centred, capitalised, bold e.g.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE-MAKING IN CYPRUS

Subheadings: I. Centred, title case, bold.

II. Left-align, title case, bold, italics.

III. Left-align, title case, italics.

(v) Quotations must correspond to the original source in wording, spelling and punctuation. Any alternations to the original should be noted (e.g. use of ellipses to indicate omitted information; editorial brackets to indicate author's additions to quotations). Quotation marks (" ") are to be used to denote direct quotes and inverted commas (' ') to denote a quote within a quotation.

(vi) Notes should be used to provide additional comments and discussion or for reference purposes (see vii below) and should be numbered consecutively in the text and typed on a separate sheet of paper at the end of the article. Acknowledgements and references to grants should appear within the endnotes.

(vii) References: As the The Cyprus Review is a multi-disciplinary journal, either of the following formats are acceptable for references to source material in the text:

- (a) surname, date and page number format OR
- (b) endnote references.

Full references should adhere to the following format:

Books, monographs:

James, A. (1990) *Peacekeeping in International Politics*. London, Macmillan.

Multi-author volumes:

Foley, C. and Scobie, W. I. (1975) *The Struggle for Cyprus*. Starport, CA, Hoover Institution Press.

Articles and chapters in books:

Jacovides, A. J. (1977) 'The Cyprus Problem and the United Nations' in Attalides, M. (ed.), *Cyprus Reviewed*. Nicosia, Jus Cypri Association.

Journal articles:

McDonald, R. (1986) 'Cyprus: The Gulf Widens', *The World Today*, Vol. 40, No. 11, p. 185.

(viii) Dates should appear as follows: 3 October 1931; 1980s; twentieth century. One to ten should appear as written and above ten in numbers (11, 12 etc.).

(ix) Tables and figures should be included in the text and be numbered consecutively with titles.

(x) **Book review** headings should appear as follows: Title, author, publisher, place, date, number of pages, e.g. *Cyprian Edge*, by Nayia Roussou, Livadiotis Ltd (Nicosia, 1997) 78 pp. Reviewer's name to appear at the end of the review.

(xi) First proofs may be read and corrected by contributors if they provide the Editors with an address through which they can be reached without delay and can guarantee return of the corrected proofs within seven days of receiving them.

(xii) Each author will receive two complimentary copies of the issue in which their article appears in addition to five offprints.

(xiii) Articles submitted to the journal should be unpublished material and must not be reproduced for one year following publication in *The Cyprus Review*.

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in the articles and reviews published in this journal are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of Intercollege, The Advisory Editorial Board or the Editors.

Indexing: The contents of The Cyprus Review are now indexed in the following publications: Bulletin Signalitiques en Sciences, Humanities et Sociales; International Bibliography of the Social Sciences; PAIS-Public Affairs Information Service; Sociological Abstracts; Social Planning, Policy and Development Abstracts and Reviews; Peace Research Abstracts Journal; ICSSR Journal of Abstracts and Reviews; Sociology and Social Anthropology; International Bibliography of Periodical Literature; International Bibliography of Book Reviews; International Political Science Abstracts; EMBASE, Compendex, Geobase and Scopus and other derivative products such as Mosby Yearbooks. In addition, TCR is available internationally via terminals accessing the Dialog, BRS and Data-Star data bases.

Advertising: Advertisements are welcomed. No more than ten full pages of advertisements are published per issue. Rates per issue: Full page \$200, Cyp£100, UK£125; Half page \$140, Cyp£70, UK£90, Back cover £380, Cyp£190, UK£240.

THE CYPRUS REVIEW

VOLUME 18
NUMBER 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Michalinos Zembylas and Hakan Karahasan The Politics of Memory and Forgetting in Pedagogical Practices: Towards Pedagogies of Reconciliation and Peace in Divided Cyprus	15-35
Anna Agathangelou Colonising Desires: Bodies for Sale, Exploitation and (In)Security in Desire Industries	37-73
Andreas Panayiotou Models of Compromise and 'Power Sharing' in the Experience of Cypriot Modernity	75-103
Savvas Daniel Georgiades Favouritism as a Form of Injustice in Cyprus: Ubiquitous and Eternal?	105-127
Mete Hatay The Levantine Legacy of Cypriot Culinary Culture	129-142
Plus Commentary Article by: Alexandros Lordos 8 th July 2006: The Unappreciated Breakthrough	145-151
And Book Reviews: The British and the Hellenes: Struggles for Mastery in the Eastern Mediterranean 1850-1960 By Robert Holland and Diana Markides (Oxford University Press: London, 2006) xi + 266 pp. (Keith Kyle)	155-159
Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism 1878-2006 Edited by Hubert Faustmann and Nicos Peristianis (Bibliopolis: Mannheim and Möhnese, 2006) 660 pp. (Zenon Stavrinides)	161-166
Divided Cyprus: Modernity, History, and an Island in Conflict Edited by Yiannis Papadakis, Nicos Peristianis and Gisela Welz (Indiana University Press: Bloomington, 2006) 235 pp. (Andrekos Varnavas)	167-172

CONTRIBUTORS

Anna M. Agathangelou teaches in Political Science at York University, Toronto. She is also the co-director of Global Change Institute, Nicosia. Author of the *Global Political Economy of Sex: Desire, Violence and Insecurity in Mediterranean Nation-States* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), Agathangelou is currently working on a book project on Neoliberal Empire and War. She is also writing a book with L.H.M. Ling entitled *From Neoliberal Empire to Multiple Worlds: Transforming Violence, Desire, and Complicity in Contemporary World Politics*. Agathangelou's research interests include feminist postcolonial and Marxist epistemologies and poetics of transformation, empire, globalisation, the global political economy of sex and race, and militarization of social relations. Her geopolitical area of focus is Eurasia and Europe. She also writes and has published poetry in Greek and English.

Savvas D. Georgiades was born in Cyprus in 1971, received his BSc in Psychology from Lancaster University, his MSW from the University of Georgia, and his PhD in social welfare from Florida International University. He has worked with diverse populations as a practitioner and a consultant. He has been full-time social work faculty at Saint Ambrose University since 2001 and also serves on the Child Abuse Council Board of Directors. His publications address child welfare, quality of social services in Cyprus, elder issues, institutional and governmental favouritism, domestic violence, inter-communal conflict, and refugee considerations.

Mete Hatay is currently engaged as a researcher and consultant at the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO), working on migration and minorities in Cyprus. He has taught at the Near East University and the Cyprus International University and served as a board member of the Turkish Cypriot Education Foundation. He has numerous published essays and articles on minorities and the cultural history of Cyprus. His latest work, "Beyond Numbers: An Inquiry into the Political Integration of the Turkish 'Settlers' in Northern Cyprus" has been published as a PRIO report in September 2005.

Hakan Karahasan is a PhD candidate in Communication and Media Studies at the Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU), Famagusta, Cyprus. He received his BA in Radio-TV and Film at EMU in 2000 and his MA in English Studies at the Department of English Literature Humanities in 2003. His thesis was entitled, *A 'Levinasian Reading of Cypriot Poetry: Nationalism as Other, and its Role in Selected Works of Mehmet Yaşın, Neşe Yaşın, and Faize Özdemirciler*. His research interests focus on nationalism in Cyprus, social theory, and communication theories. Some of his articles have appeared in various journals in Cyprus.

Keith Kyle is a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society. He was Visiting Professor of History at the University of Ulster from 1993-1999 and was a member of the staff of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) from 1972 to 1990. He worked for 'The Economist' from 1953 to 1960 in Washington and at Westminster and for the BBC-TV programmes 'Tonight', '24 Hours', 'The Money Programme' and 'Newsweek' between 1960 and 1982. He is the author of *Suez. Britain's End of Empire in the Middle East* (IB Tauris, 2003) and two monographs on Cyprus published by Minority Rights International in 1983 and 1997.

Alexandros Lordos is an independent researcher and consultant. He focuses on inter-communal social research related to the Cyprus Issue, both quantitative and qualitative, to discover points of convergence or divergence between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, with a view to informing policy makers accordingly. His recently published surveys include "Options for Peace: Mapping the possibilities for a Comprehensive Settlement in Cyprus", conducted in May 2005, and "Building Trust: An Inter-communal Survey of Public Opinion in Cyprus", conducted in April 2006. These surveys, among others, are available to download from the author's website [www.CyprusPolls.org].

Andreas Panayiotou was born in 1960. He is currently Associate Professor, Journalism Department, Frederick Institute of Technology. He has studied sociology (PhD, University of California, Santa Cruz, USA), and teaches social science, communication, and cultural studies courses at the Frederick Institute of Technology. He has worked and written on social history and the processes of identity formation in the experience of Cypriot modernity. His interests include the effort to decipher patterns and dialectical formations in the interaction between the dynamics of cultural and political structures in the world system with social movements and other forms of resistance.

Zenon Stavrinides, PhD, was born in Cyprus and studied in the Universities of London, Cambridge and Leeds. Over a period of more than 30 years he has taught Philosophy and Political Theory in a number of British universities, and has also pursued full- or part-time journalism with the BBC World Service and a number of newspapers. He is a founding member and General Secretary of the Association for Cypriot, Greek and Turkish Affairs, a UK-based organisation which works for the dissemination of knowledge and understanding of social, political and economic developments in Cyprus, Greece and Turkey. He authored *The Cyprus Conflict: National Identity and Statehood* (2nd edition 1999) and a number of papers, including 'Is a Compromise Settlement in Cyprus Still Possible?' published in *The Cyprus Review*, Vol. 11, No. 1, Spring 1999.

Andrekos Varnava BA, Hon Monash, undertook his PhD at the University of Melbourne and submitted his dissertation, entitled “‘What Shall we do with Cyprus?’ Cyprus in the British Imperial Imagination, Politics and Structure, 1878-1915” in December 2005. Andrekos has published various articles and his latest include “Punch and the British Occupation of Cyprus in 1878” in *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* (XXIX, 2, 2005) and his article on the progression of Cyprus from a new colony in 1878 to a pawn by the eve of the Great War was recently published in *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism 1878-2006* in 2006. Andrekos’ research interests are the history of the British Empire, modern Cyprus and the Mediterranean east of Malta in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He is currently Honorary Fellow, Department of History at the University of Melbourne and Assistant Professor of History at Cyprus College in Nicosia.

Michalinos Zembylas is Associate Professor of Education and the Assistant Director of the UNESCO/UNITWIN Chair of Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue at Intercollege, Cyprus. His research interests are in the areas of curriculum theory, philosophy of education, and science/technology education, and his work focuses on exploring the role of emotion and affect in curriculum and pedagogy. He is currently involved in a longitudinal ethnographic project on the emotions of peace and reconciliation education in divided Cyprus. He is the author of the book *Teaching with Emotion: A Postmodern Enactment* (Information Age Publishing, 2005). His upcoming book is entitled *Five Pedagogies, a Thousand Possibilities: Affect, Critical Hope, Transformation* (Sense Publishers).

Obituary

Keith Kyle: 1925 - 2007

It is with great sadness that we learned that Keith Kyle died on 21 February, at the age of 81.

Keith had a very keen interest in Cyprus. In addition to being a member of the Friends of Cyprus, he had written extensively on various facets of the island's conflict. Perhaps most notably, he was the author of a Minority Rights Report that was widely praised for impartial and objective analysis of the Cyprus issue and even now remains a masterpiece of balanced writing. It was this objectivity, coupled with a natural gift for public speaking, which made him such a sought after participant at conferences and other events. He would always impress audiences with his ability to present a well-reasoned, and reasonable, account of the modern and contemporary history of an island that he obviously loved. It was notable that despite his frailty and ill-health, he attended a conference on Anglo-Cypriot relations in London in December last year. It was the last chance for many of us to talk to him. Likewise, the book review published in this issue of *The Cyprus Review* is one of his last pieces of work.

However, his work was certainly not limited to Cyprus. In fact, it was perhaps one of his lesser known interests. As an historian of the British Empire and the post-colonial era, he wrote on a number of different regions and conflicts. In particular, he built up a reputation for covering the turmoil in Africa in the 1960s and 1970s, writing on Kenya and Congo. But he was perhaps best known for his work on the 1956 Suez Crisis. In fact, he was widely regarded as the world's leading authority on the subject.

But Keith was far more than an historian. He had a truly remarkable career across a number of fields. After serving in the Second World War, he forged a very successful career as a journalist, working for the BBC and *The Economist*, amongst others. As a broadcaster, he became extremely well known in Britain for his reports from the world's war zones. Similarly, he had a very successful career at the policy end of academia. In addition to having been a fellow at Harvard University and a senior associate member of St Antony's College, Oxford University, he spent many decades at Chatham House, otherwise known as the Royal Institute for International Affairs. He was also a visiting professor at the University of Ulster.

He also dabbled in politics. After leaving the Conservative Party in protest at the Suez Crisis, he joined the Labour Party and stood as a candidate for Parliament on four occasions. One can only speculate as to what might have happened had he been elected. As one obituary noted, he would have made a wise foreign secretary. Indeed, it was a testament to his standing in British life that in the days following his death a number of leading newspapers in Britain carried prominent obituaries. It was particularly pleasing to read that the esteem he held in Cyprus circles was universally shared. He will be remembered by all of those who met him as an extremely kind and modest man. He was, in every sense of the word, a gentleman and will be greatly missed.

Keith Kyle, born 4 August 1925, died 21 February 2007.

Articles

VOLUME 18

NUMBER 2



THE POLITICS OF MEMORY AND FORGETTING IN PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES: TOWARDS PEDAGOGIES OF RECONCILIATION AND PEACE IN DIVIDED CYPRUS

Michalinos Zembylas and Hakan Karahasan*

Abstract

Being raised in a divided country, we are deeply concerned with the ideological and affective practices that are used to perpetuate the existing stereotypes about the Other within each community. Using as a point of departure our own personal narratives – one of us is a Greek Cypriot (G/C) and the other Turkish Cypriot (T/C) – depicting the circulation of nationalistic technologies in education, this paper examines the prospects of peace and reconciliation education in Cyprus. The premise on which this paper rests – that nationalistic education is a problem – is not new; that premise is not the most important contribution of this paper. The more important contribution is the analysis and sorting through the G/C and T/C nationalistic pedagogical practices, to figure out ways to disrupt those practices and invoke pedagogies of reconciliation and peace in both communities. We also emphasise the importance of considering personal narratives of past trauma in critical terms to help us re-learn the wisdom of forgetting in order to remember that the weight of the past should not stand in the way of the future.

In his seminal study on nationalism, Anderson (1983/1991) pointed out that selective memory and forgetting are essential elements of the historicity of a nation and its efforts to achieve homogeneity and continuity. History emerges as the salient factor in the construction of national identity and otherness – what separates Us from Them. Not surprisingly, then, educational practices have been used to create nationalist subjects. Curricula and pedagogies implore students to remember the nation's glories and honour the leaders and warriors who defended the lands and values of the nation. Students are repeatedly reminded of what it means to belong to the nation by reasserting particular values, principles of patriotic responsibility and moral conceptions of right and wrong. In certain respects, such practices aim at establishing an historical consciousness that "aligns forgetting with evil forces" (Eppert, 2003, p. 186) that threaten to destroy the nation's identity and its very existence.

While students and teachers may view state-sanctioned curricula and pedagogies as simply the truth about what happened in the past, such practices are, in Foucault's (2003) terms, technologies formed and circulated to promote nationalism. Drawing on Foucault, Montgomery (2005) explains that there are two mechanisms with which this happens: first, by selecting and organising what can be legitimately known about the nation-state and its supposedly glorious character, and second, by legitimising both the existence and governance of the nation-state as normal and unproblematic. Analysts of political socialisation through education emphasise that the discursive practices built around curricula, textbooks and everyday pedagogical practices can become overtly nationalistic in depicting the evil enemy (Davies, 2004). Nationalistic education, then, constitutes a difficult problem in efforts to push reconciliation in divided societies.

Using as a point of departure our own personal narratives – one of us is a Greek Cypriot (G/C) and the other a Turkish Cypriot (T/C) – depicting the circulation of nationalistic technologies in education, this paper examines the prospects of peace and reconciliation education in Cyprus. The premise on which this paper rests – that nationalistic education is a problem – is not new; that premise is not the most important contribution of this paper. The more important contribution is the analysis and sorting through the G/C and T/C nationalistic pedagogical practices, to figure out ways to disrupt those practices and invoke pedagogies of reconciliation and peace in both communities. Being raised in a divided country, we are deeply concerned with the ideological and affective practices that are used to perpetuate the existing stereotypes about the Other within each community. Thus we are interested in telling the story of how Cypriot educators in both communities can invent pedagogical spaces (Shor, 1992) in which former “enemies” learn to engage in reconciliation and peace despite their past traumatic experiences.

The Case of Cyprus from the First-Hand Experience of a Turkish Cypriot and a Greek Cypriot

Hakan's Personal Narrative of Education

“I was born in north Nicosia in 1978, four years after the war of 1974. My father was born and raised in Limassol, in south Cyprus, and he later moved to Nicosia before the war began. My mother was born in Ankara, Turkey in the period after her father had migrated from Bulgaria (he was a Bulgarian Turk from Vidin) to Turkey in 1945; her mother was born and raised in Turkey. Interestingly, I don't remember any stories related to my father's life before the war. Although my father talked about his past life in Limassol, it always appeared to me that he had lived in a 'far-off land'.¹ Eventually, I was able to see this far-off land in 2003, when after 29 years people began to cross the Green Line.

I went to primary school in 1985. It was two years after the establishment of the 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC)'.² I clearly remember my teachers' efforts on every possible occasion to emphasise that the T/Cs were members of the 'great Turkish nation'. The G/Cs were presented as 'people that cannot be trusted'. I don't remember any of my teachers making any distinction between a Turk and a T/C or a Greek and a G/C for that matter; it was 'us' (the Turks) against 'them' (the Greeks). We used to be told by our teachers that although we had given everything to 'them' – or to the 'Rums', as the Greeks and G/Cs were referred to – 'they' always 'wanted more'. For example, we were taught that when the British Empire had taken over the administration from the Ottomans in Cyprus in 1878, the Greeks celebrated the fall of the Ottoman flag, whereas, we were distressed. In a sense, then, we learned that the Greeks had shown no gratitude at all because they had never been pleased with what we had given them during the Ottoman period. For instance, we gave them their religious freedom whereas the Venetians had made them suffer a lot by trying to convert them to Catholicism.

Our teachers constantly reminded us how much we had suffered because of the G/Cs. For example, we learned that the G/Cs had been systematically attacking and killing T/Cs to fulfil their vision of uniting the island with mainland Greece – i.e. their vision for Enosis. I recall how convinced I was that the only aim of all Greeks was to kill us and unite with Greece. Our official slogan in the north, UNUTMAYACAGIZ (We Will Not Forget), referred to the martyrs who had given up their lives fighting against the G/Cs. Early on in my life, I learned the great significance of this slogan in uniting us as a nation against the G/Cs. The slogan served to remind us of the bloody events of 1963, a time that is seen as the spark of interethnic violence in Cyprus. The poster of this slogan was usually posted in notice boards during the period of the Bloody Christmas week so that we remembered how barbarian, unjust, and evil the Greeks were. The lesson I learned throughout my schooling was clear: we gave them freedom and respect (especially during the Ottoman administration) and all they wanted was to kill us and unite with Greece; therefore, the G/Cs were never to be trusted.

I never met a G/C until 2000. It was then that I had a powerful emotional experience. I was 22-years old and there was a bi-communal TV programme (Siyaset Meydanı) by ATV (Turkish private TV channel) at the Ledra Palace. I still remember the moment during a break when I met the mayor of Limassol and told him that my father was born and raised in Limassol. He smiled, kindly gave me his business card and said that he would try to arrange a pass to the south and show me the neighbourhood where my father used to live. I admit that I was shocked, not because this unknown individual showed kindness and courtesy, but because it was the first time in my life that I had sat near a G/C and nothing had happened! I always had this image in my mind that the G/Cs would hurt me the very moment they saw one of us ...

My perception about the G/Cs and the overall situation in Cyprus began to gradually transform during my university studies. Reading about nationalism and social theory helped me to reflect on the things that I had learned while I was in primary, secondary, and high school. Delving into social theory made me question the things that I thought I knew. I realised that I had always listened to the stories from 'our' point of view; I never tried to listen or see that there was another side. I wondered whether my G/C compatriots were educated in the same manner ... The simple and humbling experience that I had at the Siyaset Meydanı programme initiated a process of transformation, because this event showed me that the G/Cs were human beings just like 'us', and 'they' had the same needs that we had: food, shelter, living in safety on their land. The moment I met a G/C for the first time sparked a new beginning for me: although I always felt that G/Cs were human beings and not monsters, a lived experience with someone was actually necessary in order to help me see things differently.

Another powerful emotional experience that I recently had was when I was invited by a G/C friend and colleague to visit his class at a tertiary institution in the south. The class was full of junior students, all young women majoring in kindergarten education. It was December of 2005 and for the first time in my life I had the opportunity to speak about our education system in the north and its nationalistic basis and hear their reactions. I talked about my involvement in the first bi-communal project that had been initiated to analyse how mutual distrust and nationalism were cultivated through T/C textbooks. The students' reactions stunned me. One after the other they began to narrate similar stories of how their own educational system was not much different to ours: similar references to the 'we/they' dichotomy; similar fanaticism against the other; and similar claims that one side is responsible for the other's suffering. I was pleasantly surprised to find out how honest some of the students were; for example, the fact that they said how they had always learned to hate us, admitting this in front of me was emotionally overwhelming for all of us. I also appreciated the fact that some students pointed out how hard it was for them to change how they had always felt about the Turks and the T/Cs. My initial awkward feeling of being among them was replaced by a sense of optimism that many of these students at least began to see glimpses of how this 'us/them' mentality was a big part of the problem and that with hard work we could overturn these beliefs by questioning the things we had been taught.

Despite the seemingly insurmountable difficulties, I remain optimistic that the T/Cs and the G/Cs can find ways to educate their children away from fanaticism and nationalism. If someone told me back at elementary school that one day I would be involved in bi-communal efforts for reconciliation and peace in Cyprus, I would have laughed and pledged that something like that would never happen in this lifetime. And yet ..."

Michalinos' Personal Narrative of Education

"I grew up in a small village near the Troodos mountains, one hour west of Nicosia. After the war of 1974, this village, like many others in the area, became a refuge for families who fled from the north to save their lives. Despite the fact that I was only five years old, I vividly remember many family friends and relatives, who became refugees, staying in our house for several weeks after those tragic events. I also recall how everyone was wearing black; mourning for what had happened marked everything that was being discussed. The only exception was my grandfather, a refugee from Morphou, who was always optimistic and was constantly saying that it was just a matter of days before the refugees would return to their homes: 'Within fifteen days ...' he would reassure everyone, 'within fifteen days, and we'll be back home in Morphou'. He kept repeating these words to friends and relatives, almost like a ritual, until he died in 1991 without ever being able to return to his beloved city – something that I had the chance to do in an emotionally overwhelming visit, after the opening of the Green Line.

I went to elementary school in the fall of 1975. One of the first childhood paintings I drew depicted the Turkish planes bombing Cyprus and the Turks as monster-like animals who wanted to eat 'us'. This painting was put on display on a board and everyone reiterated how evil and barbarian the Turks were. I also remember participating in frequent commemorations of past historical events in which the Greek glories were celebrated. For example, we used to memorise all the heroes of the Greek revolution in 1821, and in our childhood games each one of us picked a revolutionary hero and tried to 'be' him or her. A few years after the war of 1974, the theme of 'DEN XECHNO' became prominent in our school life.³ Pictures of Kerynia, Bellapais, and Famagusta (our 'occupied places') would decorate all classrooms; the goal was to acquire knowledge so that we would never forget these places and care enough so that one day we would be ready to fight for them, if necessary. The most prominent themes of the DEN XECHNO campaign focused on the remembrance of the Turkish invasion, the thousands of refugees, the missing, the enclaved, the violation of human rights, and the destruction of ancient Greek archaeological places. I recall how I was encouraged by a teacher to write letters to the missing persons (six years after 1974) telling them how much we loved them and prayed for their return.

My teachers presented the Greeks and the Turks in stereotypical ways: the Greeks as heroic figures who were always fighting for what was right, and for justice, democracy and freedom, and the Turks as barbarians, unjust, deceitful, evil, and war-loving. We were repeatedly reminded of what the Turks had done to us, and that the young generation had a duty to remember and fight, if needed, to throw the Turks out of Cyprus. The perception in my mind about the history of 1974 was very clear: the victims who suffered were the G/Cs and the perpetrators who committed barbarisms were the Turks (in those years, I never made a distinction between T/Cs and Turks). Not a single

teacher in my entire primary and secondary education discussed with us who the Turkish Cypriots were, whether they also suffered at the hands of Greek Cypriots, or whether G/Cs and T/Cs lived in peace in the past and fought common social issues. On one of the few occasions when the issue arose of who the T/Cs were, I stood up in front of the class and repeated full of pride what I had been taught in Katichitiko (religious school): the T/Cs used to be Christians who became Muslims to avoid taxation during the Ottoman rule.

Several years later, I left Cyprus to study in the United States. One day, while I was eating at the university's cafeteria, I was told by an American friend that there was another Cypriot in the cafeteria 'but he doesn't have a Greek name'. I was curious to meet this new Cypriot student, because I was certain that I knew all the Cypriots studying at my university. So it was in the US where I met the first T/C in my life. A few minutes after the initial shock of meeting each other, while many friends were watching us, we started yelling at each other: 'You did (so and so) to us in 1974', I said; 'You did (so and so) to us in 1963', he hit back. Then I replied 'Yes, but you did (so and so) to us in 1453' and he responded with another date that went further back in time ... The conversation became so heated that the university security was called upon to intervene. We separated with a lot of lingering anger and resentment for each other, but I remember feeling proud that I had told him how evil 'they' were. Fortunately, I met this T/C student many times after this troubling event and we eventually became close friends. For many months, we had discussions along the lines of 'You did so and so to us' and although there was no immediate shift in our perspectives about the history of Cyprus, we discovered that at least we could talk to each other in a civilised manner and 'hear' each other's point of view.

I extended my studies at another university in the US for several more years, and at the same time continued to exchange emails with my T/C friend. My studies in educational philosophy helped me to gain a deeper understanding of my earlier socialisation in nationalist G/C education and the pedagogical practices that had been used to instil hatred in us for all Turks (including the T/Cs). Only then did I discover the implications of all the polarities that were constructed in my mind: the good Greeks vs. the bad Turks; Greeks, the victims vs. Turks, the perpetrators; and so on. The struggle to overcome these polarities was not easy but emotionally painful. I became angry at myself for being deceived for so long. Only then did I realise that I had been seduced into a trap of 'egotism of victimisation': That I had never been taught to listen to the Other's point of view. I did not really appreciate my T/C friend's perspective until that moment.

After finishing my studies, I returned to Cyprus and began teaching at a tertiary institution. I saw first-hand that my young students (high school graduates) felt the same hatred as the one experienced by me many years before. My own personal transformation led me to make efforts to help my

students rethink the way they had been educated: How dominant perspectives of memory and forgetting were constructed and how toxic their consequences were. So now I teach students about whether we sometimes need to learn how to forget in order to remember, so that we may (even momentarily) subvert our emotional investments to sacred histories and face what may be designated as unpatriotic. My students' testimonies need to be heard; but the T/C's testimonies also need to be heard. These testimonies intend not only to inform us about past events and their haunting legacies, but also fundamentally to challenge us to alter our relation to these events and our modes of social interaction with each other.

In the summer of 2004, my T/C friend and I met once again at a bi-communal social event at the Ledra Palace Hotel. I had not seen him since our university years almost ten years earlier. We both confessed to each other that an amazing transformation had taken place in our lives and that we were no longer the youthful nationalists we had been in the past! We agreed that memories of past traumas inflicted by one community against the other should not be dismissed, but it was time to move on. Moving on, we both emphasised, should not be interpreted as forgetting, but rather a way of building connections between us. 'Who would have thought that we would end up in the same position, advocating peace and reconciliation in Cyprus?' we said laughing."

Narrating the Self: What These Narratives Tell Us?

These personal narratives tell us what is obvious to an outside observer: That there is a "memory industry" (Klein, 2000, p. 127) prevailing in both communities in Cyprus. Undoubtedly, there is a lot of lingering anger, resentment and grief accumulated over the years in both communities, but the biggest problem, according to Kizilyürek (1993), is the mentality of "Us and Them" that continues to be dominant. The most powerful way of forming an "Us and Them" mentality is to idealise one's own group and demonise the Other. Idealisation and demonisation are accomplished through myth-making (Aho, 1994) – accounts which justify the polarities created, that is, the negative evaluation of the Other and the glorification of one's own nation. The constitution of these polarities was very obvious in our own early socialisation as our narratives indicated.

Our personal narratives highlight two important aspects in the circulation of stories that are woven through nationalist discourses of education. First, personal narratives of education in both communities provide significant evidence of the ways in which pedagogical practices are constructed around the politics of emotions (Abu-Lughod and Lutz, 1990) such as hatred, trauma, resentment, and anger. The theme of politics of emotions emphasises how emotions are not simply an individual matter, but are crucial to the formation of social norms and collective

imaginings (Lutz and Abu-Lughod, 1990; Lupton, 1998). In other words, emotions circulate and play an important part in the constitution of collective identities and power relations within a community (Ahmed, 2004). In her study of personal narratives in Cyprus, Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis (1998) emphasises how personal feelings are political in the sense of how Cypriots' experiences or memories of past events are embedded in conflict-socialising processes and reflect the political reality in each community. Thus, in our own narratives, the notion of the politics of trauma and hatred in Cyprus helps us understand the ways in which emotional practices, sociability and power are interrelated both in everyday life contexts and in educational settings. In other words, we learn how to remember the past trauma and sustain negative emotions about the Other through everyday social and educational practices. Inevitably, then, the collective memory of fear, hatred, victimisation and dehumanisation of the Other becomes a powerful symbol and an effective tool that strengthens the existing conflicting ethos.

Consequently, when the emotional elements of the politics of trauma and hatred are not accounted for in educational efforts, they risk perpetuating the existing conflicting ethos. Personal narratives should not be discarded but considered in critical terms to help us re-learn the wisdom of forgetting (Eppert, 2003) in order to remember that the weight of the past should not stand in the way of the future. Ricoeur (1999) reminds us that "the duty to remember is a duty to teach, whereas the duty to forget is a duty to go beyond anger and hatred (p. 11). Towards the end of our own narratives forgetting is not presented as it is commonly understood – that is, as an omission that constitutes an unpatriotic thing to do – but rather as a dynamic movement toward developing new emotional connections between the two communities. It is not easy to dismiss collective memories and imaginings; however, it is a pragmatic goal to begin imagining the capacity to reconcile with one's enemies.

The second important aspect in the circulation of stories that are woven through nationalist discourses of education is that discussions of peace and reconciliation in Cyprus are often suppressed; such stories are suppressed in the sense of being played down in favour of legitimating a conflicting ethos and demonising the Other. Both of our narratives show very clearly how understanding between the two communities becomes primarily a rhetorical mechanism when it comes to educating young people. Teaching about past glories and traumas is well embedded in educational practices and school life. In particular, the ideology of victim-hood is perpetuated through pedagogical practices that highlight the violent, traumatic aggression and loss and the cultivation of a deeply rooted fear that the enemy is simply waiting for another opportunity to inflict more pain and suffering.

Therefore, there are indeed considerable advantages in putting forward people's personal narratives about past experiences of trauma and suffering and

the role of education in manipulating or subverting the memory of past events. It is important to highlight the significance of lived experiences in order to understand the emotional depth and the power of collective imaginations around memory and forgetting. Personal narratives tell us much about how individuals and social groups are engaged in the work of constructing their identities (Holstein and Gubrium, 2000). Such narratives reflect the political circumstances and the larger ideologies and hegemonies that lie behind them (Denzin, 1997). Narratives should not, therefore, be dismissed, no matter how painful they are; all points of view must be heard and acknowledged. It is through finding ways to subvert the hegemony (Apple, 1979) of official narratives that educators and students in both communities will construct spaces for peace and reconciliation in educational settings. Personal narratives of students and teachers provide significant insights about life stories, and if properly problematised, they create the potential to inspire students and teachers in the development of alternative – i.e. other than the official – pedagogical practices. However, the work of subverting the hegemony of official narratives cannot consist simply in a struggle for recognition and legitimacy of an alternative narrative in terms set by the dominant ideologies (Worsham, 2001). The work of subversion, argues Worsham, requires that we change the terms of recognition, that is, the ways we conceptualise and feel the social world. If our commitment is to effect real change of individuals and communities then the work of subversion must occur at the affective level (*ibid.*).

Our personal narratives reflect many findings of ethnographic studies and other analyses in Cyprus that depict how educational practices (e.g. school textbooks, national rituals, symbols and celebrations) create dehumanised images of the Other within each community and inspire hatred for the “enemy” (Papadakis, 1993, 1995; Bryant, 1998, 2001, 2004; Spyrou, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2006; Hadjipavlou, 2002; Karahasan, 2003, 2005; AKTI, 2004; POST, 2004). In particular, there is much ethnographic evidence indicating how individuals as well as organised groups from both communities systematically attempt to nationalise suffering and highlight the need to remember what the “enemy” has committed in the past (Loizos, 1998; Papadakis, 1998; Bryant, 2004; Sant Cassia, 2006). Spyrou (2006), for example, argues that Greek-Cypriot school education is to this day largely nationalistic in its outlook, and relies upon the image of the Turk/enemy as the primary Other for the construction of G/C children’s identity (Spyrou, 2002). He documents several negative stereotypes that are encouraged in school education and show the absolute categorisation of the Turk as an enemy, barbarian, uncivilised, aggressive and expansionist. Also, his work indicates that Greek-Cypriot children are unable to deal with the more complex, hyphenated categories of “Turkish-Cypriot” or “Greek-Cypriot.” In fact, school education promotes the use of more inclusive categories such as “Greeks” or “Turks,” at the expense of more synthetic or hybrid ones such as “Greek-” and “Turkish-Cypriots” (Spyrou, 2006; Theodossopoulos, 2006).

Similarly, the negative stereotyping of the G/Cs is pointed out in several efforts to analyse the educational system in the T/C community (e.g. see Yashin, 2002; Karahasan, 2003, 2005). For example, a recent review of school textbooks by the POST Research Institute (POST, 2004) emphasised the negative representations of the G/Cs: e.g. the systematic teaching about how the Turks and the Ottomans did their best and gave the G/Cs freedom, but the G/Cs were never happy with the situation, because their only aim was Enosis and their only goal was to exterminate the T/C community. Also, Bryant's (2004) analysis goes back to the beginning of the twentieth century and argues how the ideology of Turkish nationalism was introduced in Muslim schools and within a matter of years, Muslim Cypriots became Turks; in this manner, education was transformed into a vehicle for nationalism.

There is now ample evidence around the world that in areas of conflict, education is systematically used to demonise the enemy and legitimises particular nationalist narratives and agendas (Davies, 2004). The challenging question is then: How should we, as educators, approach personal narratives that communicate suffering for past historical trauma and resentment for the Other? A pessimistic response would be that these narratives are so deeply embedded in a group's historical consciousness that nothing can disavow past memories of trauma and resentment. An alternative response that is more optimistic, however, aspires towards a critical reconsideration of the representation of each other that goes beyond debates concerning memory and forgetting. We suggest that personal narratives can help us rethink the way we teach and learn, and teach us how to discontinue to be traumatically possessed by the past when we work through it (Eppert, 2003). Forgetting, then, argues Eppert, is not only bound up with obligation, but also with an obligation implicated in peace and reconciliation.

The Challenges for Educators in Cyprus: Constructing Pedagogies of Reconciliation and Peace

We believe that it is important to develop pedagogies that explicitly promote reconciliation and peace. Here, we use the term pedagogy not to signify classroom pedagogical practices. Broadly speaking, pedagogy may be defined as the relational encounter among individuals through which unpredictable possibilities of communication and action are created. Pedagogy, then, is a site of inter-subjective encounters that entail transformative possibilities. Consequently, we view reconciliation and peace not as states, but as ongoing processes of developing co-existent relations and seeking alternatives to feelings of hatred, resentment and trauma.

Possible Solutions

The preceding discussion about the circulation of narratives woven through

nationalist discourses of education has important implications for the prospects of peace and reconciliation education in Cyprus. Here we want to consider three options to strengthen the potential of developing pedagogies of reconciliation and peace in divided Cyprus. The first option is to develop pedagogies which encourage empathetic communication through an understanding of Others' thinking and feeling. The second one is that pedagogies of reconciliation and peace should focus attention on problem-solving, criticality and multi-perspectivity in the teaching of social studies (history, geography etc.). And the third option is the need to develop pedagogies that construct citizenship education which accepts difference and the notion of hybrid identities by relaxing the emphasis on separate identities. We discuss these options below.

The first role for pedagogies of reconciliation and peace in Cyprus is to engage both communities in relational empathy (Broome, 1991, 1993, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2003, 2004a, 2004b). The process of relational empathy can be useful in the development of shared meanings created through interpersonal encounters. Such pedagogies of empathetic communication would lead students to start thinking and feeling about the Other in different ways to those in the past. Instead of presenting the Other as the enemy, or someone who cannot be trusted (as our personal narratives have shown), students should be encouraged to see the Other as a human being who has also been traumatised by past events and who has similar needs for security, rights and homeland. In Cyprus there is an urgent need of pedagogies that are based on "empathy towards the suffering Other" (Theodossopoulos, 2006, p.10). As Theodossopoulos (2006) asserts, humanising processes, such as similar cultural characteristics between G/Cs and T/Cs and common predicaments could be some of the things to stress when social studies are taught.

Clearly, promoting relational empathy in the classroom is not an easy process and it often involves a lot of discomfort for students and teachers. However, a pedagogy of discomfort can be an alternative way to see history from the other's point of view. As Zembylas and Boler (2002) claim,

"... we suggest that a 'pedagogy of discomfort' can be used to analyse the contradictions and emotionally-embedded investments that underlie ideologies such as nationalism and patriotism. We argue that a pedagogy of discomfort ... offers direction for emancipatory education through its recognition that effective analysis of ideology requires not only rational inquiry but also excavation of the emotional investments that underlie any ideological commitment such as patriotism. A pedagogy of discomfort invites students to leave behind learned beliefs and habits, and enter the risky areas of contradictory and ambiguous ethical and moral differences."

As Zembylas and Boler (*ibid.*) further emphasise, a pedagogy of discomfort requires that individuals step outside of their comfort zones and recognise what and how one has been taught to see (or not to see) things. In Cyprus, a pedagogy of discomfort could be used as a powerful pedagogical tool to help teachers and students to “step outside of their comfort zones” and problematise the ways in which G/Cs and T/Cs have been taught to see the Other (e.g. through history textbooks, pedagogical practices, school rituals, celebrations and so on), in other words, to understand how education is so often politicised and one-sided (see also Boler and Zembylas, 2003).

In building empathy and reconciliation, a wide variety of alternative narratives need to be developed out of the mutually hostile trauma stories. It is important to deepen awareness and criticality in children about how trauma stories can be used to teach fear, hate, and mistrust (Ramanathapillai, 2006). All narratives, Kreuzer (2002) emphasises, even the ones from the perpetrators of violence, need to be considered seriously, because they help us understand the emotional aspects of conflict and they point towards openings for strategic intervention. To build empathy and reconciliation, it is valuable to identify the narratives that evoke fear, hate, and mistrust and publicise the stories that show positive emotions emphasising the humanity of the “enemy” – for example, stories of collaboration and caring among G/Cs and T/Cs. Telling positive stories can help rehumanise the Other, and they counteract the confrontational symbolical and emotional content of competing narratives that work hard to dehumanise the enemy. We suggest therefore that the promotion of empathy and reconciliation in curriculum and pedagogy is a critical component of developing alternative narratives about past traumas – narratives that contribute to changing the hegemonic conflictive ethos.

Second, peace and reconciliation pedagogies in Cyprus should focus on multi-perspectivity, criticality and problem-solving, especially in the teaching of social studies. Multi-perspectivity is suggested by the Council of Europe in the teaching of Twentieth Century European History (Stradling, 2001) and emphasises the teaching of history from a variety of perspectives, including political, religious, social, cultural, economic and techno-scientific. The notions of multiple perspectives, critical thinking and problem-solving are highlighted by many recent developments in educational research and practice. These notions are not only strategies of understanding the Others’ perspectives but also feeling with the Others’ viewpoints and building connections with them. Stradling argues that multi-perspectivity, especially in the context of history teaching helps students: to gain a more comprehensive and critical understanding of historical events by critically comparing and contrasting the various perspectives that are constructed; to gain a deeper understanding and feeling of the historical relationships between nations or groups; and to gain a more dynamic picture of the ongoing development of the

relationships between nations and groups.⁴

Undoubtedly, peace and reconciliation pedagogies can benefit greatly from using multi-perspectivity in Cypriot classrooms. Having to deal with multiple perspectives, G/C and T/C students can begin seeing that there are multiple voices within the Cypriot society. More importantly, though, students will be encouraged to see that their ethnic identity is just one out of many other identities they share with others (related to their age, gender, family relationships and so on). As Stradling writes: "Often their [people's] identities as a parent, daughter, woman or doctor may be more significant in trying to understand their reactions to a particular situation or event" (p. 143). In those roles, G/C students may begin to realise that they have more in common with their T/C peers than they think (and vice versa) – such as fashion trends, technology gadgets, friendships, age-level concerns and worries, food preferences, familial customs and so on. Bi-communal visits to sites in Cyprus and internet communication can certainly help along the lines sketched here. In general, educators and students have to become aware that they are falling prey to nationalist agendas and need to discover ways to overcome the hegemonic power of these narratives.

Finally, another way of pushing peace and reconciliation education is to construct pedagogies that promote the idea of citizenship education based on accepting differences and hybrid identities. Bekerman and Maoz (2005) suggest that goals such as peace and coexistence education may be better achieved if the emphasis on separate identity and culture is somewhat relaxed. According to them, strengthening coexistence might not be achieved if alternative options to the ones dictated in the past are not pursued. As Azar also notes, it is the perpetuation of "exclusionary myths, demonising propaganda and dehumanising ideologies" (in Miall, Ramsbotham and Woodhouse, 2000, p. 75) that legitimise polarised trauma narratives. Educators and students should learn to be open to the possibility of transformation and the exploration of multiple ways of connecting with each other. Such connections will constitute a third space – a space that opposes nationalist sentiments and polarised trauma narratives and opens possibilities for re-imagining the sense of community and identity. An important way that pushes such connections is to avoid becoming enclosed in past identities that have been historically associated with nationalism and struggle to invent a democratic citizenship that critically reconsiders past feelings of belonging.

It is important to emphasise the need to be careful with claims about what kind of citizenship education is promoted, since much citizenship education has been geared to the strengthening of nationalism and patriotism (Davies, 2004). The question here is how citizenship education could likely challenge nationalist ideologies. We want to argue that hybridity should be an important component of

citizenship education in Cyprus. That is, Cypriot educators need to develop a notion of citizenship that takes into account difference. “The tendency”, writes, Davies (2004), “is to view citizenship in terms of universals that everyone, despite or because of their differences, should try to recognise and respect” (p. 90). There are, however, problems in an approach that tends to represent citizenship education as a homogenising process. Spinner-Halev (2003) urges us to be particularly cautious about citizenship education in divided societies: “Education in divided societies has to begin with different assumption[s] than education in other societies. In divided societies, those divided by religion or nationality, where fear and perhaps hatred permeate these divisions, the group cannot be ignored” (p. 90).

Consequently, the goal of citizenship education in Cyprus cannot exist by itself without the difficult goals of reconciliation and peace. Nevertheless, to push reconciliation and peace, Cypriot educators need to encourage tolerance and respect for difference, not bland commonalities. In our view, then, citizenship education in Cyprus has: to value hybridity and multiplicity in identity construction, including regional and global identities; to have a critical approach to difference, enabling analysis of when this is valuable or destructive for individuals and groups; and to promote empathetic communication without diminishing the importance of dissent – thus it is significant to avoid the veneer of politeness in the building up of relations between the two communities.

Undoubtedly, there are several structural limitations in doing what we suggest. For example, the official structures in both communities do everything in their power to perpetuate the conflicting ethos – through political rhetoric, commemorations of historical events, official school policies, military and school parades and so forth. The prevailing ideologies of conflict and resentment make Cypriots in both communities vulnerable to chauvinist propaganda. Official ideologies in both the south and the north have been insisting that each community and its people are part of a greater ethnic family (Greek or Turkish). Thus the quest for a new identity that is not fixated on the ethnic identity of Greeks or Turks is politically sabotaged. Reconciliation activities are often criticised by nationalist groups and the vocal positions of authorities, such as political and religious leaders speaking against the perceived intentions of the other; reconciliation efforts are interpreted (in both communities) as reaching out to the enemy labelling those who participate as traitors (Hadjipavlou, 2002). Finally, a common language for communicating with each other is missing. Although English might do the job to a certain extent, it is important that we learn the language of each other.

Despite the structural limitations, it is important to acknowledge that both of us are involved in efforts to try some of the above ideas for promoting pedagogies of peace and reconciliation. An ongoing project in which we are involved is the

accumulation of university students' narratives from both communities and their analysis in terms of their rhetoric of memory and forgetting. For example, in one of the first attempts to implement this idea, Hakan visited Michalinos' class in the south and narrated his life story, his initial perceptions about the G/Cs and his transformation process. Many G/C students confessed that this was the first time they had ever met a T/C; they told Hakan of their own perceptions about him and the T/Cs and they soon acknowledged the role of stereotypes in preventing communication between the two communities. Although it is too early to talk about any transformation taking place, the feeling emanating from students' written reports relating to this event has been the fundamental impact of listening to the other's point of view. In their reports, the students analysed various aspects of the impact that nationalistic history teaching had on constituting negative stereotypes about the T/Cs. If nothing else, the process of beginning to give new meanings to old events was an important lesson for these students.

Consequently, what we are trying to do is to provide opportunities for our students to encounter first-hand testimonies to ethnic hatred and atrocities conducted by both communities, as well as to create openings for students to expose acts of kindness and compassion enacted by both communities in the past or in the present. The intended effect of directing students to collect and examine such testimonies (e.g. orally through stories, interviews, and written records) is to invite students into bearing witness to one's own or another's trauma (Zembylas, 2006). Furthermore it is our intention to constitute responsibility for one another as co-witnesses engaging in alternative versions of how and why past traumatic events leave us feeling the way they do. This pedagogical approach is set in motion by questions of how we and others feel about trauma narratives, bearing in mind those feelings that we are eager to talk about as well as those that are not easily acknowledged or expressed. In this way, the classroom-based community moves beyond traumatic feelings by using such responses as a springboard to appraise emotions and nationalism politically and ethically. Whenever such a community is created – and clearly this is not always the case – our classroom becomes a place of political transformation in which students perform their roles as witnesses. It is precisely because of the possibility of such connections that teachers and students are called into being witnesses of testimonies as inscriptions of empathetic understanding. A critical engagement with testimonial narratives means that teachers and students have to decide how to become critical witnesses of such testimonies (rather than merely consumers or tourists) and “consider what of (and about) these testimonies should be remembered, why, and in what way” (Simon and Eppert, 1997, p. 185).

In other words, the pedagogical activities that inspire witness need to include provision for a dialogical structure within which the resources are provided for

expressing and interpreting old and new affective relations (Zembylas, 2006). As witnesses, teachers and students are obliged to recognise that such engagements are active, yet partial, ways of meaning-making; however, teachers and students have an obligation to be open to the possibility of transformation and the exploration of the multiple ways of connecting with others (Ropers-Huilman, 1999). In addition, acting to promote the practice of defined connections – such as intimacy, kindness and compassion – helps teachers and students to create movements of difference and hope that can act to propel the future by intensifying the present. The groups who are willing to take up these challenges may also be ready for open engagements.

Conclusion

The ideas discussed here explicate the educational challenges to peace and reconciliation education inherent in our own personal narratives as well as in the official narratives of our communities. We have argued that there are many things to be gained by drawing on students' narratives (or their families' narratives) in teaching as well as on educators' personal experiences. Through the analysis of their narratives, students and teachers can learn how to name their affective lives, and how they might begin the process of subversion and renaming. Educational programmes and pedagogies – especially those of history education – must be designed to help Cypriot children become aware, both at an emotional and an intellectual level, of the shared meanings, visions and ethical interdependence that can promote understanding and communal interaction. These shared meanings and visions are embodied in gestures, languages, beliefs, foods, narratives and rituals (Cohen, 1997). Pedagogies designed to help our children make choices about how they wish to relate to these shared meanings must help them overcome emotional resistances to change, and, therefore, must engage them both emotionally and intellectually (McKnight, 2004).

In this regard, educational practices in Cyprus can actively facilitate the efforts for peace, coexistence and reconciliation by helping to dismantle the system of entrenched myths and antagonistic trauma narratives that perpetuate division between G/Cs and T/Cs. In particular, educational programmes and pedagogies which challenge hostile trauma narratives may offer two important things. First, they provide a space where educators and students can question common sense assumptions and the politics of hegemonic trauma narratives. Second, those programmes and pedagogies also provide opportunities for traumatised students to work through feelings of trauma and rehumanise the Other. Through dealing with the emotional challenges of trauma, educators and students may begin then to empathise with the Other; thus, by becoming sensitive to the emotions of trauma and mourning, educators and students can begin to confront the ideological and

political aspects of chosen traumas (Volkan, 1979, 1988, 1997) within each community. While these suggestions do offer alternative approaches for the promotion of peace and reconciliation education, education alone cannot do much for reconciliation; both T/Cs and G/Cs must be actively engaged in addressing the structural limitations mentioned earlier at the widest social level. Simultaneously, more research and analysis is needed in this area particularly through educational interventions undertaken in both communities in Cyprus.

In Cyprus where suffering has been experienced by all communities, educators may choose to use the lived experiences of one's own suffering to enhance his/her understanding of the suffering of the Other. This is not an easy task, especially as our "enemies" are implicated in our suffering (as we are in theirs). Suffering, in itself, does not necessarily lead to compassion or empathy, however, compassionate and empathetic attitudes can be nourished (Cohen, 1997). Through social and educational practices, our own experiences of suffering, and our memory and forgetting of them, may enhance our capacity to form wise and compassionate responses to the suffering of others, and help us to take a critical stance toward the construction of our narratives.

Notes

- * Michalinos Zembylas: Intercollege, Cyprus and Michigan State University, USA, and Hakan Karahasan: Eastern Mediterranean University.
1. The phrase "far-off land" is inspired by the Cypriot (T/C – British) writer Taner Baybars' book, *Plucked in a Far-Off Land: Images in Self-Biography* (1970/2005).
 2. "TRNC" is not recognised as an independent state in the international arena, except by Turkey.
 3. The slogan of "Den Xecho" is originally attributed to author Nikos Dimou; see [http://www.ndimou.gr/kypros_gr.asp].
 4. The recently completed school textbooks on Teaching Modern Southeast European History by the Centre for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe, is an exemplary case of putting in practice the idea of multi-perspectival teaching. For more information visit [http://www.cdsee.org/teaching_modern_sehistory.html].

Bibliography

- Abu-Lughod, L. and Lutz, C.A. (1990) 'Introduction: Emotion, Discourse, and the Politics of Everyday Life' in Lutz, C. and Abu-Lughod, L. (eds.), *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-23.
- Ahmed, S. (2004) *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh, UK, Edinburgh University Press.
- Aho, J.A. (1994) *This Thing of Darkness: A Sociology of the Enemy*. Seattle, University of Washington Press.
- AKTI-Project and Research Centre (2004) *Report on the History and Literature Textbooks of 6th Grade in Terms of Promoting Violence and Nationalism*. Nicosia, AKTI.
- Anderson, B. (1983/1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London, Verso.
- Apple, M. (1979) *Ideology and Curriculum*. London, Routledge.
- Bekerman, Z. and Maoz, I. (2005) 'Troubles with Identity: Obstacles to Coexistence Education in Conflict Ridden Societies', *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, Vol. 5, pp. 341-357.
- Boler, M. and Zembylas, M. (2003) 'Discomforting Truths: The Emotional Terrain of Understanding Differences' in Tryfona, P. (ed.), *Pedagogies of Difference: Rethinking Education for Social Justice*. New York, Routledge, pp. 110-136.
- Broome, B. (1991) 'Building Shared Meaning: Implications of a Relational Approach to Empathy for Teaching Intercultural Communication', *Communication Education*, Vol. 40, pp. 235-249.
- . (1993) 'Managing Differences in Conflict Resolution: The Role of Relational Empathy' in Sandole, D.J. and van der Merwe, H. (eds.), *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice: Integration and Application*. New York, Manchester University Press, pp. 97-111.
- . (1997) 'Designing a Collective Approach to Peace: Interactive Design and Problem-solving Workshops with Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot Communities in Cyprus', *International Negotiation*, Vol. 2, pp. 381-407.
- . (1998) 'Overview of Conflict Resolution Activities in Cyprus: Their Contribution to the Peace Process', *The Cyprus Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 47-66.
- . (1999) 'Inter-communal Contacts Help Build Links for the Future of Cyprus', *Washington Reports on Middle East Affairs*, Vol. 18, No. 6, pp. 69-71.
- . (2001) 'Participatory Planning and Design in a Protracted Conflict Resolution: Applications with Citizen Peace-building Groups in Cyprus', *Systems Research and Behavioural Science*, Vol. 18, pp. 1-9.
- . (2003) 'Responding to the Challenges of Third-party Facilitation: Reflections of a Scholar-Practitioner in the Cyprus Conflict', *Journal of Intergroup Relations*, Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 24-43.
- . (2004a) 'Reaching Across the Dividing Line: Building a Collective Vision for Peace in Cyprus', *International Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 41, pp. 191-209.

- — —. (2004b) 'Building a Shared Future across the Divide: Identity and Conflict in Cyprus' in Fong, M. and Chuang, R. (eds.), *Communicating Ethnic and Cultural Identity*. Lanham, MD, Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 275-294.
- Bryant, R. (1998) 'An Education in Honour: Patriotism and the Schools of Cyprus' in Calotychos, V. (ed.), *Cyprus and its People: Nation, Identity, and Experience in an Unimaginable Community, 1955-1997*. Boulder, CO, Westview Press, pp. 69-84.
- — —. (2001) 'An Aesthetics of Self: Moral Remaking and Cypriot Education', *Comparative Study of Society and History*, Vol. 43, pp. 583-614.
- — —. (2004) *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London, IB Tauris.
- Cohen, C.E. (1997) 'A Poetics of Reconciliation: The Aesthetic Mediation of Conflict'. Unpublished Thesis, University of New Hampshire.
- Davies, L. (2004) *Education and Conflict: Complexity and Chaos*. New York, Routledge.
- Denzin, N. (1997) *Interpretive Ethnography: Ethnographic Practices for the 21st Century*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Eppert, C. (2003) 'Histories Re-imagined, Forgotten and Forgiven: Student Responses to Toni Morrison's *Beloved*', *Changing English*, Vol. 10, pp. 185-194.
- Foucault, M. (2003) *Society Must be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975-1976* (ed. A.I. Davidson et al., trans. D. Macey). New York, Picador.
- Hajipavlou-Trigiorgis, M. (1998) 'Different Relationships to the Land: Personal Narratives, Political Implications and Future Possibilities' in Calotychos, V. (ed.), *Cyprus and its People: Nation, Identity, and Experience in an Unimaginable Community, 1955-1997*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 251-276.
- Hadjipavlou, M. (2002) 'Cyprus: A Partnership between Conflict Resolution and Peace Education' in Salomon, G. and Nevo, B. (eds.), *Peace Education: The Concept, Principles and Practices around the World*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp. 193-208.
- Holstein, J.A. and Gubrium, J.F. (2000) *The Self We Live By: Narrative Identity in a Postmodern World*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Karahasan, H. (2003) *A Levinasian Reading of Cypriot Poetry: Nationalism as Other, and its Role in Selected Works of Mehmet Yasin, Nese Yasin, and Faize Özdemirciler*. Gazimagusa: Eastern Mediterranean University, Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis in English Studies, September 2003.
- — —. (2005) 'Different Narratives, Different Stories: The Language of Narrative and Interpretation', *Journal for Cyprus Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 28/29, pp. 115-127.
- Kızılyürek, N. (1993) *Ulus ötesi Kıbrıs/I Kypros Peran tou Ethnos*. [Cyprus beyond Nation]. Nicosia, Cassoulides.
- Klein, K.L. (2000) 'On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse', *Representations*, Vol. 69, pp. 127-150.
- Kreuzer, P. (2002) *Applying Theories of Ethno-cultural Conflict and Conflict Resolution to Collective Violence in Indonesia*. Frankfurt, Peace Research Institute of Frankfurt.
- Loizos, P. (1998) 'How Might Turkish and Greek Cypriots See Each Other More Clearly?' in

- Calotychos, V. (ed.), *Cyprus and its People: Nation, Identity, and Experience in an Unimaginable Community, 1955-1997*. Boulder, CO, Westview Press, pp. 35-52.
- Lupton, D. (1998) *The Emotional Self: A Sociocultural Exploration*. London, Sage.
- Lutz, C. and Abu-Lughod, L. (eds.) (1990) *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- McKnight, A. (2004) 'Historical Trauma, the Persistent of Memory and the Pedagogical Problems of Forgiveness, Justice and Peace', *Educational Studies: A Journal of the American Educational Studies Association*, Vol. 36, pp. 140-158.
- Miall, H., Ramsbotham, O. and Woodhouse, T. (2000) *Contemporary Conflict Resolution: The Prevention, Management, and Transformation of Deadly Conflicts*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Montgomery, K.E. (2005) 'Banal Race-thinking: Ties of Blood. Canadian History Textbooks and Ethnic Nationalism', *Paedagogica Historica*, Vol. 41, No. 3, pp. 313-336.
- Papadakis, Y. (1993) *Perceptions of History and Collective Identity: A Comparison of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot Perspectives*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge.
- — —. (1995) 'Nationalist Imaginings of War in Cyprus' in Hinde, R. and Watson, H. (eds.), *War, a Cruel Necessity? The Bases of Institutionalized Violence*. London, IB Tauris, pp. 54-67.
- — —. (1998) 'Greek Cypriot Narratives of History and Collective Identity: Nationalism as a Contested Process', *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 25, pp. 149-165.
- POST Research Institute (2004) *Education for Peace: Pilot Application for the History and Literature Books of the 5th Grade of the Elementary School*. Nicosia, POST.
- Ramanathapillai, R. (2006) 'The Politicizing of Trauma: A Case Study of Sri Lanka', *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, Vol. 12, pp. 1-18.
- Ricoeur, P. (1999) 'Memory and Forgetting' in Earney, R.K. and Ooley, M.D. (eds.), *Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy*. New York, Routledge, pp. 5-11.
- Ropers-Huilman, B. (1999) 'Witnessing: Critical Inquiry in a Poststructural World', *Qualitative Studies in Education*, Vol. 12, pp. 21-35.
- Sant Cassia, P. (2006) 'Guarding Each Other's Dead, Mourning One's Own: The Problem of Missing Persons and Missing Pasts in Cyprus', *South European Society and Politics*, Vol. 11, pp. 111-128.
- Shor, I. (1992) *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Simon, R. and Eppert, C. (1997) 'Remembering Obligation: Pedagogy and the Witnessing of Testimony of Historical Trauma', *Canadian Journal of Education*, Vol. 22, pp. 175-191.
- Spinner-Halev, J. (2003) 'Education, Reconciliation and Nested Identities', *Theory and Research in Education*, Vol. 1, pp. 51-72.
- Spyrou, S. (2000) 'Education, Ideology and the National Self: The Social Practice of Identity Construction in the Classroom', *The Cyprus Review*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 61-81.

- — —. (2001a) 'Those on the Other Side: Ethnic Identity and Imagination in Greek-Cypriot Children's Lives' in Schwartzman, H.B. (ed.), *Children and Anthropology: Perspectives for the 21st Century*. London, Bergin and Garvey, pp. 167-185.
- — —. (2001b) 'Being One and More than One: Greek Cypriot Children and Ethnic Identity in the Flow of Everyday Life', *disClosure*, Vol. 10, pp. 73-94.
- — —. (2002) 'Images of "the Other": The Turk in Greek Cypriot Children's Imaginations', *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, Vol. 5, pp. 255-272.
- — —. (2006) 'Constructing "the Turk" as an Enemy: The Complexity of Stereotypes in Children's Everyday Worlds', *South European Society and Politics*, Vol. 11, pp. 95-110.
- Stradling, R. (2001) *Teaching 20th Century European History*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Theodossopoulos, D. (2006) 'Introduction: The "Turks" in the Imagination of the "Greeks"', *South European Society and Politics*, Vol. 11, pp. 1-32.
- Volkan, V. (1979) *Cyprus-War and Adaptation: A Psychoanalytic History of two Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia.
- — —. (1988) *The Need to Have Enemies and Allies: From Clinical Practice to International Relationships*. Northvale, NJ, Jason Aronson.
- — —. (1997) *Bloodlines: From Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism*. Boulder, CO, Westview.
- Worsham, L. (2001) 'Going Postal: Pedagogic Violence and the Schooling of Emotion' in Giroux, H. and Myrsiades, K. (eds.), *Beyond the Corporate University: Culture and Pedagogy in the New Millennium*. New York and Oxford, Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 229-265.
- Yashin, N. (2002) 'School is a Textbook: Symbolism and Rituals in Turkish Cypriot Schools' in Koulouri, C. (ed.), *Clio in the Balkans: The Politics of History Education*. Thessalonica, Centre for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe, pp. 414-422.
- Zembylas, M. (2006) 'Witnessing in the Classroom: The Ethics and Politics of Affect', *Educational Theory*, Vol. 56, pp. 305-324.
- Zembylas, M. and Boler, M. (2002) 'On the Spirit of Patriotism: Challenges of a "Pedagogy of Discomfort"', Special issue on Education and September 11. *Teachers College Record On-line*.

COLONISING DESIRES: BODIES FOR SALE, EXPLOITATION AND (IN)SECURITY IN DESIRE INDUSTRIES

Anna M. Agathangelou

Abstract

Desire industries have emerged as a major social relation of seduction under the Neoliberal Imperium. Through the household domestic and entertainment reproductive sectors, the desire industries promise fulfilment, while intimately tying freedom and prosperity with securitisation for individuals and states alike and preserving wealth through access to the market, the state, and masculine power for what comes to be constituted as the bourgeois and white elite. More concretely, this paper examines how the “higher income generating” peripheries of Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey actively participate in bringing female migrant labour from “lower income generating” countries. Albeit in contradictory ways, these countries work toward realising the historical tendencies of capital by feminising, racialising, sexualising, and constituting the subject of exploitation as a threat to the (re)production of the neoliberal imperium’s relations. Through the “import” and exploitation of cheap reproductive labour for what is referred to in this article as the “desire” or sex industries, these peripheries work toward realising the (re)production of neoliberalism, albeit with strategies, activities, contestations, and struggles. Female migrants face daily violence as their labour is exploited to realise the historical tendencies of capital, and yet, these working class migrant women exceed capital’s push and attempt to seize their corporeal bodies, and/or appropriate their feminine labour. They invest time and energy toward constituting communities that do not exploit, violate, appropriate, and indeed, kill their bodies. In moving to realise this potential, the creative power of labourers, as producers of their own communities, is crucial toward social and self-affirmation and social and self-realisation.

Introduction

With the USA’s declaration of a permanent world “war on terror” and its changed focus from Al Qaeda to the Taliban (i.e. due to its socio-spatial relations to “locals” who can be more easily located), the academic focus seems to have shifted from other kinds of terror and to the centralisation of global political sovereignty

(Johnson, 2000). Much of this focus seems, however, to have also made invisible other intensification processes of restructuring or what some have coined as globalisation, others “imperialist globalisation” and others simply “empire” (Kaplan, 2002; Hardt and Negri, 2000). This new attempt to reconsolidate relations of asymmetrical power relations through “war” military, and otherwise, disrupts many traditional understandings about regions as well as subject formations. Furthermore, the conditions that pushed for such reconsolidations expose the limitations of such understandings or categorisations. Yet, many of the analyses of globalisation seem to presuppose those regions, markets, states, and other civil society relations as if these are not historical phenomena worthy of explanation (Rupert, 1995). Migration or the movement of labour is one such process. The ways these processes draw on feminine, masculine, and racialised codes to constitute power require explanation as well.

In this paper it is argued that the attempts to (re)produce the “New World Order” and its contingent neoliberal policy agendas, depend on the shift of the surplus value produced by the low-waged working classes from peripheral and semi-peripheral regions/spaces and states (as in the cases of China, India, and Russia) and the migration of reproductive labour into other semi-peripheries and dominant states. More concretely, this paper examines how Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey “import” cheap reproductive labour for the “desire” or sex industries. This labour becomes crucial in the (re)production of neoliberalism as both a contradictory social process and a political subject formation’s project. Such labour also takes the necessary time away from the working class to reproduce itself or participate in the articulation and production of other projects as well as toward social, self-affirmation and self-realisation. While exploitation and corporeal violence against these workers redirects their energies toward the production of structures and social relations of capital, these labourers are, albeit contradictorily, entering communities and mediating capital-labour by re-appropriating the means of production to disrupt understandings and practices of labour as “absolute poverty”. Many female migrants, along with non-profit organisations, and other radical feminist workers move to rearticulate and draw out “the general possibility of wealth as subject and as activity” of social transformation (Marx, 1857) and push toward the practice of a less violent “social”, that is, the capacity to produce new living conditions and communities of their own.

Three key questions emerge: How can we understand this redrawing of borders, and the neo-imperial sexualised and racialised social relations of this particular form of migration? What kinds of interventions are desired in the communities within which we work and live? What kinds of stories, both political and theoretical, do we, as radical materialist feminists, articulate to intervene in the social relations of this world?

Reproductive Labour in the Global Economy: Historical and Epistemological Issues

International migration worldwide is intensified with world restructuring or globalisation. The international economic and political power relations create the conditions that make possible the flow of, and control over, migrant labour (Agathangelou, 2004; Lazaridis, 2001; Erder and Kaska, 2003; Erder, 2000; Agathangelou, 2002). Since the economic turmoil of the 1980s, the states of Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, Sri-Lanka, India, the Philippines, and China are exporting in addition to the surplus value produced in these regions, their cheap labourers as value-generating bodies themselves (Agathangelou, 2005, p. 26). These mainly female workers are employed in industries with few social controls (Kempadoo and Doezema, 1998; Enloe, 1989, 1993, 2000). The trade in these industries accounts for the racialised feminisation of the present migration (Lazaridis, 2001; Erder and Kaska, 2003; Lazos, 2002; Democratic Movement, Greece, Women against Violence, Greece, Icduygu, 2006) that allows for the placement of these women as “exploitative casual labour”. It results from the sending and receiving states deregulating labour to enhance flexible accumulation so that they can effectively and efficiently continue the competition and free trade (Ucarer, 1999; IOM, 1996). Within this structurally asymmetrical context the sale of cheap reproductive labour has become a major “technology” and a tool of the neoliberal project(s) in the process of trying to (re)produce the middle class on the cheap.

In their desire to sustain their position in the global economy, states ascribe race, gender, and sexuality to skills and transpose racial, sexual, and gender hierarchies from peripheral countries to more dominant ones (Agathangelou, 2004). The state also facilitates the commodification and fetishisation of desire to “fit into” the capital accumulation machine by normalising whiteness, masculinity (Razack, 2004; Bhattacharjee, 1997), and heterosexuality (Irigaray, 1985, p. 173). The more we participate in constituting black bodies, the more power we accumulate; the more black bodies we can export and import for cheap labour, the more competitive it enables us to be; the more violence we use to exploit these migrant bodies, the more powerful we seem in the global order; and the more corrupt trafficking (that is, exchange strategies) technologies we draw upon to reduce costs of labour, the more “white” we become. Paradoxically, producing and accessing surplus value and supporting the migration of reproductive labour become a priority for the peripheral state even at the expense of the feminisation of its own state and industries, and its own female citizens. What comes to be constituted as the peripheral state will often draw on militaristic and economic crises discourses (e.g. migrants as security threats; the vulnerability of the state to any kind of exigency; the working class as expensive) to moralise and justify the structural theft

of wealth from those peoples deemed to be the trammellers of the state's sovereignty, that is, what is articulated as upper and middle class, masculine, heterosexual, and "white" authority.¹ It will also do so for the export of migrant female labour, arguing that the remittances from "migrant labour" benefit families and the majority of the society (Agathangelou, 2002; Nair, 2006).

Semi-peripheral states such as Greece and Turkey, and core states like the US, Germany, and Canada, work to facilitate the migration of reproductive labour, in terms of both sex and domestic labour, in formal profit-making industries but also in what comes to be produced as shadow economies (Hughes, 2000; Emke-Papadopoulou, 2001; Anthias and Lazaridis, 2000; Ergocmen and Yuksel, 2005). Reproductive labour comprises the physical, mental, experiential, and affective labour toward the child bearing and rearing responsibilities, domestic and intimate tasks undertaken by either sex. It is labour that is required to guarantee the welfare, survival, the pleasure, and the (re)production of individuals – including the offering of intimacy, rearing, educating, feeding, looking after and nurturing household members – all frequently at the expense of the subject who gives of her body and labour in maintaining the household and the welfare of its members.

Epistemological Frameworks and Methods

In analysing the flow of women's reproductive labour and toward the desire industries from lower-income to higher-income generating peripheries² as a result of intensified globalisation, I look at the sexual division of labour in social relations of production, epistemologies, and practices of race, sex, sexualities, gender, and class (Ebert, 1996; Anderson, 2000; Razack, 2004; Agathangelou and Killian, 2006) within them and toward the production of regimes of exploitation and other kinds of violence. Social relations of production here refer to the racialised, gendered, and sexualised class position of the subject of labour: some own the means of production within capital relations and push to command the surplus labour of others, and many own only their labour power which often enables a violent exploitation of such labour (Cotter, 2001; Ebert, 2001; Anderson, 2000; Aguilar, 2004) due to historical tendencies of capitalism to push people to exploit others and succumb to the seductions of profit all in the name of freedom and individual choice. This historical tendency to succumb to exploitation is based on the premise that capitalism is essentially the only viable formation of social relations. Following those feminists who argue that the labour of domestic and sex workers produces the major commodity central to capitalism, labour power itself (Anderson, 2000; Glenn, 1992; Brenner and Laslett, 1989), this research proposes that sex and domestic work together constitute reproductive labour. It is crucial to recognise that there are differences in the ways that domestic and sex workers become hired and used in capital relations, however, there is a larger epistemological logic with ontological presuppositions (e.g. bodies are for sale;

bodies are property; women's labour is just use-value; work equals body) that inform and are informed by these social relations of production. Exploited by property owners and those seeking to produce wealth, sex and domestic workers do not escape being subordinated to the logic of profit despite reproductive labour's "private" nature (e.g. child care happens in the household and sexual gratification happens between two private self-contained bodies). Sex and domestic workers' bodies in the new global economy become constituted as zones marked and exported for their "cleanliness" and sexual orifices.³ In grouping them together we are also able to make apparent the ways in which spaces become declared public or private for exploitative and oppressive reasons, together with the ways in which the "male sexuality [itself] becomes alienated as a female object" (Tadiar, 1998, p. 943),⁴ all in the name of accumulating power (e.g. the ability to work in the market; the ability to divide labour from one's body; the ability to alienate one's body from oneself and others). Through a set of seductive processes (i.e. mirages, metonymic, metaphorical, and synechdotal) and strategies, capital obfuscates the exploitation and commodification of labour, "private" and otherwise. Despite the imaginary constructions of public and private spaces within the borders of neoliberal nation-states, a parallel relation is perceived between a domestic and a sex worker within the desire industries. Whether working in a private household or across town in a public cabaret, hotel, or street, they are both exploited workers, and are often constituted as "enemies" of each other (i.e. many of the domestic workers engage in conversations about their "goodness" (i.e. moral codes) and their productivity (i.e., offer to the global economy and state) in relation and in opposition to the work and identity of sex workers.

Based on a postcolonial feminist historical materialist epistemology which posits that subjects' activity "exceeds the exigencies of capital (such as the historical tendency towards 'feminisation')" and the roles that capital expects them to play (ibid. p. 953), I argue that the sex and domestic labourers redirect their labour and bodies instead, toward self-affirmation and self-realisation (Marx and Engels, 1976, p. 765), albeit in contradictory ways. Drawing on postcolonial/feminist historical materialist epistemologies I also posit that these relations take place under "circumstances of reckless terrorism" (Marx, 1976, pp. 732-733). Indeed, under conditions of (re)colonisation.

The material for this article comes from several sources – historical interpretation of state documents such as employment policies, employment contracts, and analyses on sex and domestic work, media documents; EU documents on migration and female import of sex and domestic workers; and interviews with sex and domestic labourers, including in-depth interviews with state officials, migration officials, policemen, impresarios, clients, focus groups of sex and domestic workers, and feminist theorisations on trafficking, prostitution, and

domestic work. The absence of any previous study on the political economy of sex (i.e. the ways domestic and sex work constitutes social relations of power as well as (re)produces subjects) and the structure of these industries in Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey influenced the method of investigation chosen. It called for interviews with sex and domestic workers that could provide significant insight into their “experiences” with their employment contracts (such as work schedules, earnings, recruitment patterns, the organisation of household and sex work spaces, and the dynamics between the sex and domestic workers, their employers and their clients). In addition to exploring the relationship with the state through the employment contracts and citizenship status, I also sought to explore the self-understandings of these relationships by the women themselves and thereby enable comparative epistemological/interventionist analyses of the same relationship from different angles and perspectives. Feminist/postcolonial historical materialism as an epistemology focuses on the ontological primacy of mediation of social relations and their production and toward social relations and communities whose fundamental premise of formation and reproduction is not violence and terror. In recognising this ontological primacy of mediation, it is possible to explore and look for “other” interventions outside the exigencies of capital. How does migration of reproductive labour (and their contingent body parts) come to fulfil an historical tendency toward “peripheralisation” and marginalisation of states and peoples? How does reproductive labour “sell” its use and surplus value toward the production of subjects and the fulfilment of historical tendencies of capital, albeit through exploitation and other forms of violence such as feminisation, sexualisation, and racialisation of their labour and their bodies?

(Re)colonising Social Relations and their Contingent Desires

Reproduction and sexual relations are at the crux of the (re)production and change of the “New World Order” or what social scientists call the “social.”⁵ Bodies, of a particular kind, are required to make possible the transition to what is called the neoliberal imperium.⁶ The bodies of women from Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, and from states such as India, the Philippines, Sri-Lanka, and Bangladesh are being turned into objects, parts used in the production and legitimating of political power and authority as well as subjectivities of a broad array of players both “inside” and “outside” the desire industries (bourgeois bodies, nations, communities, geographies, masculine authorities, “whiteness”).

The sale of women and children worldwide is not a new phenomenon. What is new is the intensification of what is coined here as the desire industries (Agathangelou, 2002; Agathangelou and Ling, 2003; Agathangelou, 2004).⁷ These intensified processes – the trafficking and sale of women and children – are embodied struggles and contestations at different moments and within different contexts around the (re)production of the social or rather our communities and

within them ourselves and our bodies. Restructuring worldwide has pushed many peripheral economies to reorganise themselves as well as social relations: domestic, local, and international. Many peripheral countries “export” thousands of women daily to other higher income generating states, which are actively participating in reorganising huge parts of their economies into the desire industries. Desire industries depend extensively on reproductive labour, or labour that produces the major commodity central to capitalism – labour power itself (ibid., p. 13).

The labour of women worldwide serves to create bodies and subjects for the neoliberal imperium daily. The production of things is not the only material base for the oppression and exploitation of people; it is the production of people also because it depends on the private appropriation of the use-value and surplus labour of those who own nothing but their labour power to sell (Agathangelou, 2004; Mies, 1998). Within these production relations I argue, unlike Marx and Engels, that colonisation for the ensuring of “primitive accumulation” is not a one- moment relation.⁸ It is an ongoing process. The production of the modern “free” and “outlawed proletariat”, or rather aspects of that subject depend on (re)colonisations of bodies and labour of what comes to be constituted as “unfree” and reproductive peoples. Marx and Engels (1976, pp. 732-733) argue in theorising colonisation:

“The spoliation of the church’s property, the fraudulent alienation of the State domains, the robbery of the common lands, the usurpation of feudal and clan property, and its transformation into modern private property under circumstances of reckless terrorism, were just so many idyllic methods of primitive accumulation. They conquered the field for capitalistic agriculture, made the soil part and parcel of capital, and created for the town industries the necessary supply of a ‘free’ and outlawed proletariat” (Marx, *Capital*, Volume 1, 1984, p. 685).

This production of the “necessary supply of a ‘free proletariat’ and its outlawing” depends on the creation of the “unfree” and reproductive subject who comes to be constituted as a producer of use-value instead of surplus labour by multinational corporations and in capital relations in general. To understand the production of the desire industries it is necessary to begin with this epistemological insight while considering the reorganisation of socio-economic and political relations in order to co-constitute the peripheral states themselves. The desire industries form such a series of social relations which are part and parcel of larger production relations whose major logic is the desire of the upper and middle classes to buy and exploit and expropriate anytime, anywhere, the bodies and surplus-value labour of working class women and men, peoples of colour for satiating and in the process constituting of what is called “white but not quite” subjectivities (Agathangelou, 2002, 2004).

A major method of “moving” women and children across borders for the desire industries is trafficking (Mediterranean Institute of Gender Studies, 2006, <http://www.humantrafficking.org/updates/389>). More specifically, sex trafficking is turning into a global industry. There are different kinds of networks of trafficking of women such as the large-scale network which

“has political and economic international contacts in both the countries of origin and destination. Women are recruited in a variety of seemingly legal ways as au pairs, language students, etc”; as well as “the small scale network traffics one or two women by accompanying her to the country of destination and delivering her to the impresario. The route and mode of transport used will depend on the location of the sending country and also on the women who desire to migrate to other sites for a different life” (Agathangelou, 2004).

What happens when women are trafficked as part of a larger restructuring process (e.g. the development or what the researcher calls the desire of the peripheral economies to acquire part of the labour market and with it political power within the European Union or the global economy)? When women are trafficked as part of a larger restructuring process, epistemologies and practices toward fulfilling historical tendencies (i.e. securing the social and geographic national boundaries of Cyprus or Greece or Turkey vis-à-vis the migrant who is there to work for very cheap wages) seem to prevail. In many cases violence is aimed at women and children and also those states that are not using their laws effectively. For example, particular kinds of men and women are required to urge the “white but not quite” state (i.e. those states that collude with multinational capital but can never be its decision makers or those who have the right to reap the profits of such relations)⁹ to teach those women that are trafficked about “proper” sexualities and ways of cleaning and taking care of children and households. In the process of acquiring a “white but not quite” status, these states and subjects come to mystify their own selves and bodies as superior and deserving and can thus violate the “white but not quite” men and women whose bodies they bought through trafficking.

A series of migrations and fettering, both social and personal (e.g. sexual, racial, class, mental, etc.), push around 4 million women, men, transgender, transsexual, and children to migrate (and be trafficked repeatedly) in order to better their conditions and their families. According to ‘Captive Daughters’ “an estimated 2 million women and children are held in sexual servitude throughout the world, and between 100,000 and 200,000 are trafficked across international borders for the purposes of sexual exploitation each year [<http://www.captivedaughters.org/demand.htm>]. Many countries including peripheral sites are now participating extensively in exchanging bodies for sale. Desires – for exotic black flesh, bodies for cheap labour, and for freedom (i.e. the freedom of the market) – are about

power; it is a power that property owners draw upon to justify using all means available (i.e. the impresario, the sex trafficker including women, the state, us) and even at the expense and death of others to access the following: corporeal bodies, labour and its surplus value, and quick accumulations. The generation and sustenance of the wealth and employment of the desire industries depends extensively on production relations, and with trafficking as a major tool of governance and exchange – a newer form of slavery. The way people produce products and services has changed, and the way capital and labour relate to each other has changed as well. However, the logic and practice of this neoliberal imperium draws extensively on historical tendencies and processes of violence such as exploitation, oppression, feminisation and masculinisation, racialisation and sexualisation and quite often the annihilation of the body of the wage-labourer (Marx and Engels, 1976). For the first time the United Nations Crime Commission defines trafficking in the Trafficking Protocol and states:

“Trafficking in persons shall mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs [with footnote explanation];”

- (1): “The travaux préparatoires should indicate that the reference to the abuse of a position of vulnerability is understood to refer to any situation in which the person involved has no real and acceptable alternative but to submit to the abuse involved.”
- (2): “The travaux préparatoires should indicate that the Protocol addresses the exploitation of prostitution and other forms of sexual exploitation only in the context of trafficking in persons. The terms ‘exploitation of the prostitution of other’ or ‘other forms of sexual exploitation’ are not defined in the Protocol, which is therefore without prejudice to how States Parties address prostitution in their respective domestic laws” (Trafficking Protocol, United Nations, 2000, Article 3).

The UN intervenes to “eliminate” trafficking and begins this work by defining this newer technology of governmentability (Hardt and Negri, 2002). Yet, while this definition gestures toward articulating trafficking as more than a mere technology of exchange, it still remains within that capital framework and does not really engage relations of production and their historical trajectories which time and again enable mediations of violence, sexual, racial, and class exploitation and the contingent vulnerabilities of such relations. Sex and domestic work remain analytically outside

international labour relations than within relations of exchange. This definition “precludes an understanding of the productive capacity of the women who are exchanged and ‘prostituted’ by others” (Tadiar, 1998, p. 952). Moreover, the protocol ensures that its definitions, “exploitation of the prostitution of other” or “other forms of sexual exploitation”, are not addressed because as an organisation it is concerned more with not undermining the spatial division of the state (i.e. its sovereignty and within it, its own definition of domestic laws).

Even when the trafficking of peoples allows for access to the surplus value of labour of previously “unimagined” sites and bodies through violence (e.g. by forcing peoples to sell their bodies), the mediations in this major UN document which foregrounds this “relation of exchange” are still erased. More specifically, the participation of women and others in the “production of the structures of exchange and exchange relationships” and the ontologically primary relation of mediation “in the production of the very differences in which relationships of exchange, exploitation, and oppression are understood to be predicated” are made invisible (ibid, p. 940). Such texts and others that analyse the traffic of women make invisible the mediation that women and children and others participate in order to realise and socialise themselves (ibid.). Indeed, women are not mere products. They are also producers of their own production, the structures of exchange and exchange relationships, one of which is trafficking. The trafficking protocol presumes a sexual difference which helps constitute the category of trafficking (i.e. the “exploitation of the prostitution of other” and sexual exploitation) and yet, this sexual relation is removed from the larger context within which it is produced, including production and sovereign relations, which now appear sexually specific to trafficking (and which itself trespasses sovereign territoriality of the state). To convince as many states as possible to sign the document, the trafficking protocol collapses “exploitation of the prostitution of other” with trafficking. Indeed, this document argues that (1) trafficking is merely a cultural/institutional/human rights issue, (2) trafficking, prostitution, and oppressions of different kinds are one and the same, and (3) states cannot but acknowledge these forms of racism through the demands generated by the globalised market. This protocol, ultimately, ends up presuming and (re)erecting the system of clearly defined sovereign nation-states. “The document is therefore without prejudice [as] to how States Parties address prostitution in their respective domestic laws”. Amid these definitions of the United Nations, we also read other definitions that come to expose these epistemological logics that violently define out of their knowledge productions, peoples, bodies, labour, and violence. Trafficking under globalisation according to the WCAR NGO Forum is more than just merely a technology of exchange.

“Trafficking in persons is a form of racism that is recognized as a contemporary form of slavery and is aggravated by the increase in racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. The demand side in

trafficking is created by a globalised market, and a patriarchal notion of sexuality. Trafficking happens within and across borders, largely in conjunction with prostitution. Women and children are especially vulnerable to trafficking, as the intersectionality of gender, race and other forms of discrimination leads to multiple forms of discrimination. Trafficking in persons must always be dealt with not purely as a law enforcement issue but within a framework of respect for the rights of trafficked persons” (World Conference against Racism, 2001).

The World Conference against Racism exposed this “exchange” relationship as more than just a trafficking relationship. It is a form of racism mediated with “multiple forms of discrimination.” It requires more than just “law enforcement” in a context within which the emergence of desires and their fulfilment are pushing daily for an increase in the demand of bodies that can be “exported” and “imported” instantly. In the process, countless women’s labour and bodies are (re)colonised. Their condition, their disruptions, and their participation toward the articulation of “other” communities cannot be foreseen but need to be understood as they are created in the struggle to determine both the subject and communities/socialities that demand a detachment from the historical and epistemological trajectories of capital, of neo-colonialism, imperialism, and the new age of terror.

Restructuring of World Economy and Re(organisation) of Reproductive Relations

“If money, according to Augier, ‘comes into the world with a congenital blood-stain on one cheek,’ capital comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt” (Marx, 1976, p. 712).

“What makes labour a different commodity is in fact its process of reproduction, which is necessarily material and social and follows historically established norms” (Picchio, 1992, p. 2).

Marx foregrounds the development of capital as predicated on the blood and dirt of the body and labour of the worker. Picchio, following Marx, argues that labour is material and social. Labour is not just any commodity. What makes it a different commodity is its reproduction, and the material and historical social relations inform social conditions that make its reproduction possible. However, bodies are ontologically primary for any kind of mediation, including labour relations. As advocated by Marx, the significance of its corporeality in social relations is also engaged with in this article.

With the restructuring of the world economy, and to respond to stringent budgets and resources, lower-income generating states push increasingly more of their major resources to generate profits – women and children into the global

market's tentacles. In the flow of reproductive labour the state plays an important role in the restructured world economy (Kempadoo and Doezema, 1998; Enloe, 1989, 1993) by mediating the relation between racialised and gendered capital and labour through immigration policies and laws, and by controlling labour markets and the cost of reproducing labour.

As migration movements expand, both regular and irregular, more countries are actively participating in the import and export of cheap labour for the generation of remittances and profits. Countries (Cyprus, Greece and Turkey) that historically exported labour are now also becoming importers, specifically of cheap labour. With migration, regular and irregular, human trafficking activities driven by internationally organised networks intertwined with violence are the issues of the day. In this intensified current phase of globalisation in which capital depends on productive wage labour, Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey are now destination countries of cheap productive labour, and more specifically, reproductive labour. Beginning in the 1960s, all three countries followed official policies to attract tourism, enhance their foreign currency reserves (Lazaridis, 2001; Erder and Kaska, 2003; Erder, 2000; Agathangelou, 2002), and "exported" labour to other Western European countries and North America.

In the 1990s the three countries began actively recruiting cheap wage labour from other peripheral economic states such as the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, and the Ukraine. While migrants from different neighbouring countries arrived in these countries before the 1990s, in that decade all three states changed their liberal border policies to respond to intensified capital restructurings by designing more restrictive migration policies to control the labour market. One way that global capital controls the labour market is by dividing the process of migration under the rubrics of regular and irregular. Regular migration refers to the process through which the state officially involves itself to control the movement of the worker. Irregular migration refers to a process involving violations of the national laws of the state. This division and mirage between regular and irregular migration, however, has been systematically acting as a mystification method that works toward privatising the space of the nation-state in such a way that it allows "some people to walk some of the time" (Bhattacharjee, 1997, p. 317) through the use of law. This division of regular and irregular migration enables the control, management as well as the disciplining of women and children, as well as the working class of the importing peripheries, especially if they are found working in what has come to be known as the "shadow" economies of sex.

The EU designed and continues to design and implement policies and laws to control irregular migration, arguing that it is intertwined with drug and human trafficking (Ghosh, 1998; Erder and Kaska, 2003; Lazaridis, 2001; Lazos, 2002;

Country report on trafficking in human beings: Turkey, 2002; Global Survival Network, 1997), but these policies do not seem to stop the exploitation and violence of working-class women who either migrate “officially” or through trafficking. The sale of women’s labour and women’s bodies seem to become inseparable in regular and irregular migration.

The EU is moving to design a comprehensive policy on human trafficking so that it can allow trafficked women to have public recourse. Many theorists and policy makers argue that when these laws and judicial process are implemented in the EU, it will be possible to reduce human trafficking (Ucarer, 1999; Democratic Women’s Movement, Greece; Women Against Violence, Europe, Austria; Research Centre of Women’s Affairs, Athens; Emke-Papadopoulou, 2001). Regulating migration, and with it human trafficking, may prevent some traffickers from circulating in the market. However, it may also generate alliances with policy officers and other administrators to negotiate the terms under which women and children become trafficked. In focusing only on irregular migration (e.g. processes of trafficking as being illegal) may prevent us from seeing that there is a relationship between regular and irregular migration. On many occasions the men who traffic women may access the state and gain the legal permits to enable the women to work in the country of destination. This relation of power is frequently made invisible. Simultaneously, this arbitrary dichotomy becomes a fundamental process in retaining the founding myth of capitalism and its political system of liberal democracy: that the “owner of money” and the female working-class labourer enter the market on equal footing in the eyes of the law, and, therefore, the regulation of migration will succeed in managing abuses in capitalism, such as human trafficking, and within it the high rate of abuse and violence against women and children. Of course, a crucial question that does not get asked is the following: what if “formal” capital relations depend and were always dependent on technologies such as **trafficking**?¹⁰

Sex and domestic workers in Cyprus are drawn mostly from Eastern Europe, such as Russia, Rumania, and Albania, plus the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and mainland Turkey. In the ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’ these women workers constitute one among several groups entering the northern part of the country. Most of them are associated with prostitution and the state has special regulations that govern their entry into the country (Scott, 1995, p. 387). Some travel to Turkey to engage in prostitution, and from there, travel to the ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’. The women who come to Cyprus depend on their employer to deal with entry visa requirements and health and blood tests. As work permits and the employer rather than the employee agrees upon permissions, a change of employment requires permission from the state through the new employer. If women are brought to the country as a group, some formalities are

waived (e.g. health exams). In the ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’, if a woman is travelling alone to find a job, she must produce a visa and health certificates upon embarking on a plane from Istanbul to Kyrenia. The Republic of Cyprus and the Philippines, for instance, work with each other and design laws to cover cheap wage labour import and export. These laws facilitate the transfer of female labour to Cyprus and into those homes and businesses that can afford it through the issuance of visas, training lessons about domestic work, and the production of ideologies about a “sexy”, “economically heroic”, “efficient” and productive labour force.

In Greece the migration of domestic and sex workers began in the late 1970s (Kontis, 2000; Cavounidis, 2002; Droukas, 1998; Demetriou, 2000; Karasavoglou et al., 1998; Lazos, 1997; Katsoridas, 1994; Lazaridis, 1995; Ventura, 1993; Zographos, 1991). As part of a larger migration phenomenon in Southern and South-eastern Europe, many people migrated from places nearby such as Albania, Bulgaria, Poland, Rumania, Russia, the Ukraine, Moldavia, and Georgia. Many others arrived from the Philippines, Ethiopia, Pakistan, and India (Kethi, Human Resources Information, 2002; Ministry of National Economy, 1998, 1999). The migrant population of Greece is primarily from twenty different countries (including Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Pakistan, the Ukraine, Poland, Syria, Moldavia, Egypt, India, Georgia and Russia).

Against the backdrop of the political contestations swirling around its quest for full membership in the EU, Turkey actively participates in the importing of reproductive labour as well. Similarly to Cyprus and Greece, gender and race play a crucial role in the division of labour within Turkey. The new migration flows in Turkey exhibit dramatically different patterns (Erder and Kaska, 2003; Gülçür and Ilkkaracan, 2002; Narli, 2002, p. 2; Guncikan, 1995). Some of the new migrants, both males and females, participate in the “suitcase industry” (ibid., 1995; interviews with sex and domestic workers). They enter Turkey carrying suitcases that contain small commodities and plastic bags from their country of origin so that they can sell and buy goods to take back to their home countries (Gülçür and Ilkkaracan, 2002, p. 3 citing Morokvasic and de Tinguy, 1993; Narli, 2002). Most migrants who participate in this industry are Russians, Ukrainians, Bosnians, Bulgarians, Romanians, Tunisians, and Algerians. A lot of women, who participate in the “suitcase industry”, simultaneously work in the sex industry to “supplement their incomes” (IMO, 2003; Gülçür and Ilkkaracan, 2002, p. 3 citing Beller-Hann, 1995; interviews with women in the sex industry). Women from Russia, the Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldavia work as sex workers, bar girls, and dancers. Women from Moldova and Azerbaijan are now replacing many of the young women from the Philippines who worked as domestic workers (Narli, 2002; Interviews with female Turkish employers in Istanbul, 2000).

The changes in the migration patterns and processes which contribute toward the further fulfilment of the historical tendencies of these sites as peripheries are a result of restructurings of the corporate, state relations, other socio-economic and political reorganisations, and sexual, racial, and class relations. The capital's move to locate, commodify and exploit cheap labour wherever it can be found pushes it to create markets and achieve competitive rates through the cheapest available labour internationally. What do the migration policies and employment contracts embody and constitute simultaneously?

All three states' migration policies and employment contracts are tools that inform reproductive labour and relations with employers. In this way, domesticity, intimacy relations, corporealities, and the imperial market – the four spheres/zones “vaunted by middle-class subjects” in these three countries as distinct from each other – “converge in a single commodity spectacle” (McClintock, 1995, p. 32). The contract of the state provides the middle class subject, male and female, a privileged vantage point onto the “global realm” of exchange (ibid.) and his/her interests are prioritised while simultaneously the reproductive labour's basic social rights are marginalised and often violated. Within these contracts imperialism is figured as coming into place through domesticity (clean households and caring of children and elderly through the labour of black women), and sexual intimacies in the cabaret, hotels, and other sites with “white but not quite” bodies and sexual orifices – the site of prostitution. Indeed, reproductive labour presents itself either through domestic spaces and social relations of power, or through sites of prostitution and pleasure “paradigm ... for natural forms” (ibid., p. 34). Within these relations the “labour of changing history” disappears (ibid., p. 40) and within it the marginalisation, the production relations and the disposing of bodies become invisible. For reasons of brevity two examples will be drawn from the work contracts to show how these relations of asymmetrical power relations become constituted together with the effects on “white but not quite” and “black” bodies.

Producing Desire Industries and Peripheries

The (Dis)appearance of Reproductive Labour via Contractual “Equality”

As women migrate for work in Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey, much of the work they do comes to be articulated by these states as a commodity. A commodity here refers to a social relation in that the value of one's labour and personhood is gauged solely by the use value of that labour by those who pay for her services. For example, the Greek Cypriot state's laws (Aliens and Immigration Law 2910/2001, Greece) structure the relationship between employer and employee, and as a tool sets forth who has what “rights” within the national boundaries of Cyprus. The Ministry of Interior Civil Registration and Migration contract states:

“The employer shall pay to the employee as remuneration for her services a fixed annual salary of _____ Cyprus Pounds payable in (12) equal monthly payments of _____ each on the last day of each consecutive month.”

This document by itself does not seem different from any other employment contract. However, upon closer examination, the role of the state in facilitating the flow of the female migrant reproductive wage labour as well as its enforcement of the interests of the owning class becomes apparent in this contract. This contract is a tool for guiding/mystifying the social reproduction of classed subjects within the borders of the state. The state mediates the relation between the worker and the employer by presenting the labourer (from lower-income generating peripheral economies) and the employer (from higher-generating income peripheral economies) as equal because they are both “owners of commodities” (Marx and Engels, 1976)” (cited in Agathangelou, 2004, p. 46). A notion of a free exchange of wages for labour power is fraudulent. Not only does it obfuscate the exploitative racialised and gendered relation between the domestic worker and her employer, it also renders invisible the fact that these services are specifically “domesticated,” sexualised, and racialised (the Sri-Lankan, the Filipina housemaid for the Greek and Turkish subject, the Sri-Lankan, the Filipina home help for the Greek and Turkish subject, and the Eastern European artist who services the Greek and Turkish subject) compensated by cheap wages (Agathangelou, 2004, p. 47). The state’s involvement in the mediation of capital and labour ensures that the production of sex and domestic labour takes its historical trajectory through a series of violent episodes: it is feminised, it is devalued as reproductive labour, it is even removed in the process of constituting the category of universal labour, it is racialised as not the universal race (e.g. whiteness):

“[[I]t is the positing of reproduction as non-value that enables both production and reproduction to function as the production of value. In the continuously aggressive expansion of capital accumulation through increased expropriation of surplus labour, ‘feminisation’ names the drive towards the increased devaluation of the worker’s necessary labour towards non-value, that is, the tendency of labour towards reproductive labour ‘which appear(s) to have had all value stripped from them by capital.’ This condition is ‘feminine’ in as much as it is created by work which is gendered as female, that is, work which is viewed as a ‘natural force of social labour’ engaged in the reproduction of labour power ... As Fortunati shows, which such work creates value for capital, this value remains hidden, incorporated as it were within the forms of masculine labour power which are visibly expropriated by capital ... The operations which enable the disappearance of the value created by ‘reproductive’ work and its hidden expropriation by capital are repeated in the symbolic construction of the concept of universal labour” (Tadiar, 1998, p. 939).

Masculine and class power of labour come to be produced through the exploitation but also the devaluation of women's labour as well as their exploitation of their use value. These actions are a series of violent episodes fundamental to the visible expropriations of capital. It is through these that the production of bourgeois hegemony and subjects are ensured (Razack, 1998, pp. 355-356). These commodified relations between employee and employer are further managed by the state through the following clause of the employment contract that enables the middle and upper class Cypriot woman to both produce herself as a putative manager of the bourgeois heterosexual family and manager of the relationship between herself and her employee:

"The Employer shall employ the Employee and the Employee shall work exclusively for the Employer as nanny/governess/housemaid/home help (strike out what is not applicable) at her residence situate at ... The term of the employment in Cyprus shall not in any way exceed the period of two years ... The employer shall deposit with the Migration Department of Cyprus a bank Guarantee of 500 pounds [about 1,000 dollars] as security for travel expenses of possible repatriation of the Employee" (Immigration Office, 2002, Republic of Cyprus, Contract of Employment).

Through these contracts the state mediates the relation of the employer with the employee by regulating it. Moreover, the state through its process of mediation of relations between capital and wage labour comes to play a significant role in reducing the costs of social reproduction because the state does not have to be responsible for the development and well being of the worker. On the contrary, the state, as the defender of multinational and corporate profits, pushes to privatise social relations such as social responsibility and social reproduction. This cost is passed to the state where the wage labourer originates. The employer must deposit about 1,000 dollars with the state in case the employee (always female from lower-generating income peripheral economies) dies or is fired, and, resources are required for repatriation. Even when this amount of money is deposited, the value that the worker produces for the family is much higher than the deposit and the wages. Indeed, the worker, depending whether she is a sex or domestic worker, enables the production of subjects through her labour (including household care and affective labour) and the active sexual relations that she may have with her clients and impresarios.

In addition, the state mediates the control and discipline of the women's lives and also use of time. Employees are tied to their employers and are expected to perform their duties according to their employers' requirement.

"The employee shall not be allowed to change Employer and place of employment during the validity of this contract in his Temporary

Residence/Work Permit ... shall work 6 days per week, for 7 hours per day, either during the day or the night and shall perform his duties or any other duties relevant to his employment according to the requirements of the Employer ... and contribute to the utmost of his abilities in promoting the interests of the Employer, protect his property from loss, damage etc ... shall obey and comply with all orders and instructions of the Employer and faithfully observe the rules, regulations and arrangements for the time being in force for the protection of the Employer's property and in general the good execution of work ... shall produce work of the highest standards and in no way inferior in quality and quantity to the work produced by skilled or unskilled workers of the same specialisation/occupation in Cyprus" (Cited in Agathangelou, 2004, p. 48: Republic of Cyprus, Contract of Employment).

These property contracts and policies put in place a map of how the employment relationship is expected to unfold. They outline extensively the duties and responsibilities of the employee as well as the exclusive expectations towards the employer. Furthermore, this document not only indicates the state's securing of the interests of its middle and upper class citizens but also outlines what needs to be protected (e.g. property and reputation) by the employees. Thus, the employees are more than workers; they turn into the guardians ensuring the protection of the private property and the reputation of the Cypriot employers. Additionally, the employees are expected to become more and more flexible labourers. They have to follow particular rules if they are to be considered legitimate objects of desire (temporary, healthy, non-contagious). The reproductive labour (i.e. Sri Lankan, Myanmaran, and Filipina) as temporary, flexible, and, in some ways, the "property" of her bourgeois "white but not quite" (Greek Cypriot) employer can be here understood as mediated through this contract and toward the realisation of an historical tendency. The production of the desire industries, the participation of different peripheral states, the participation of women is "predicated on this tendency and it is the effect of these intertwined logics" (Tadiar, 1998, p. 935) that enables the different productions: whole regions (e.g. the Mediterranean) turning into peripheries of multinational corporations and capital, states into peripheries, desire economies, sexual orifices, "unfree" racialised and sexualised workers, etc. The employee's labour power is a commodity, and the person herself becomes a commodity and an object of desire for the peripheral economy and the employer. Indeed, the state turns into a commodity and a periphery in the global economy through its participation in the desire industries and its dependence on trafficking as a technology and operation of transference of cheap reproductive labour. This contract outlines a few major "neo/liberal" principles that come to be embodied by the state, the migrant wage labourer, the employer, and the spatialities of power:

- (1) the role the state chooses to play in the mediation of the relation between capital and female migrant wage labour;

- (2) its role in processing the cost of social reproduction;
- (3) the “agency” and “freedom” of the employer and the worker; and
- (4) the spaces and bodies where “violence can happen with impunity” (Razack, 1998, p. 358).

The contract is signed both by the employer and employee as a stamp of the power of capital.

This neo-liberal democratic labour law/contract does not necessarily precipitate a relationship of violence. However, in many instances this contract becomes a tool that justifies the various forms of violence that trafficked women have experienced. The employer possesses the political rights and agency, whereas the female migrant working-class Sri Lankan, Filipina, or Myanmaran is not defined as a citizen and, thus, does not possess the right to approach the state to hold her employer accountable or even involve herself in political organising.

The contract moves beyond the exchange to outlining that the employee is also responsible for securing the material interests of the employer. Yet, the severity of the contract does not seem to deter female migrants from migrating to Cyprus for dependent employment and even being paid by the hour in homes/cabarets/taverns/clubs (Interviews with domestic workers in Nicosia, Limassol and Larnaca in Cyprus, 2002). Despite claims that the worker is “equal” and “free” to choose her own conditions of labour, it becomes apparent through this contract that the owning and middle class employer who works to ensure the command of her labour seems to have the power and the freedom to do as s/he chooses depending on the situation. S/he has the power to terminate employment of the employee on the spot and without explanation. Even when an immigrant woman possesses the opportunity to become an economic actor in the transnational service economy and society, she still cannot command her own labour. She provides her labour/services to her employer, but according to global capital she is not a political agent who can challenge the violence she faces daily since she lacks citizenship and, therefore, the full rights of the social contract (Mills, 1997; Pateman, 1988).

“Domestication” of Reproductive Labour and Bodies through Contractual Exploitation

A recent bill for immigration policy in Greece (Baldwin-Edwards, 1998, 2002) locates domestic and sex workers’ reproductive labour and bodies in spaces of servitude. The bill’s wording shows the ways in which the state and market mediate the social relations between the Greek subject/employer with the “other” object/employee or wage labourer. Race and sex, for example, are almost always the first sorting mechanisms in reproductive labour services. Female domestic workers are collapsed under the general category of foreigners/Third country

nationals entitled “for the allocation of ‘dependent employment’” (Law 2910/01, Ministry of Labour and Social Security, Greece, Article 19).

In Article 34 we read the following about sex workers: “It might be possible with the decision of the Minister of Interior to define as entertainment centres other places outside the definition provided in the textual provisions.” The employer of “entertainment centres” can request the entrance of particular artists provided that these artists are under the management and control of the employer while working for them. Of course, the “artist-lover” has to prove to the state that he basically owns the money to initiate and expropriate the labour of the sex worker. Some of the requirements are that he “possesses four times more income from that of his unskilled [artist] worker”; “has supporting documents in which he states that he possesses no criminal record in the past five years and that as an employer he possesses a shop with at least 50 seats and that he employs no more than 20 foreigners”; “possesses a certificate from the general hospital of the artist’s country of origin” stating that the artist has no “sickness that can constitute a risk for the public health in conjunction with the conditions set in WHO” (paragraph 2); “has a bank guarantee note that covers the expenses of (re)promotion (epanaproothisi) or deportation expenses to the country of origin (paragraph 2)” (Agathangelou, 2004, p. 50). Similarly, to the domestic worker contract this bill, paragraph 4 of Article 34 states that the artist is “given a permit of six months that she cannot renew. A change of employer or employment is not allowed.” Once the sex worker is in the country she is faced with the possibility of her “non-value” as a citizen without human rights. The contract frequently becomes a tool of disciplining the movement of women as well as basically violating their basic human rights of existence. Sex workers who were interviewed regarding their work related the following about their bodies and the understandings of their employers of them:

“I am from Belarus. My impresario knew my boss in Greece and sent me to him. The Greek impresario picked me up at the airport. He took me to his house telling me that I had to stay over at his place till the next day when my employer will be ready to meet me at his nightclub. He offered me several drinks and then wanted to sleep with me by telling me: ‘Before I sell you to _____ I want to try you out ... I am your first and foremost boss in this fucking country’” (ibid., p. 80).

The bodies of trafficked women are not merely acknowledged as commodities for sale but are also expected to become the property of the impresario who sells these bodies to different bars, cabarets, and hotels. The male desire for a guaranteed relation to his commodity, securing as it does male property and power, is regularly contradicting the state contract of “equal exchange.” On the contrary, what this moment highlights is that women are always there through sale and non-sale to fulfil their natural reproductive teleological role in the assertion of male heterosexuality

and heteronormativity.¹¹ Thus, the female and racialised body is first and foremost for the pleasure and the (re)production of the male as powerful and property owner of women's bodies and labour. The productive labour of sex and domestic workers becomes subsumed as 'reproductive' labour without value.

Many women head to Greece to work as dancers or waitresses, but, on arrival, they meet an expectation to perform sexual services as part of their job as artists, a euphemism for prostitutes. Other political and social forces affect the commodification of women's labour power and bodies within Greece. For example, the import of sex workers takes place in a country where prostitution is legal and is seen by citizens as a "necessary evil" serving a "necessary function."

The political practices and policies of the state (Kandaraki, 1997 cited in Lazaridis, 2001, p. 96) run parallel to the proclivities of public clientele: their approach to sex workers reflects the same assumption of necessity (Magganas, 1994). When men and women were asked to explain the reasons behind the increased levels of prostitution (Interviews with Greeks in Cyprus and Athens, 2001), they expressed views similar to those found by Kandaraki. Greek men and women seem to assume that men's sexual drives are "natural" (Loizos and Papataxiarchis, 1991, p. 222). Loizos and Papataxiarchis identify two forms of constituted male heterosexuality, one that argues that men have sex to produce the next generation and another in which men's natural sexual desires are informed by kefi. Kefi is "a state of pleasure wherein men transcend the pettiness of a life of calculation" (ibid., p. 17) or "the spirit of desire that derives from the heart" (ibid., p. 226). "Such desire is spontaneous, ephemeral and individualistic" (Lazaridis, 2001, p. 76) and women who participate in fulfilling these desires are condemned as "women of the road" (Magganas, 1994).

The state intervenes to mediate this relation in such a way that it obfuscates the class/gendered/racialised relations between those who are "white but not quite" and "black" working class women whose labour power is expropriated and commodified and those "white but not quite" subjects within the new emerging transnational owning class who command not only the labour power but also the whole person, by exploiting and using different methods of violence such as name calling, beating, sexual assault, and rape. Reproductive labour (both domestic and sexual) is defined by naturalist notions (e.g. kefi, or protection of one's employer's property) camouflaging the mediations, activities, and processes through which such relations participate in realising the historical tendencies as outlined by capital. These politics, which focus on the imaginary of a heterosexually married, two-parent family as the norm, displace and marginalise households that do not fit such a model. This model ends up centralising the social reproduction of the Greek and Turkish bourgeoisie in Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey who are able to access high-

income levels, cheap labour and expensive living space. The female migrant worker as well as the local working class ends up accessing lower wages as well as becoming ghettoised within these peripheral economic states' borders and spaces. The working class, migrant and local, is relegated to the margins by the state and those entrepreneurs who hire their labour. This spatial moral ordering premised on the idea of consent of liberal democratic states makes possible the further domination of the working class and more specifically the sex and domestic workers. Sherene Razack brilliantly articulates how the marginalisation of and the violence against the prostitute secures property and home for men:

“Actual spaces express relations of domination-relations mapped as degrees of belonging to the nation state ... the idea of how much we can care. We care less about the bodies in degenerate spaces and often define out of existence the violence enacted on those bodies. The spatial system of moral ordering is enabled by the notion in liberal democratic states that we are all free individuals entitled to pursue our own interests. The idea of consent as it operates in prostitution bolsters the hierarchy of bodies and spaces. Further, the consent framework effectively dissolves a consideration of the production of spaces. We do not ask what the spaces of prostitution enable or what happens in them. There are simply designated bodies and spaces where so called contractual violence can happen with impunity” (1998, p. 358).

These “designated bodies and spaces” as the different contracts mediate become the sites where “so called contractual violence can happen with impunity.” What is also important is to recognise that the restructuring of spaces (e.g. cabarets) fall within those spaces that Razack names as the degenerate spaces. But the households in which domestic employees work can also become degenerate spaces where violence happens with impunity. The contractual relations between women and employers basically sanction violence in such a way that allows the creation of higher employment rates for the upper and upper middle classes and lower wages, higher stress and levels of violence, including the “use” of bodies and labour for the female migrants and the local working class. Simultaneously, these practices make possible the heterosexual white bourgeoisie production of masculinity and femininity as well as the securing of property, the surplus-value of the labour from the working class and provide the rights to them to treat sex and domestic workers' bodies as zones that can be punished and violated (*ibid.*, p. 358). Moreover, the labour comes to be produced as “white but not quite” and “black” female worker, that is, their life activity appears as a “means to life” (Marx and Engels, 1988, p. 76). The female worker is thus both estranged from her life-activity and from those she works for. This social reproduction of asymmetrical racialised, gender, and class identities is constituted through the social practices (e.g. valorisation and commodification of social reproduction, buying one's labour, signing an employment contract) within an international division of labour. Those

states that participate in their own feminisation through their participation in the desire industries rather than the “formal” economies (i.e. corporations of financial investments; corporations which produce industrial technologies) facilitate an asymmetrical social reproduction, through its mediation and support of the sale and purchase of reproductive labour and its exploitation. The upper and middle class of Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey is constituted as “white but not quite” (economically powerful but not as powerful as their EU core country counterparts) through the labour of women of colour (or black) and “white but not quite” sex workers.¹²

All three peripheral economies and the state mediate the sale and purchases of the reproductive labour of migrant women and in the process encourage prospective employers to specify racial and other social characteristics/contradictions for the reproductive labour and the bodies they wish to buy. This “mediation” supports a particular kind of economic exchange of reproductive labour. However, a different picture unfolds when we take a closer look at the state’s intervention and the people who sell or buy these services and their bodies.

As Marianne and Galena said in an interview:

“When we leave here [Turkey] to go back to Russia and Moldavia we want to be able to sit in our homes with our daughters and mothers and drink our vodka without any impresarios around sucking your blood” [they both laugh].

“Sucking your blood” is a reference to the exploitation that they experience in the desire industries, and yet, their knowing that a structure of exploitative relations exists does not stop them from migrating to make quick cash or from selling their bodies or reproductive labour “as a strategy of subsistence survival” (Ebert, 2001, p. 14). Moreover, knowing this episteme of capital does not stop them from fantasising about or desiring a different life full of pleasure. The root condition of this neoliberal capitalist structure is based on buying and selling women’s reproductive labour as a commodity to produce profit. The “blood sucking” that reproduces the neoliberal imperium happens in conjunction with restructurings of the state and its contingent epistememes of “security”.

Securitisation of Consent and “Freedom”: Traversing an Imperial Geography and Concealing Exploitation

The purchase and sale of reproductive labour did not begin with Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey. It is a dynamic, transnational process. The structural, forced migration of women for reproductive labour began with slave labour that took place from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries (Anderson, 2000, p. 129; Glenn, 1992). The labour of what comes to be constituted as black and indigenous peoples was exploited, that is, forcefully appropriated by what came to be known as the owning-class (e.g.

theft of the land of indigenous populations; theft of bodies, i.e. slavery; theft of labour) or through the purchase of people's labour. Despite the fact that slavery is illegal under bourgeois democracy (Marx, 1990) so that the fraudulent notion of free exchanges of wage for labour is made invisible, today the sale and purchase of reproductive labour is done "legally" but forcefully as part of licit and illicit exchanges. Though the organisation of the desire industries and the trafficking trade is not the same as the slave system in the antebellum South, this trade still draws on the epistemologies and practices of colonisation (i.e. "primitive accumulation"), exploitation and racism in its everyday constitution and reproduction (Agathangelou, 2004, p. 124). As Anderson (2000, p. 128) argues, "the distinction, if one wishes to make it, can be extremely complicated, but perhaps the key point to make is that the slavery and wage labour ("wage slavery") are not diametrically opposed" when looking at the ways the trafficking of women and children is organised. This seemingly free relation between the employer and labour is guided by compulsion. The legal blocks against slavery have not ended (Farley, 2005). Both sex and domestic workers become reproduced as feminised, non-producers of value within the historical trajectories of capital. Legalistic notions that sex trafficking and other kinds of trafficking are illegal in the EU and in the peripheries of Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey serve to mystify that sexual slavery is an integral part of the formation of the projects of neoliberalism and bourgeois democracy (Conference on Trafficking in Human Beings, International Women Lawyers Federation, Istanbul 2001; Europe Against Trafficking, OSCE Report, October 2001; Erginsoy, 2000). Those states which, historically have been marginal to European and US capital, due to histories of colonisation and imperialism, come to be constituted as peripheral states in the contemporary moment through processes of desire and force. These peripheral states facilitate and manage potential "crises" of imperialist capitalism and play a crucial role in sustaining structural and other social insecurities. These states conceal them by drawing upon the epistemic imperial political frameworks that end up making the working-class and, more specifically, female migrant workers, the scapegoat.

"A majority of individuals, who have financial gains from the ... Natasha Activities show these women as married on paper and make them Turkish citizens. If no measures are taken, the number of people who have acquired Turkish citizenship in this way will increase to hundreds of thousands. This situation will become an important security issue for Turkey ... It will also be an important threat factor in terms of the effect it will have on our human resources ... Most of these women are university graduates and they provide the intelligence units of their countries with intelligence on various issues. It has been established that the intelligence units interrogate some of these women for days after they return to their countries. The state officials, who have been involved in the Natasha activities and who are [in] important positions, may leak extremely important information regarding the general security of the state, to these women. It has been established that some of

these officials have illegal relationships with these women. It is known that the important strategic natural sources and the human structure [of Turkey] are being examined with this method”
[<http://www.cdi.org/russia/johnson/6064-11.cfm>].

In the above newspaper text, the episteme of capital and masculinisation (that is, authority of particular subjects; devaluation and hidden expropriation of labour and its value) is prioritised. The text argues that women have “ways” of drawing out crucial information from officials about national security that may compromise the sovereignty of the state (Agathangelou, 2004, p. 126). On centralising the security of the state, this text participates in silencing the racialised/sexualised class struggles ensuing, the state’s collusion with the multibillion dollar industries of desire, trafficking, and smuggling to ensure their profitable operation while also infantilising the men as being used by women, while expropriating their surplus value. Even when the text emphasises the agency of the state officials, this text also characterises women as potential threats to state security and “exploiters” of the Turkish economy. The focus on the Russian woman and its relation to the Turkish official makes invisible the structural racialised and gendered relation of what comes to be produced as “black” labour and “white but not quite” capital as well as the state and other terrors that migrants face daily. Most of these reports in the media regime are informed by reports produced by the state (Natasha Activity Report and the Interior Ministry) and play an active role in both making invisible the violence (including the exploitation) that women experience as well as produce them as threats to its sovereignty. The considerable insecurity that the female working-class migrants and children embody is rendered unimportant and invisible. These are major strategies of terror that contain popular discontent and contribute toward disarticulating mass organising (Petras, 1987, p. 103; and Pigem, 2003).

Globalisation as a process engenders new forms of transnational marketisation for cheap wage-labour and trafficking of humans to serve others and new cooperative/domination relations among different states. The licit and forced movement of people is constantly articulated as a national security threat “as Turkish citizens, we live in an uncomfortable area. We have to consider the internal security of our country. All of our regulations respond to the logic of stabilising the security of our country” (Frelick, 1997, p. 47). These, though, are epistemological tools and modes of governmentability that new emerging transnational institutions as well as states use to affirm their role as providers of protection and security and to mystify anxieties about their structural economic precariousness in international relations of labour and capital within world economy and conceal the violence exerted on migrants from private powers. As Bigo (2002, p. 70) argues:

“The ‘will to mastery’ on the part of the politicians has only one effect but an important one. They change the status and say (at the national – or, in the

contemporary European context, Schengen – borders), declaring legal and illegal the arrival and they stay in the country, but they know that a person who wants to enter will succeed anyway. Thus, in an illegal situation, the immigrant becomes, for the politician ... the personal enemy. Politicians see themselves as insulted by the incapacity to enforce the integrity of the national body they represent. The 'migrant' is seen as both a public enemy breaking the law and a private enemy mocking the will of the politician."

A synecdochal move by the state and its agents to identify the migrant as their public and private enemy activates epistemologies that link migration and security. This linkage blurs the methods and categories such as sovereignty and security that are associated with a "particular way of governing – that of the so-called Westphalian state and its modern ... variations" (ibid., p. 68). These approaches obscure unresolved structural questions such as exploitation, poverty, unemployment, and urbanism and converge in a space that lacks political solutions. Moreover, these activations make invisible just what they are in response to (e.g. in Greece for instance, the migrant and the student movement has been challenging the restructurings of the state). Such epistemological punctuations enable the articulation and implementation of particular practices of exploitation and violence:

"This is not your job. It is closing your eyes, surviving, and if you finish your "ambassadorship to Turkey" with some money in your pocket, you are in good shape ... you know cabaret is only for sex and prostitution and, of course, I can't ever say anything negative about the Russian, the Moldavian, or any other impresarios even when they steal your money and do not do anything for you ... and you know the reasons behind this silence" (Elena, Russian sex worker in Turkey).

Within Elena's words we hear an epistemological contestation of aspects of the neoliberal imperium: the earning of some money through one's "ambassadorship in Turkey" does not come for "free." It comes through "closing your eyes" and "surviving" the many forms of violence and incessant fears that come with such earning, including the different impresarios who may be considered nationally connected to Elena. As a representative of Russia, Elena arrives in Turkey precisely in the name of ensuring the earning of some money. The class politics that are embedded in that conceptualisation expose the many ways that the state enables one class's possibility through migration (e.g. ambassadors to other countries either as political figures or sex workers). This epistemology speaks of the ontological mediations: the "white but not quite" Russian woman participates through her sexual services toward the production of the "white but not quite" Turkish man which indeed would allow her to constitute herself as Russian, always sexual object (i.e. with sexual orifices of seduction). This epistemological articulation speaks to the violence embedded in these social relations as well as the cultures of terror that are

central to the formation and continuation of the desire industries. More specifically, these epistemologies expose the many strategies that migrant and/or trafficked women, the impresarios, the state, work with to sustain in place a regime of “wage slavery” which in turn, results in supporting the further feminisation of aspects of the economy of the peripheral economic state (Gülçür and Ilkcaracan, 2002).

By Way of Conclusion: Disrupting Neoliberal Formations and Articulating “Other” Social Relations

The new neoliberal projects push on turning women’s, children’s, and working class’ bodies into borders and war zones. Yet, daily these same peoples disrupt these demands, albeit contradictorily, and imagine and draw on such borders and war zones as their sites of political intervention and change. How are feminists and other radical theorists disrupting these compulsive and seductive pushes of “brutal solidarities” between “blacks” and “whites”, between capital and states, between peoples at the margins and peoples in the centres? In recognising that wars, racisms, sexism and other kinds of violence are methods and approaches of shackling more people in the prisons of capital and its agents, radical feminists and other organic intellectuals are reminded that autopsies of nation-states, families, communities and migrant bodies would read dirt and the blood of women, children, peoples of colour, and the working class. As an intervention and a strategy of solidarity with the working class, the working class of migrant women, the children; those dying daily on the front lines to secure the interests of the middle and upper classes, this piece acts to disrupt aspects of such violence. It is a contribution to those who daily redirect their energies toward cementing movements of solidarity and change rather than metamorphosing war zones and borders of violence. We, as intellectuals need to ask: How is knowledge produced about the migration of reproductive labour in peripheral economies toward the production of the desire industries? “Who are ‘we’ that this question of trafficking becomes a question for us?”; “How has the ‘we’ been constructed in relation to this question?”; “How does the epistemological question itself become possible?” (Interview with Butler, 1998.) Why is it produced this way and what are the implications materially and socio-ontologically of such knowledge production? And what are the political stakes in these productions?

In raising these questions about productions of knowledge and insecurity, a crucial ontological question arises: How can we produce social relations of desire and sex differently? The trafficking of women is not merely about work or violence. It is about the ways that historical trajectories become realised; it is about the role that different technologies, including trafficking, play in securing racial and heterosexual patrimonies and military regimes (i.e. migration offices, police

institutions, prisons) in today's transnational world. Moreover, the trafficking of women for the desire industries becomes a major restructuring tool of peripheral states which collude with the leadership of the neoliberal world order in covering over its contradictions: the promises that it will provide for the majority, and yet, it actively provides maximum access to resources and bodies to a very small minority in the world. By investing in logics and practices that emphasise the equal exchange of labour for cash silences, the fact is rendered invisible that both the production of peripheral economies, and, within them, the peripheral "shadow" economies, depend on turning the working class migrant women and children into war zones and borders. In these relations, those who own the resources expropriate the surplus value of bodies deemed exploitable toward enabling their own possibility of reproduction (that is, the reproduction of their identities and their own communities) as well as property relations and the neoliberal imperium at the expense of less violent and less alienating worlds. When people and states as social relations push to mediate their activities in such a way to draw on labour to produce it as an object, social relations become impoverished. However, such relations are not produced without struggles from the migrant women who are expected to redirect all their resources toward the (re)production of bourgeois subjects "white but not quite" and with risking their own death on a daily basis. Even when extreme measures are taken by the peripheral state to contain and manage conflicts of interest, contradictions, and antagonisms inherent in the racialised sexual and class divisions of labour (Anderson, 2000, p. 1) as well as the larger sexual and economic structures, migrant women are exceeding the logics of capital by making connections with "local" peoples of working class and other peoples interested in movements that articulate non-racist, non-militaristic, exploitation. Women, children, and the working class in these sites are crossing borders daily to create alliances and solidarities which challenge these patrimonies, and by re-entering communities and by re-appropriating their means of production and labour and toward the creation of other worlds and communities less violent and death inducing.

Domestic and sex workers challenge the isolation and the alienating conditions that they face daily. They organise by coming together outside the context of the households which are sites of ongoing exploitation and violence. Many migrant workers in all three countries draw on their wages collectively to rent apartments and use them as spaces within which they come to reflect on their daily lives and the need for alternatives which can dismantle the power relations of exploitation (Agathangelou, 2004), including their intervention in "local" movements even when they are not articulated as political agents. Many of these women are joining different organisations and transnational movements toward the production and realisation of other selves and worlds. Sex, domestic workers, academics, and non-profit organisations join in different collectives and confront the regime of profit

(Greek Helsinki Monitor, Global Change Institute, Reintegration Centre for Migrant Workers, Greece). Working together in solidarity, they build movements, confronting the asymmetries that exist among us based on the positions that we each occupy in the international division of labour. Through such movements, it becomes possible to reorganise power till the asymmetries approach a vanishing point. "The stakes in the struggle to solidarity are different for all of us; however, our entry point into this struggle is informed by a sexual raced division of labour and vision for an alternative world" (Agathangelou, 2004, p. 173). This article is written as an intervention in commandeering the creative, libidinal forces that produce the world in capital's imagination. This writing attempts to intervene by demonstrating that the creative, socio-subjective practices and activities of women migrants must be viewed from the sites of production, exchange, and the peripheral states where migrant women are declared "marginal," "white but not quite," "black," "feminised", etc. Both radical feminists who claim the death of patriarchy and Marxist analysts (who claim the primacy of labour) at times naturalise women's reproductive labour and dominant power relations which use as their contingent strategies mystification, invisibility, appropriation, exploitation, and sexual violence. Seduced by the radicalness of our frameworks, we can end up colluding with capital's dreams and imaginaries all in the name of freedom and choice. To what end? The working class, "peripheral states", and academics can disrupt the mythologies of self, freedom and choice, and social crises and redirect their material and symbolic resources toward the constitution of worlds and communities of life.

Notes

1. "Whiteness" here is understood as an ideal signifier but also a process that pushes for organising social relations in certain ways. This process is contingent on historical tendencies; its embodiment changes depending on the spatial and time re-constitutions within which social relations unfold.
2. It is crucial here to note that the production of and the participation by states in the desire industries either through export or import of labour is 'peripheralising' the state's labour, and indeed, its own location in the global economy. This peripheralisation (i.e. feminisation and racialisation of aspects of the socio-economic and political relations of different sites) draws on gender, sexuality and/or race to constitute the general category of "labour" (i.e. the industrial working class proletariat).
3. Tadiar (1998, p. 931) analyses the Philippines in the new global economy and she argues that the bodies of women "are detailed for increasingly specialised and fragmented tasks in the electronics, garments, textiles, and prostitution industries. The subcontracting of production processes hence entails the subcontracting of Filipina body parts and their respective 'skill'. Such a correlation represents the national body and the individual body as sites for the reception and processing of capital-intensive flows and,

therefore, as effects of the same gendered and gendering, sexualised and sexualising global production processes. This is the perspective one arrives at when one proceeds from the presumption of the privileged, unified detaining agency of capital”.

4. Tadiar (1998) brilliantly articulates that the processes through which the hom(m)o-sexuality regime of relations of production becomes constituted depends on the sublimation of male labour and the alienation of male sexuality as a “female object”. She draws on Marx’s Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 to make the point that “sexual intercourse thus assumes the role of a spontaneous activity, an activity in which the worker regains his self, the loss of which becomes embodied in the woman who occupies the domestic sphere, from he is as labour separated ... Opposed to labour, ‘recreation’ (for example, in military Rest and Recuperation [R&R]) turns sexual activity into aggression: ‘begetting’ is virile, masculinising. Since work is an emasculating activity turned against the male worker, configured as that which does not belong to him, activities defined against work, such as private sexual pleasures, become avenues of aggression” (p. 943).
5. “Social” here refers to our societal relations (e.g. society, structures, and institutions and more specifically, the relations and the processes (i.e. how do we go about organising our daily lives through which such structures, institutions, and regimes become formed and sustained and under what conditions).
6. I define neoliberal imperium here as a set of disjunctive neocolonial processes, social relations worldwide. More specifically, I refer to the West’s (e.g. the US, Western Europe etc.) economic and military power and its technocratic political culture whose contentious surface hides a firm consensus about the supremacy of capital (e.g. property relations and privatisation of social relations).
7. Desire industries refers to those activities that deal primarily with the (re)production of subjects, including their sexual, racial, and corporeal aspects and whose primary economic value is derived from the racialised and sexualised reproductive labour.
8. Harvey has called this process accumulation through dispossession.
9. Here I am following critical theorists of race, who argue that “whiteness” as a process “is a structural privilege” and it “whiteness” as a process is “violence and terror” and denote the historical legacy of colonialism and imperialism (Brander, Rasmussen, Klinenberg, Nexica, and Wray, 2001, pp. 10-12). I would also argue that there are continuities with colonialism but also disjunctures in race relations today. However, understanding them outside colonialism and imperialism is impossible as contemporary benefits based on racial divisions and asymmetries are created based on asymmetrical divisions of labour. Whiteness is not merely about “black” and “white” or just about the colour of one’s skin. It is about a global system of racial relations that ethnicises some (i.e. a more sanitised way of racialisation)/racialises all and locates them asymmetrically with regards to access to resources and production relations by drawing on different codes (e.g. black vs. white).
10. There are other technologies as well such as slavery, reservation structure, and the prison structure (See Agathangelou, Bassichis, and Spira, forthcoming).
11. Homonormativity is another major process in the restructuring of global economies (See Agathangelou, Bassichis, and Spira, forthcoming).

12. "White but not quite" here as a category does not apply "equally" to the sex worker and her employer. It is rather a signifier of power. More so, I am drawing on this category not to constitute a universal category that applies to/and represents subjects equally but rather that such categorisations themselves are mediated in social relations continually and contingently. Within the social relations of reproductive labour "domestic workers" are in many instances understood as "black" bodies due to the relations they have with women that come from Eastern European states who are considered according to capital more legitimated subjects for "sex" due to their whiteness (i.e. more beautiful and more attractive). These categories do not gesture to essential traits of identity even when they are used as such in a synecdochal manner (as an apparatus of power) in the epistemologies of capital to underwrite the historical tendency of certain subjects toward dependence and sexual exploitation. In the movement to undo this tendency of collapsing (i.e. reducing a body as 'colour' of the epidermis of one's skin) bodies with "colour" and identities we must recognise the practices of peripheral states and the desire industries as constitutive of the general marginalisation of international labour relations.

Bibliography

- Agathangelou, A.M. (2002) 'Sexing "Democracy" in International Relations: Migrant Sex and Domestic Workers in Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey' in Chowdhry, G. and Nair, S. (eds.), *Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations: Reading Race, Gender and Class*. New York, Routledge, pp. 142-169.
- — —. (2004) *The Global Political Economy of Sex: Desire, Violence and Insecurity in Mediterranean Nation-States*. London, MacMillan/Palgrave.
- — —. (2005) 'Colonizing Desires: Bodies for Sale, Exploitation and (In) Security in Desire Industries'. Invited Presentation at the Captive Daughters Conference, Chicago, United States, March 2005.
- Agathangelou, A.M. and Kyle, D. Killian (2006) 'Epistemologies of Peace: Poetics, Globalisation, and the Social Justice Movement', *Globalisations*, Vol. 3, No. 4 (December), pp. 459-483.
- Agathangelou, A.M., Bassichis, D. and Spira, T. (forthcoming) 'Intimate Investments: Homonormativity, Global Lockdown, and the Seductions of Empire'.
- Agathangelou, A.M. and Ling, L.H.M. (2003) 'Desire Industries: Sex Trafficking, UN Peacekeeping, and the New World Order', *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Vol. X, No. 1, pp. 133-148.
- Aguilar, D. (2004) 'Questionable Claims: Colonialism Redux' in Aguilar, D.D. and Lacsamana, A.E. (eds.), *Women and Globalisation*. New York, Humanity Books, pp. 404-423.
- Aliens and Immigration Law 2910/2001, Greece.
- Anderson, B. (2000) *Doing the Dirty Work? The Global Politics of Domestic Labour*. London, Zed Books.

- — —. (2004) 'Who Needs Yehudi Menuhin? Costs and Impact of Migration' in Aguilar, D.D. and Lacsamana, A.E. (eds.), *Women and Globalisation..* New York: Humanity Books, pp. 262-277.
- Anthias, F. and Lazaridis, G. (2000) *Gender and Migration in Southern Europe; Women on the Move.* New York, Berg Press.
- Baldwin-Edwards, M. (1998) 'The Greek Regularisation: A Comparative Analysis with the Spanish, Portuguese and Italian Experiences'. University of Reading, Centre for Euro-Mediterranean Studies, Working Paper 98/2, April [<http://www.rdg.ac.uk/EIS/research>], accessed 11 October 2003.
- — —. (2002) 'Immigration and the Welfare State: A European Challenge to American Mythology'. MMO, Working Paper, 4, November [<http://www.antigone.gr/southern>], accessed 11 October 2002. *European Labour Markets and Immigration.*
- Beller-Hann, I. (1995) 'Prostitution and its Effects in North Eastern Turkey', *The European Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 2, pp. 219 – 235.
- Bhattacharjee, A. (1997) 'The Public/Private Mirage: Mapping Homes and Undomesticating Violence Work in the South Asian Immigrant Community' in Alexander, M.J. and Talpade Mohanty, C. (eds.), *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures.* New York/London, Routledge.
- Bigo, D. (2002) 'Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease', *Alternatives*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 63-92.
- Brander, B., Rasmussen, I.J., Klinenberg, E., Nexica, E. and Wray, M. (2001) 'Introduction' in Brander, B., Rasmussen, I.J., Klinenberg, E., Nexica, E. and Wray, M. (eds.), *The Making and Unmaking of Whiteness.* Durham, Duke University Press, pp. 1-24.
- Brenner, J. and Laslett, B. (1989) 'Gender and Social Reproduction: Historical Perspectives', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 15, pp. 381-404.
- Briggs, L.J. (2002) *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and US Imperialism in Puerto Rico.* Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Cavounidis, J. (2002) 'Migration in Southern Europe and the Case of Greece', *International Migration*, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 45-70.
- Costera M.I. and Prins, B. (1998) 'How Bodies Come to Matter: An Interview with Judith Butler', *Signs*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 275-286.
- Cotter, J. (2001) 'Eclipsing Exploitation: Transnational Feminism, Sex Work, and the State', *The Red Critique*, (Spring) [<http://redcritique.org/spring2001/eclipsingexploitation.htm>], accessed 21 October 2006.
- Demetriou, A. (2000) *Strictly Akatallion. Greek: From Omonia to Alkazar.* Athens, Oxi.
- Droukas, E. (1998) 'Albanians in the Greek Informal Economy', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (April), pp. 347-365.
- Ebert, T.L. (1996) *Ludic Feminism and After: Postmodernism, Desire, and Labour in Late Capitalism.* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- — —. (2001) 'Globalisation, Internationalism, and the Class Politics of Cynical Reason', *Nature, Society, and Thought*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 389-410.
- Emke-Papadopoulou, I. (2001) 'Trafficking in Women and Children: Greece a Country of

- Destination and Transit'. MMO, Working Paper 2, August
[\[http://www.uehr.panteion.gr/data_en/3541.htm\]](http://www.uehr.panteion.gr/data_en/3541.htm), accessed October 2003.
- Enloe, C. (1989) *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- — —. (1993) *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- — —. (2000) *Manoeuvres: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Erder, S. (2000) 'New Tendencies in International Migration: Is Turkey Becoming a Receiving Country?', in Atacan, F., Ercan, F., Kurtulus, H. and Turkey, M. (eds.), *Mubeccel Kiray icin Yazila, Baglam Yayinlari*. Istanbul, Baglam Yayinlari.
- Erder, S. and Kaska, S. (2003) 'Irregular Migration and Trafficking in Women: The Case of Turkey'. IOM International Organisation for Migration.
- Erginsoy, F.G. (2000) 'Female Child Sex Workers in Istanbul Metropolitan Area, Turkey: Gendered and Informal Child Labour in the City'. Paper presented at International Association for Feminist Economics, Bosphorus University, Istanbul, 15-17 August.
- Ergocmen B. and Yuksel, I. (2005) 'Migration and Internally Displaced Persons in Turkey'. Hacettepe University, Institute of Population Studies
[\[http://hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/tyyona/tyyona.htm\]](http://hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/tyyona/tyyona.htm), accessed 21 October 2006.
- Europe against Trafficking, OSCE Report (2001) Conference Report, Berlin Conference 15-16 October [\[http://www.osce.org/publications/odihr/2001/01/14182_290_en.pdf\]](http://www.osce.org/publications/odihr/2001/01/14182_290_en.pdf), accessed 21 October 2006.
- Farley, P.A. (1997) 'The Black Body as Fetish Object', *Oregon Law Review*, Vol. 76, No. 3, pp. 457-535.
- — —. (2005) 'Accumulation' [\[http://teachingfromtheleft.org/downloads/Farley_1.pdf\]](http://teachingfromtheleft.org/downloads/Farley_1.pdf), accessed 21 October 2006.
- Frelick, B. (1997) 'Barriers to Protection: Turkey's Asylum Regulations', *International Journal of Refugee Law*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 8-34.
- Ghosh, B. (1998) *Huddled Masses and Uncertain Shores: Insights into Irregular Migration*. The Hague: IOM: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- — —. (2000) *Managing Migration: Time for a New International Regime?* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Glenn, E.N. (1992) 'From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labour', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 18 (Spring), pp. 1-43.
- Global Survival Network (1997), A Conference on Trafficking, Moscow, 3-5 November.
- Gülçür, L. and Ilkcaracan, P. (2002) 'The "Natasha" Experience: Migrant Sex Workers from the Former Soviet Union in Turkey' (forthcoming in *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 25, No. 4).
- Guncikan, B. (1995) *Bir Kitap: Haraso'dan Natasa'ya* [From Haraso to Natasa]. Istanbul, Arion.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2000) *Empire*. Cambridge/MA, Harvard University Press.

- — —. (2002) *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. London, Hamish Hamilton Book.
- Hughes, D. (2000) 'The "Natasha" Trade: The Transnational Shadow Market of Trafficking in Women', *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 53, No. 2, pp. 625-651.
- — —. (2005a) 'The Demand for Victims of Sex Trafficking', June 2005 [<http://www.uri.edu/artsci/wms/hughes/pubtrfrep.htm>], accessed 15 January 2006.
- — —. (2005b) "'How Can I Be Sold Like This?'" Trafficking of North Korean Women Refugees', *National Review Online*, 19 July [<http://www.uri.edu/artsci/wms/hughes/pubtrfrep.htm>], accessed 15 January 2006.
- Icduygu, A. (2006) 'The Labour Dimensions of Irregular Migration in Turkey'. CARIM: Euro-Mediterranean Consortium for Applied Research on International Migration. Research Report, San Domenico Di Diesole [http://www.iue.it/RSCAS/e-texts/CARIM-RR2006_05_Icduygu.pdf], accessed 12 October 2006.
- Immigration Office (2002) *Contract of Employment*. Nicosia, Republic of Cyprus.
- International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (2006) *A Form of Slavery: Trafficking Women in OSCE Member States*, (June), pp. 21-24.
- International Organisation of Migration (1996) *Trafficking in Women to Austria for Sexual Exploitation*. IOM, Geneva.
- International Organisation of Migration (2001) 'Trafficking In Migrants', No. 23, (April) [http://www.old.iom.int/documents/publication/en/tm_23.pdf], accessed 21 October 2006.
- Interior Ministry Interviews in Cyprus (2000). Nicosia, Cyprus.
- Interviews with domestic workers from Rumania, Bulgaria, and Moldavia (2002). Istanbul.
- Interviews with female Greek employers of domestic workers (2001). Nicosia.
- Interviews with female Turkish employers of domestic workers (2000). Istanbul.
- Irigaray, L. (1985) *This Sex which is Not One*. Translated by C. Porter. Ithaca/NY, Cornell University Press.
- Johnson, C. (2000) *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire*. New York, Henry Holt.
- Johnson, D. (2002) 'Russian Prostitutes Seen to Pose Threat to Turkey's Security, Economy'. Translated by Ersin Ramoglu 'Natashas Being Used by Secret Services' [<http://www.cdi.org/russia/johnson/6064.txt>], accessed 10 October 2003.
- Kaplan, A. (2002) *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of US Culture (Convergences: Inventories of the Present)*. Cambridge, Harvard Press.
- Karasavoglou, A., et. al. (1998) *Foreign Workers in Kavala*. Turkey, School of Social Statistics.
- Katsoridas, K. (1994) 'Foreign Workers in Greece', *Information Bulletin of Labour Institute (INE)*.
- Kempadoo, K. and Doezema, J. (eds.) (1998) *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance, and Redefinition*. New York, Routledge.
- Kethi, Research Centre for Equality (2002) 'Human Resources Information' [<http://www.kethi.gr/greek/meletes/index.htm>], accessed 10 October 2001.

- Kollontai, A. (1977) *Selected Writings of Alexandra Kollontai*. Edited and Translated by A. Holt. New York, Norton.
- Kontis, A. (2000) 'Greece as a Receiving Country of Foreign Migrants', in Kostandinidis, S. and Pelagidis, Th. (eds.), *Greece in the 21st Century*, Athens, Papazisis, pp. 293-324 (in Greek).
- Law 4310 of 1929/Legislation regulating the status of alien immigrants, Greece.
- Lazaridis, G (2001) 'Trafficking and Prostitution: The Growing Exploitation of Migrant Women in Greece', *The European Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 8, pp. 67-102.
- Lazarides, G. and Romaniszyn, K. (1996) 'Albanian and Polish Undocumented Workers in Greece: A Comparative Analysis', *European Social Policy Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 42-56.
- Lazos, G. (1997) *Sexuality as a Value in Modern Greece*. Athens, Delfini.
- . (2002) *Prostitution and International Trafficking in Contemporary Greece*. Athens, Kastaniotis.
- Loizos, P. and Papataxiarchis, E. (1991) *Contested Identities: Gender and Kinship in Modern Greece*. Princeton/New Jersey, Princeton University Press.
- Lukacs, G. (1971) *History and Class Consciousness; Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. Translated by R. Livingstone. Cambridge/Mass, MIT Press.
- Magganas, A. (ed.) (1994) *Ta Ekdidomena Atoma. Pornia: Pareklissi h Paravasi [The Issued Persons: Prostitution: Deviation or Infringement?]*. Athens, Papazisis.
- Marx, K. (1976) *Capital*, Vol. 1. Translated by B. Fowkes. London, Penguin Books.
- . (1986) 'Economic Manuscripts of 1857-58' in Marx, K. and Engel, F.'s *Collected Works*, Vol. 28. Translated by E. Wangermann. New York, International Publishers.
- . (1990) *Capital*, Vol. 1. 1976. London/New York, Penguin.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1976) *The German Ideology*. Moscow, Progress Publishers.
- . (1988) *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. New York, Prometheus Books.
- McClintock, A. (1995) *Imperial Leather [electronic resource]: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest*. New York, Routledge.
- Mediterranean Institute of Gender Studies (2006) 'Mapping the Realities of Trafficking Women in Cyprus' [<http://www.medinstgenderstudies.org/wp/?p=16>], accessed 21 October 2006.
- Mies, M. (1998) *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour*. London/New York, Zed Press.
- Mills, C. (1997) *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Ministry of National Economy (1998). Athens, Greece.
- Ministry of National Economy (1999). Athens, Greece.
- Morokvasic, M. and de Tinguy, A. (1993) 'Between East and West: A New Migratory Space' in Rudolph, H. and Morokvasic, M. (eds.), *Bridging States and Markets: International Migration in the Early 1990s*. Berlin, WZB.

- Nair, S. (2006) 'Hegemony and its Discontents: Migrants, Security and the State in Southeast Asia'. Paper presented at National Sun Yat-Sen University, Taiwan, 2 June.
- Narli, N.A. (2002) Human Smuggling and Migration of Illegal Labour to Turkey. Istanbul, Marmara University.
- Nilüfer, N., Türkmen, A., Ekrem, S. and Çoban, M. (2002) 'Transit Migration and Human Smuggling in Turkey: Preliminary Findings from the Field Work' [<http://www.ucansupurge.org/newhtml/english/links/movementarchive/transitmigration.php>], accessed 10 January 2002.
- Organisation of Development of Human Resources (1998) Athens, Greece.
- Pateman, C. (1988) *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford/California, Stanford University Press.
- Petras, J. (1987) 'Political Economy of State Terror: Chile, El Salvador, and Brazil', *Crime and Social Justice*, No's. 27-28, pp. 88-109.
- Picchio, A. (1992) *Social Reproduction: The Political Economy of the Labour Market*. Great Britain, Cambridge University Press.
- Pigem, J. (2003) 'The Altered Landscape' in *We are Everywhere: The Irresistible Rise of Global Anticapitalism*. Notes from Nowhere (eds.) London/New York, Verso, pp. 408-412.
- Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (2000) [http://www.uncjin.org/Documents/Conventions/dcatoc/final_documents_2/convention%20traff_eng.pdf], accessed 15 December 2006.
- Razack, S. (1998) 'Race, Space, and Prostitution: The Making of the Bourgeois Subject', *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 338-376.
- — —. (2004) *Dark Threats and White Knights*. Canada, University of Toronto Press.
- — —. (2005) 'Racial Violence and Masculinities of the New World Order: Lessons from Peacekeeping'. Presentation York University, Toronto, Canada, 8 March 2005.
- Rupert, M. (1995) *Producing Hegemony: The Politics of Mass Production and American Global Power*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, J. (1995) 'Sexual and National Boundaries in Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 22 (Fall), pp. 385-403.
- Stoler, A. (1989) 'Making Empire Respectable. 'The Politics of Race and Sexual Morality in Twentieth Century Colonial Cultures', *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 16, pp. 26-51.
- Tadiar, N. (1998) 'Prostituted Filipinas and the Crisis of Philippine Culture', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 927-954.
- Trafficking in human beings in South Eastern Europe (Belgrade, UNICEF, OHCHR and OSCE-ODIHR, June 2002).
- Trafficking Protocol, United Nations Article 13 (2000) Office of the United High Commissioner for Human Rights [<http://www.ohchr.org/english/law/protocoltraffic.htm>], accessed 21 October 2006.
- Turkey Country Report (2002) Country Report on Human Rights Practices. Released by the

- Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labour, US Department of State.
[<http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2002/18396.htm>], accessed 3 January 2003.
- Ucarer, E.M. (1999) 'Trafficking in Women, the European Union, and Nongovernmental Organisations'. Paper presented at the International Studies Association, Washington, DC, 16-20 February.
- Ventura, L. (1993) 'Female Migration: Birth and Development of the Scientific Interest', *Dini*, Vol. 6 (May) (in Greek).
- Women against Violence, Europe, Austria (2005) 'Violence against Women: Good Practices in Combating and Eliminating Violence against Women', 17-20 May, Vienna Austria [<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/egm/vaw-gp-2005/docs/background/wave.paper.pdf>], accessed 21 October 2006.
- World Conference against Racism (2001) 'World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance', Durban, South Africa, 31 August-8 September [<http://www.un.org/WCAR/durban.pdf>], accessed 21 October 2006.
- Zographos, A. (1991) 'I Katastasi ton tritokosmikou ergaton stin Ellada' [The Condition of Third Workers in Greece], *Kinoniki Ergasia*, Vol. 23, pp. 165-184.

MODELS OF COMPROMISE AND ‘POWER SHARING’ IN THE EXPERIENCE OF CYPRIOT MODERNITY

Andreas Panayiotou

Abstract

There are two arguments running through this essay: Analytically the goal is to look into the experience of Cypriot modernity in order to explore what kinds of compromises/accommodations/forms of “power sharing”, have been developed in order to address conflicts involving issues of identity. Methodologically there is an effort to develop a social-historical interpretative framework in which identity is seen as a form of subjectivity constructed and contested on the terrain of social and political conflicts. The empirical focus will be on periods of social upheaval during the past two centuries in relation to cultural (production of subjectivity/identity) and political (power sharing) forms. It is suggested that we can discern three basic models of compromise which manifested themselves as de facto sociological realities rather than as legal texts.

Introduction

The “solution” to the Cyprus problem is usually seen in terms of legal clauses (of the new constitution, of guarantees) and in this context efforts to understand the possible implications of a suggested solution tend to focus on values (justice, respect) and textually defined efficiency (functional solution, security guarantees). It is proposed in this essay to look at the socio-historical reality through which modern Cypriots were shaped (and which they shaped through their social action), in order to see how they managed to mediate or settle conflicts – to see, that is, the “repertoires of compromises” available in the “collective unconscious” of historical consciousness. And since cultural-political identity (in its national form) is considered the key variable distinguishing the two opposed communities today, the focus will be on the construction of subjectivity and identity conflicts. The empirical focus will be on the G/C (Greek Cypriot) community but the relation with the T/C (Turkish Cypriot) community will be a key variable in examining the construction of subjectivity and the relative and transitional form of identity conflicts.

Studying identity conflicts, though, is not innocent in Cyprus – politically and culturally. Academically the issue of identity is at the centre of an ongoing

intellectual (and indirectly political) debate – whether identity should be seen in “natural” or historical/contextual terms. A lot of the bibliography stemming from the past tends to take for granted the rhetorical claim of G/C nationalism that the majority of the island’s inhabitants were/are people of the same identity for “three-thousand years”. This view has not been the only one historically. Marxist and liberal political texts and practice pointed to more relativist interpretations of identity formations and to a different relation of culture (the nation) and politics (state) – rather than the identification proposed by nationalism. And in terms of social science, there has been a growing body of literature in anthropology and sociology which has focused on the construction of identities – and their inevitable historical relativity and contextual fluidity. But ironically, for a political context in which almost everybody agrees on the need for a multicultural society and polity, the “natural” identity paradigm continues to dominate in education and to a degree in internal political discourse. Thus the article which follows has a de facto second argument running through it – it is an effort at historicising the issue of identity as subjectivity constructed, articulated, and contested in a historical framework determined by class, status and power conflicts.

In empirical terms we will examine three social-historical conflicts in the twentieth century but the historical trajectory will trace the developments since the nineteenth century in an effort to outline the systemic background of analogous compromises achieved on the level of class conflict. The exploration in each period/conflict will move along three levels of analysis: the systemic referring to trends in the world system and regional geopolitics, the structural level which will focus on apparatuses (church, school) producing/shaping/articulating subjectivity, while on the situational level the focus will be on the forms of identity conflicts and their impact on everydayness. This emphasis on everydayness will lead to the exploration of de facto sociological realities in relation to models of “compromises”/“power sharing” rather than textual, legal documents.

The Transition to Modernity: The Modernisation/Adaptation of the Church and the “Transitional” Model of Compromise (1750-1920)

Modernity is usually viewed as an age in which reason (or the principle of rationality) becomes dominant in society. The rise of a conceptual framework and a worldview based on rationality/science implies the displacement of traditional values and norms which were based on a religious worldview. The difference between the two “ages/epochs” is not only cultural: Modernity heralds, through its revolutions (symbolically the French and the Russian one), the establishment of the principle of equality (on the basis of a discourse proclaiming the “sameness” of all human beings) as an organising principle in opposition to the organising principle of hierarchy which dominated traditional society. The concepts of modernity and

tradition are too broad and methodologically and theoretically under scrutiny. Yet they can be used as indicators of broad trends. One of the problems raised by critics of sharp differentiations is the lack of pure forms of the traditional and the modern since, especially in the process of transition/modernisation, there are a variety of mixed forms. And this is significant for our study here as we will see – thus in order to describe a model between traditional and modern, the term “transitional” will be employed.

In Cypriot history the two centuries from the middle of the eighteenth to the middle of the twentieth century were periods of intense social conflicts: class/economic and cultural (religious or national) identity seemed to compete for dominance. There were three class revolts (1760-1833, 1900-1910, 1920-1950) which at times coincided with conflicts over cultural forms of identity (1900-10) but the key cause of these class movements (of peasants, urban poor, and modern working class respectively) seemed to be, the relation of Cypriot society to the capitalist world-economy and the progressive incorporation of the economy of the island in the broader structures of the world system.

Let us begin, therefore, with the causes and forms of class identity, the related class conflicts and the corresponding compromise models. On the systemic level in the period 1750-1910, the “Ottoman feudal” system was being “incorporated” in the capitalist world-economy. According to Wallerstein incorporation was the “moment”/process by which a “zone” which “was at one point in time in the external arena of the world-economy came to be, at a later point in time, in the periphery of that same world-economy.”¹ Inside Cyprus during this period there was, according to Kyrris,² a change in the internal class structure with the emergence of a section of the bourgeoisie based on tax collectors. The period from the uprising of 1765 in support of popular demands for taxation relief, to the triple uprising in 1833 was a particularly rebellious one. A key moment was 1804 when the peasants, without leaders from the elite, besieged Nicosia. The uprisings were multicultural – Orthodox Christians, Muslims and Linovamvaki³ participated according to reports.⁴ And then suddenly the uprisings stopped after 1833. It took almost one-hundred years (1931) to see widespread uprisings again. Almost a century of relative peace must have had a cause. The major change seems to have been the emergence of small-ownership as form of a “land-regime”.

Smallholders according to Katsiaounis⁵ emerged out of the division of communal lands – a process which was part of broader trends in the Ottoman Empire as the work of H. Inalcik points to, but which was also particularly “successful” in the “province of Cyprus”:

“Piecemeal reforms, aimed at securing smallholders in their position as users of Miri land, were nevertheless promulgated during the 1840s and 1850s. ...

In the province of Cyprus the intention that such a role [of the state as a guarantor of the 'full right of the peasant' to his land] should be undertaken by the state was manifested by the establishment of the Defteri Hakani or Department for Sale and Registration of Land, at about ... 1853."⁶

The fact that Cyprus became a "sea of land proprietors" in the period 1830-1878 had broader implications. The land-regime of smallholders, to begin with, precludes the dominance of a plantation model which had been established, according to Wallerstein, in other areas incorporated at the same historical "moment". In this sense one might say that the lower classes in Cyprus had been spared the worst organisational forms of control and extraction of surplus. And actually if one looks at the economic conditions on the island between 1833 and 1878 it would seem that the improvement was significant and noticeable for all classes: in the 1830s the Sultan was contemplating giving away Cyprus as a troublesome place, while by the 1870s the relative peace on the island and its comparatively prosperous status were among the incentives for the British in choosing it – in contrast to Crete for example. Was there a compromise among the different classes which "gave something" to the lower classes and pacified them? On the institutional level there were the Tanzimat reforms and it can be argued that the improvement of the conditions on the island was in part due to the successful implementation of reforms by the Governors assigned to Cyprus. Yet beyond the tendency/ability of individuals we have to see that in a period in which other areas were feeling the strains of exploitation, the Cypriot lower classes seemed to be doing better – to the point of abandoning their riots and actually emerging as smallholders when the British took over the administration of the island. Thus it would seem reasonable, in the framework of an ongoing historical class conflict, to consider the growth of smallholdings as a *de facto* compromise. And this compromise had a transitional "character": small-ownership was a step in the direction of modernisation (as opposed to feudal land-regimes) but it was done, and maintained, within the context of traditional institutions and culture – such as the protection of owners against land expropriation by moneylenders.⁷

We now move to the cultural conflicts which centred on the hegemonic institution/apparatus of subjectivity construction/articulation, the church. The church was a major actor in class relations (landowner, tax collector) and it was often the target of popular criticism⁸ and revolts, as in 1804. But the church's power legitimacy did not derive so much from economics, as from culture. Its primary product was ideology: the construction and articulation of cultural subjectivity – the identity of the Orthodox Christian, the Romios. The temporal imagery of this identity drew its framework from biblical narratives and centred on Byzantium as its "glorious historical moment", while its spatial boundaries extended from the Balkans to the west, to the east Mediterranean/Middle East, and to Russia in the north.

The cultural regimes (and their boundaries) in this period, however, were not essentially strong. Kyrris has argued that the community of Linovamvaki emerged (earlier than 1750) out of Orthodox Christians who chose to follow Islam rather than be under the exploitation of the church. The very existence of the Linovamvaki, the general peaceful coexistence, and the common uprisings are enough testimony that by the eighteenth-nineteenth century religious identities did not essentially provoke conflict. In the most tense episode of the first half of the nineteenth century, the hanging of the archbishop and part of the Christian elite in 1821, it is significant to note that the event did not develop into massacres on the popular level. And despite the events (which may be seen as the result of elite rivalries over power) the lower classes joined hands again in 1833 for the common uprisings. It would seem that when class identity emerged (in moments of crisis and tensions) it could easily accommodate/put aside religious differences. The broader common/unifying framework (common language,⁹ customs etc.) seemed to be stronger than the inevitable antagonism produced by the exclusive monotheism of the church and the mosque.

In this context the church faced legitimation problems in relation to its subject population. But there were also internal problems in relation to the content itself of the subjectivity produced/articulated. In the broader context of the Ottoman world, the beginning of the nineteenth century was the period in which the historical conflict between two forms of cultural identity unfolded in the Orthodox millet – between modern nationalism and the traditional worldview of Romiosini.¹⁰ In Cyprus the conflict may have origins also in this period,¹¹ but the key conflict came in 1900-1910. Katsiaounis¹² views it as being analogous to the French revolution while Attalides¹³ sees it as the climactic conflict between two factions of the Christian-to-become-G/C community: the moderates and the intransigents. Kitromilides actually links directly, those two factions to the clash of Hellenism and Romiosini which was being waged in the broader area of the East Mediterranean and the Balkans – having as the two rival symbolic centres of power, Athens (the Greek national state) on the one hand, and Constantinople/Istanbul (the seat of the Patriarchate) on the other. On the face of it, the conflict of 1900-1910, the “Archbishopric issue” as it came to be known, was a fight between two bishops over who would become archbishop. But precisely because the church was also a de facto institution of local government of the Orthodox Christians, the conflict inevitably took dimensions beyond the conscious will and desire of the participants.

Some incidents in this conflict which split the Orthodox Christian community sharply will be referred to in order to highlight the broader (cultural and historical) dimensions of this identity conflict and the relation of the rival Christian factions to the Muslim community. A major incident in the first years of the conflict was the accusation that the bishop of Kitium was a Free Mason. The celebrated “Masonic

issue” was taken to court eventually, but as such the conflict revealed the biases of each camp: on one side the camp of the bishop of Kyrenia developed a discourse on defending tradition against “dangerous infiltrators”. Indicative of this discourse was the invitation of a preacher named Teknopoulos, who came to Cyprus to offer his rhetorical services to the traditionalist camp – since the other camp had a clear advantage in this respect.¹⁴ The discourse of Teknopoulos seems to have expressed well the dangers/problems that the traditionalist defenders, Romiosini, perceived as coming from the modern world of nations – as expressed in the society of the Greek national state. According to reports his preaching included the following denunciation:

“Greece unfortunately is in a moral and national decadence, in which there is no other Christian nation ... Three-quarters of the Greeks are animal thieves. Greeks are liars and cheat in trade ... Greek prime ministers ... are arrested as embezzlers. The Professors at the University teach materialism.”¹⁵

The modernisers/nationalists responded by claiming their own loyalty to the Christian tradition – linking it with Greekness. Thus they counter-accused the bishop of Kyrenia as being under the influence of “protestant teachings” – implying an identification of the traditionalists with the British. The most modernising demand of the nationalists, that of popular participation in the selection of the new archbishop, was, thus, couched in references to the early church’s practices.

How did the two factions see the Muslim community? We have noted already that the relation of the two religious communities in the early part of the nineteenth century was friendly. In relation to the general climate of the late nineteenth century it is worth commenting on the well known poem by Vasilis Michaelides, *I 9i louliou tou 1821*, which narrates symbolically the events of the hanging of the archbishop and other members of the Christian elite when the Greek revolution/war of independence broke out. The poem was written in the latter part of the nineteenth century and it has acquired a status analogous to that of a G/C national anthem both institutionally (through its use in school curricula, ceremonies etc.), and thematically. It is a narrative linking implicitly the fate of Cypriot Christians-G/Cs to the events in Greece, but by virtue of the fact that it is written in the Cypriot dialect/language it provides also a distinction/differentiation/autonomy for Cypriots. From the beginning the poem invokes the presence of a “good” Cypriot Muslim who is juxtaposed to the “bad” Governor. The very presence of a redeeming Muslim-T/C even in a poem intended to be a national/nationalist epic is characteristic of the relation of the two communities. During the inter-Christian clash of the first decade of the twentieth century there were at least two major instances invoking Muslims-T/Cs. The first case was actually a reaction to the problems in the cooperation of legislators from the two communities which arose as a result of the progressive rise of the enosis ideology: in that context, in 1903, the bishop of Kitium made an appeal

for bicomunal unity whose spirit was captured in a phrase destined to become very controversial subsequently: "Cyprus should be for the Cypriots" said the, otherwise, leader of the nationalist camp. The nationalist bishop had no trouble articulating the phrase at that juncture. Decades later, in the 1960s and early 1970s, for example, the same phrase, even though logical as an expression of the interests of the islanders, would be denounced as treasonous in the sense that it could be considered as betraying Greek national identity. But in 1903 Greek nationalism was a rising modernising ideology whose primary opponent inside the G/C community were the traditionalists who were in power. In the 1960s, on the contrary, Greek nationalism was an ideology expressing vested interests and its questioning provoked moral panics. This climate of considering the Muslims-T/Cs as some form of "neutral neighbours" was well expressed in another incident in 1908 when the two Christian-G/C factions failed repeatedly to agree on a G/C candidate for Nicosia mayor, and thus a Muslim-T/C was elected for the first (and only) time as Nicosia mayor.¹⁶ This situation of sharp division in which the T/Cs would be considered as potentially better than G/C opponents, has been repeated as a practice (around 1948)¹⁷ and as rhetoric (around 1974) throughout the twentieth century.

How did the conflict in the church end? It was a compromise which can be taken as a transitional model of adaptation to modernity in cultural-institutional terms. On the surface the nationalists won. By 1910 Greek nationalism was triumphant and the bishop of Kitium was elected archbishop after a new church charter was introduced by the British and voted by the Legislative Council – in opposition to the decision of the Patriarch in Constantinople/Istanbul.¹⁸ Yet behind the seemingly clear victory the de facto reality was more complex – the ideological victory of the nationalists was achieved within a structure of power (the church) which had its own dynamics and which eventually shaped ideological discourse (and social action) accordingly. To begin with, the defeated bishop of Kyrenia was given a ceremonial post. And actually when the newly elected archbishop died in 1916, the old traditionalist was elected as archbishop with the support, in part, of some of his staunch opponents in the past.¹⁹ But these ceremonial figures would not be that significant if it was not for the deeper structural reality. The compromising ideological discourse was what came to be known as *ellinohristianismos* – and as such it was imported from Greece in the framework of the ideology of the *Meyali Idea*.²⁰ In both societies it functioned in an analogous fashion whether in the 1840s or in 1910. In terms of historiographic narratives of subjectivity, *ellinohristianismos* was a framework mediating the differences (and opposition until then) between the ancient Greek past (which was considered until then as idolatry) and the Byzantine middle ages (the "glorious past" according to the church, but not according to the modernising adherents of the Enlightenment). In the new transitional narrative, the two periods (antiquity, Byzantine Empire) were

considered as continuous – part of the history and evolution of the Greek nation. In Cyprus there was also a historiographical shift which is indeed impressive if one compares the narrative of the eighteenth century “Chronological History of the Island of Cyprus” by Archimandrites Kyprianos, with the narratives that came to dominate official historiography in the twentieth century: Cyprus from an autonomous country tracing its origins to either the Bible or mythical Kings-Gods, was transformed into an archetypical colony from even ancient times, tracing its culture and origins to migrations or influences from the area ruled by the Greek Kingdom.

But the institutional/structural framework was different from the Greek experience and the local church came out much stronger than the corresponding Greek one. The church of Cyprus had been autonomous since early Byzantine times and this independence often made the church a local administrative institution. It certainly played this role during Ottoman times in relation to the Orthodox Christian millet. The church of Cyprus found itself in a different institutional/structural framework with the coming of the British. The end of certain rights upset the church elite from the beginning, but in broader terms what was more significant was the structural role of the church. In the traditional/Ottoman world of the millets the autocephalous church of Cyprus had a clearly defined role and privileges. In the modern transformation inaugurated by British colonial rule, the church found itself “lacking” as a traditional institution vis-à-vis the new secular administration established by the British. The crisis of 1900-1910 eventually helped modernise the church: it transformed it into an arena of politics and a type of public sphere for the G/C community, as the elections for the archbishop implied the adoption/adaptation by the church of a practice introduced in Cyprus by the British.²¹

This modernisation made the church adapt as a transitional institution/apparatus. The term “transitional” refers, in this context, more to products of a reform rather than radical revolution, and thus in historical terms it combines elements from tradition and modernity. The adaptation of the imported ideology of enosis is a characteristic example. In cultural terms enosis can be seen as an adaptation of the Orthodox Christian imagery of re-union of humanity and divinity in the Second Coming. But in institutional terms there was little potential benefit (of power, status or economics) for the church as an apparatus, in the realistic (as opposed to the rhetorical proclamations) annexation/enosis of its dominion (Cyprus) to the Greek state. In political terms the church adopted enosis as an ideology against the British colonial state, but also as a cultural claim to being equally civilised as the colonising West – and subsequently as an ideology against the Left. But the fact that the institution of the church followed its structural interests eventually is abundantly evident in the history of the church after 1960 when

Makarios became the symbol of independence. Before the 1930s, for example, when the church had adopted the rhetoric of enosis, but was still controlled by the “dynamics of the past” (symbiosis with the colonial state/“British-Greek friendship”), its prelates talked and signed petitions about enosis but did not come in direct/militant/subversive confrontation with the British. By contrast as the church modernised and a new generation of prelates took over, the confrontation with the British became open as the cases of Makarios III and Leontios demonstrate. Institutions have their own structural dynamics. Even though nationalism seemed victorious after 1910, in effect it legitimised (by modernising) a local institution which sooner or later would have produced phenomena like Makarios III – i.e. symbols of the island’s autonomy/independence – once, that is, the church could control (or impose its hegemony) on the secular modern apparatuses of the state. The phenomenon of the archbishop/president of the 1960s-1970s, in this sense, may have owed part of its appeal to Makarios’ “charisma”, but this “charisma” appealed to and derived its legitimation from, the success of the church in establishing its hegemony over the state.

There was another cultural legacy of the compromise: the ‘residuals’ of Romiosini – i.e. “left-over” cultural dynamics and realities in everyday life which continued to exist and followed diverse paths of adaptation. These trends were not essentially all conservative as the trends expressed by the circles around the bishop of Kyrenia.²² Romiosini, for example, represented an old world in which modern nationalism was not the predominant theme – and thus coexistence with Muslims was more understandable. And since Cypriot reality was bicomunal till the 1960s, some “residuals” resonated more with the existing reality than with the nationalist discourses which were still trying to mould reality in their image. These residuals found themselves in an alien cultural and institutional totality and their survival depended on Cypriot everydayness. Thus they expressed (by virtue of their structural position) localist “feelings” – such as the retention of the Cypriot dialect/language. In politics the residuals of Romiosini became fluid realities which influenced different factions/wings. The Left, for example, even if not culturally related to religion, was clearly influenced by these residuals. The work of Pavlos Liasides²³ is a good textual testimony to this leftist mutation of Romiosini.

In effect what the compromise inaugurated under the cloak of ellinohristianismos was the beginning of what we may call the modern Greek-Cypriot “nation” – an imaginary community which referred initially to the church as a form of a proto-state. The ethnarch/archbishop was de facto the symbolic and realistic leader of this imaginary community. Unless we take this into consideration we will not be able to understand the seemingly sudden reversion of Cypriots to independence in the 1960s.²⁴ What Makarios, and the groundswell of support for him, represented (and expressed) was based on the underlying reality of this

“Christian-transformed-Greek” community which was, however, solidly based/“rooted” in Cyprus. This “nation” matured (but did not articulate its own autonomous discourse) in the 1960s and 1970s, and seems to be speaking in its own voice recently.

Modern Crisis and Class Revolt: Negative Integration and the Modern Subculture of the Left, 1920-1950

The church was in a transitory stage during the first decades of the twentieth century. If, on the one hand, the crisis of 1900-1910 mobilised the Christian-G/C community in conflicts within the institution/apparatus of the church, on the other hand there seems to have existed still a crisis of legitimation – which one can trace back to the class role of the church as a landowner. This crisis was evidenced in the 1920s when an economic crisis created a volatile socio-political climate. In the decades to follow, till the 1950s, the church had to struggle with a resurgent class movement which was more similar to those in the 1760s-1833 period rather than the crisis in 1900-1910 in which class conflict was articulated in the context of the conflict of subjectivities and leaders within the church. But there was a decisive difference from the 1760s-1833 period. The new class movement did not just respond to a new development in the relation of the island to the world system. There was also an ideological discourse (communism) which proposed a form of social change within the dynamics of modernity. The Left was a form of Cypriot modernity, and it affirmed the basic principles of the age: equality, progress, belief in rationality/science/education. In this sense the church had a new rival – and a rival based on a discourse claiming in many key areas a different, clearly modern (rather than transitional) subjectivity. Thus a new identity split emerged in the Christian-G/C community: between aristeri/dexii (leftists/rightists).

We shall investigate first the crisis (which had systemic roots) and then the conflict of the two institutions/structures (the church and the Left) which produced the competing forms of identity/subjectivity. The 1920s witnessed the crisis of the regime of smallholdings – available research traces the 1920s crisis to the expropriation of smallholders by the moneylenders.²⁵ In order to understand the context, it will help if we consider the period in terms of the dynamics of “peripheralisation” which followed “incorporation” in the capitalist world-economy. According to Wallerstein peripheralisation “involves a continuing transformation of the mini-structures of the area in ways that are sometimes referred to as the deepening of capitalist development.”²⁶ The immediate cause of the crisis of the 1920s was a fall in agricultural exports after the war. The indebted peasants suddenly found themselves at the mercy of the moneylenders – tokoylifi. Similar crises in the world economy did not affect Cyprus that much earlier, because in part the island was not so dependent on the world economy and trade (it was still in the

process of “incorporation” rather than “peripheralisation”), and in part the Ottoman legal structures punished debtors but they did not permit the transfer/confiscation of property. The British transformed the institutional/legal framework, rationalising it in capitalist terms and thus “deepening capitalist development”: the moneylenders could take/sell the land of indebted peasants. Thus the coalescing of a fall of external demand for Cypriot agricultural products, with the new colonial framework on land property, brought an economic and social crisis of unprecedented proportions. The crisis was reflected politically in the middle of the 1920s, in the swinging of voters towards more moderate politicians on the national question who promised to work on socio-economic reforms. But towards the end of the decade, as the hope for reform declined, it was radicalism (of the Left and the Right)²⁷ which took the upper hand. The communist party circle, which was formally organised in 1926, started to spread. It is noteworthy that the communist party gained this growth in a period in which it was (in comparison with its subsequent positions) radically confrontational in ideology – it proclaimed openly both its atheism and its condemnation of nationalism and union with Greece. In 1929 there was the first mass uprising in the new export industry of the island, mining, where the Cypriot working class was obtaining its “mass experience of the proletariat”. The uprising at Amiantos mine was ascribed to the communists but it was mostly spontaneous – showing the climate of the times.

The Left became the cultural-political space which expressed this militant class consciousness as it became an ideological identity. This identity came immediately into conflict with the hegemonic subjectivity expressed by ellinohristianismos. This discourse accused the Left of atheism, “materialism”, and lack of “national ideals”. The climax of these cultural-economic-political confrontations came in 1948 but the tension had been building up from much earlier. The communists in the 1930s had lowered the banners of ideological confrontation (in an effort to achieve “popular unity” in mobilisations), but still both their activists, and the worldview they represented, “accepted” (rather than endorsed “passionately”) the national identity discourse which had become hegemonic in the G/C community. Two incidents from 1940 may help illustrate the underlying realities and tensions during that period.

1. When the Italians bombed a Greek submarine in August, there was an effort to collect money for the military needs of Greece – this in itself was an old practice dating from the beginning of the twentieth century. The communists in the trade unions, however, were cold on this:²⁸ their antagonism to the Greek nationalist/pro-fascist government was coupled with their dislike of the ideology of the Right (ethnikofrosini) which centred on the subjectivity of ellinohristianismos.
2. On October 29 when the news of the attack of Italy on Greece became known, high school student demonstrations broke out. One might have

expected G/C students to mobilise/demonstrate, but according to the press of the period²⁹ the demonstrations were actually bicommunal – and so were the gatherings of adults in the afternoon.

National identity/Greekness was hegemonic but as Mavratsas puts it³⁰ there was an experiential difference in the relation between institutional-structural reality and hegemonic discourse: “in everyday life, the average G/C is integrated in local Cypriot institutions which in most cases differ significantly from the corresponding Greek ones”. In this Cypriot everyday reality, the 1940s was the key decade in which the basic institutions of subsequently modern Cyprus were established. Thus the imported national identity was faced with the tradition of local class resistances and also with a context in which bicommunal boundaries were still relaxed.

By the middle of the 1940s the Left developed into a major political force, and as the prospects for the post-World War period seemed fluid, there were twists which revealed also the practical politics of power behind the messianic rhetoric of enosis. As the war seemed to be coming to an end the Left in Greece seemed to be emerging as a major (indeed the key) player in resistance politics. In this context, the Cypriot Left moved closer to the idea of enosis.³¹ August 1944 was revealing. The colonial secretary came for a visit to Cyprus to assess the situation. It was the Left which organised mass protests to demand union with Greece – the Right abstained, insisting that such demands should be raised only after the war. But when the civil war started in Greece, revealing the geopolitical reality coming out of the Yalta agreement/division of spheres of influence, the Cypriot Left became less enthusiastic.³² When in 1947 the British responded to the growing popular mobilisations (of which the Left was the main organiser) on the island by offering a constitution for self-government, the Left participated in the talks. The split in the leadership of AKEL on the issue – especially after the change of policy in 1949 from the strategy of “self-government” to “enosis and only enosis” – has been at the centre of a growing historical debate which focuses on the proposed constitution as “the first lost chance” for avoiding the subsequent bloodshed/tragedy. Yet the period can be analysed more fruitfully if we look at the issues involved (constitution/self-government and change of policy/slogan of anti-colonial struggle) in relation to the split between experienced reality and hegemonic discourse in a historical context of political and cultural conflicts in the process of modernisation.

1. Political dimension: Constitution/Self-Government/Civil Rights and Participation. The Left had been consistently demanding rights and practical reforms thus a constitution was a response, a framework, which was well within leftist demands. The Left mobilised and demanded rights, representation, and in general popular participation. It was to be expected that the historic leadership of the party/movement from the beginnings of

the 1940s would see in the discussions for a constitution the chance to expand the “rights of the people” – and forms of securing power for the “people’s movement”. In this context (of leftist demands for the expansion of participation and democratic politics) we should note also the active involvement of the Left in the archbishopric elections of 1947. In that case the Left was continuing the conflicts of the 1900-1910 period over popular participation, by demanding the participation of the Left/“people’s movement” in the ethnarchic council – the body talking on behalf of the G/C community. The Right, by contrast, which monopolised power in both the church and the colonial state,³³ was reluctant to accept “opening” of the political sphere to further participation.

2. Cultural discourse: Geopolitical strategy vs. metaphysical discourse: The issue of leftist shifts on self-government and enosis in the late 1940s should be seen more in the context of the geopolitics of the era, rather than taking rhetorical enoticism at face value. Even when the Left argued for enosis its discourse was more geopolitical and strategic (in terms of broader struggles “against imperialism” or in favour of “peace”) rather than metaphysical and messianic³⁴ as the discourse of the church. There was, in this sense, a cultural clash of ideological perceptions in relation to anti-colonial strategy. Thus the period of 1947-1948 saw a bitter conflict not only over discussing a legal document, a constitution (and its function or prospects) – it was actually an intense clash of identities. In the “great strikes” of 1948 and in the split of leftist and rightist organisations and institutions which spread all-around Cyprus in that year, there was something akin to the clashes and splits of 1908. In this case it was *ellinohristianismos/ethnikofrosini* vs. *laiko kinima/communism*.

In this context in 1948 the Left found itself fighting (and under attack) as the Right and the colonial authorities were trying to marginalise the communist “people’s movement”. This led to the development of a leftist subculture which solidified its boundaries in the 1950s – especially in the late 1950s during the period of attacks by EOKA nationalists against the Left. Football is probably the most obvious example of that separation which endures till today – like the coffeeshops/*silloyi* which dot most central squares in villages and urban “neighbourhoods”. If one looks at the electoral results of the Left from 1960 till today, it is actually impressive how its percentages seem stable. It is as if the Left is not only a political space but also a subculture reproduced through community and family bonds. In some way, it can be called a “political ethnic community”.³⁵

And what is the result of this new confrontation? In this case we did not have a compromise integrating the two opponents but rather the *de facto* coexistence of two distinct cultural-political “spaces”/subcultures. The Left and the church

continued to coexist sometimes as rivals and sometimes, actually, cooperating. But it was the church (and the Right which functioned within its apparatuses and discourses) which retained power. A new institutional model of compromise emerged which may be called “negative integration”. In this model the Left was allowed to function/exist but was excluded from power. This model of “coexistence but exclusion from power” is not unique to Cyprus. The term “negative integration” was used by G. Roth in order to describe the position of the Social Democrats in imperial Germany.³⁶ But one may also easily use the Italian experience after 1945 as an example. The model can be juxtaposed with models of systematic violent mass persecution of ideological opponents like in the Greek civil war. The soccer association actually provides a good indication of the development of this model in Cyprus. Leftist teams created a new league in 1948 after being practically expelled from the official league. By 1953 the two leagues (the right-wing controlled one, and the leftist one) were united. But the “union” was implemented actually on the terms of the Right – the leftists were re-integrated in a way which led to a situation in which leftist fans felt that the authorities/referees were biased against their teams. This exclusion from political power, however, was not the total picture. As rumour has it, part of the problem of the rightists in football was that the leftist teams drew much bigger crowds of spectators than the rightist teams. There was, thus, a practical and an economic dimension to it. In broader terms the Left by its very presence (and given its exclusion from the administration of power) became a *de facto* influence in two realms – economic and foreign policy – where its framework, we might say, became hegemonic or achieved hegemonic compromise.

Let us investigate the dynamics in the economic realm first. On the face of it, the leftist union, PEO, which led and organised solidarity around the strikes of 1948, did not win – or at least the mining union.³⁷ But the demands of the leftist unions became subsequently accepted as *de facto* reality by the employers – and of course by the right wing union which was competing for the same membership pool. In the 1960s, as the historical trade union leader Ziartides has noted/acknowledged,³⁸ the agenda of the leftist unions was largely adopted by the post-colonial government – and especially by the then Minister of Labour Tassos Papadopoulos. Nevertheless the Left remained excluded and despite all his indebtedness to the Left, Papadopoulos continued to favour, for example, right wing unions in the public sector. But the key dimension to observe in this context in relation to “compromise models” is how the excluded part of society managed through its practice, to create a form of institutional hegemony in this realm. And in economic terms what the Left managed to construct through its mobilisations and *de facto* presence, was a social democratic model for the control of the effects/consequences of the capitalist market.

In terms of foreign policy, the shift was much more visible and thus it attracted American concerns which led to the coup of July 1974. The Right in Cyprus after

an extended period of adhering to Anglo-Greek friendship,³⁹ embarked on the anti-colonial revolt of 1955-1959, under the leadership of the rejuvenated modernised church which the image of Makarios represented. This anti-colonial shift was in part the result of pressures from the Left.⁴⁰ In the 1960s Makarios moved even more in the direction of the suggested policy of the Left from the late 1940s/early 1950s: relations with the socialist bloc and the anti-colonial/anti-imperialist movements and regimes in the Arab world. The Left pressed its political agenda through mass mobilisations which Makarios needed in his conflicts with the extreme right wing and the interventions of the Greek State in the 1960s. And the very fact that the Left was excluded from power, allowed him to use elements from both (rightist and leftist) discourses. The Left first and Makarios subsequently (expressing politically the Centre and sectors of the Right), realised that the "non aligned" policy served the interests of the islanders better in the systemic reality of decolonisation and in, general terms, post World War II global politics. But internally, in terms of the hegemonic discourse on subjectivity on West-East relations, it was a compromise. Makarios' policy of "We belong to the West – We belong to the non aligned movement" represented the articulation of this consciousness of border experience and policy.⁴¹ In terms of time-space variables it was a compromise between the aspired temporal goal – progress, development towards the western modern model – and the geopolitical reality of the East, of having to "fight for your rights", of the colonised who rebels. The metaphysical goal (descended from Orthodox Christianity) of "union with the divine/sacred" was, thus, translated and secularised in the goal of "reaching"/"becoming like", advanced societies. The aesthetics and rhetoric of "becoming civilised"/advanced like "them" (ex-colonial power, rich etc.), were expressed by the Right, while the Left expressed more the demand for realistic practice/reform/change in the here and now of the decolonising/developing East.

In this sense (if we take the Right to represent power/hegemony and the Left practical everyday politics), from the sixties onwards we can discern a split in society between hegemonic rhetoric (as articulated by the educational apparatus and the media – since the church as a space had lost its primacy as a structure of subjectivity)⁴² and everyday reality. At the level of everydayness, residuals from previous transformations (Cypriot language) and new trends (consciousness of independence/Cypriot consciousness) remained a vibrant reality which was, however, excluded from hegemonic discourse: they were not recognised as existing entities – except as dangers. Just like the Left in the political realm: Hegemony of one discourse on one hand and de facto autonomy for a counter-hegemonic subculture on the other.

Cleavages of Modern Subjectivity: The Fluidities between the Homogeneity of School Subjectivity and Separation/Partition (1950-1980)

From the middle of the twentieth century onwards, the key conflict on subjectivity shifted from cultural vs. economic/class, to cultural (national) vs. political (identity of citizen). The Greco-Christian discourse (ellinohristianismos) on subjectivity which the church and the upper classes sponsored and promoted came into conflict with the empirical everyday reality of independence. Thus the conflict that we noted above (between hegemonic/right wing discourse and leftist/everyday practice) became broader and, in many ways, came to define the period 1960-1974. Before proceeding though, we need to clarify the significance of the subjectivity of ellinohristianismos for status hierarchy and conflicts. The Greco-Christian identity, as perceived, was a historical compromise and a form of identity used against the class consciousness of the lower classes. Yet there was another dimension which made it the key framework within which G/Cs identified themselves and their internal relations with those of the world around them. Greekness meant a ticket to the “civilised people” of the world (i.e. the West which claimed ancient Greece as its intellectual ancestor) while at the same time it was a form of internal status differentiation. A key variable in this differentiation was the use of language. The Cypriot language/dialect⁴³ was claimed as a “branch” of the “tree” of the Greek language – thus legitimising G/C claims to be Greeks. But this “branch” was then considered (in modernity) to be a remnant of the past – and a “polluted” one as such with words and expressions from other “barbaric languages”.⁴⁴ Thus language lessons became a centre piece of the educational apparatus – but the language status ladder spread much beyond the school classroom. In class terms the middle and upper classes “refined” themselves (and claimed a higher status) by speaking closer to the Greek idiom. Teachers, professionals, even people living in the city vs. people living in the village, defined their relation to others (and themselves) via the language idiom/expressions they adopted in everyday life and in specific contexts. There was, of course, resistance – but this resistance (like Cypriot consciousness in this period) was not ideological and did not assume the offensive except among the milieu of the lower classes where “Greek talk” (kalamaristika) was ridiculed as a form of middle class “hypocrisy” or “softness”. In general the Cypriot linguistic form was on the defensive – but it survived as part of a broader everydayness which was distancing itself from the official discourse of Greekness.

As Gellner⁴⁵ noted nations are constructed through the mass educational system which diffuses a homogenous print form/variant of high culture into the everyday reality of the “people”. In Cyprus, the concepts (and contents) of national narratives and frameworks had been imported from Greece and Turkey and thus instead of (the construction of) a Cypriot nation⁴⁶ we had two rival ethnic communities claiming to be part of the nations of neighbouring states. By the 1960s

Cypriot identity was almost eclipsed from the hegemonic discourse – Cyprus officially, even in its constitution, was inhabited by Greeks and Turks and three small religious minorities. The imported nations were, of course, based on the traditional religious millets of the Ottoman Empire. But the new national division was imposed more through the school classroom than the space of the church or the mosque. An incident in the late nineteenth century cited by Kyrris is indicative of the differences constructed by the school. In Kilani, a major village/administrative centre in the Limassol area, the Muslims complained about the new schools supported by the British, since their children could not understand the language of teaching – Turkish. Once the Cypriot language was designated as dialect and thus not appropriate for teaching the “high ideas” of the school curriculum, then one of the key bonds keeping Christians and Muslims together was excluded as a variable from education. English appeared in this context as the only language in which both communities could communicate without translation and mediation. But the school classroom was not only a place where language re-education affirmed power and separation – it was also a place where imported national histories and geographies nearly eclipsed Cypriot time/history and space/geography.

Let us examine the broader systemic context. In the late nineteenth century, the integration of Cyprus in the British Empire (and the expansion of British control to Egypt in 1882) confirmed the rise in the geopolitical significance of the area due to the opening of the Suez Canal. After World War I, Cyprus became even more significant as a base in a geopolitical area put under the western “Franco-British” mandate, and which was becoming a key source of energy/oil for global industry. After World War II and the end of colonialism in the Arab world, Cyprus increasingly emerged as a form of border/frontier colony initially, and then a state. The move towards independence (even in the form of mobilisations for “full self-government” in 1948) represented the consciousness of this border position. The key historical moment for the area came in 1956 when Egypt nationalised the Suez Canal, and despite re-capturing militarily the canal, the Anglo-French coalition was eventually forced to withdraw. At that moment, historically, the Soviet Union and the United States emerged as the new contenders for dominance in the area. The United States was in the advantageous position to have “inherited” from the British the hegemony of the world capitalist system while the Soviet Union was still re-industrialising after World War II. But the Soviets had the ideology which was adopted or referred to as a mobilising model for anti-western claims to political independence and autonomous economic development. It was, in that context, the revolutionary model of the East which claimed/promised that it would surpass the West in modernising.

In terms of economic conflicts the Left shifted its focus from internal class conflicts into claiming a political strategy based on the geopolitical dynamics of anti-colonial/anti-imperialist movements. Internally, the acceptance of the agenda of the

leftist unions led to a form of social peace/compromise in class terms. And the key issue became how to draw capital from outside – through trade, tourism or development aid. The opening to other markets (and the strategic alliance with post-colonial Arab states and the socialist bloc) led to a significant growth. Nevertheless this growth was increasingly controlled by the G/C community (via its elite) which in addition to being the majority, (including, as such, much of the local bourgeoisie) it came to control also (or probably more appropriately, it usurped) the state apparatuses in 1963-1964.

The division of the two communities and their military confrontation in the period 1955-1974 became the decisive characteristic of the period after the middle of the century. In effect the de facto partition which had been established in education spread/diffused, one might say, to the rest of society. Already from 1960 the new constitution stipulated a separation in educational apparatuses. And in this case the G/Cs who tended usually to argue for unified forms of the state (in which case they hoped that they would dominate due to their majority numbers) were as adamant as the T/C nationalists, on the need to preserve the separate/partitioned nationalist character of education. Education, its codes, linguistic forms, historical narratives (which included now the EOKA mythology) was becoming part of a process legitimising power and status.

In the G/C community there was, as already noted, a new cleavage around the emergence of “Cypriot consciousness” – a term used to describe support for independence and distancing from the discourse of Greek nationalism. In part the cleavage was a result of the regime of negative integration and the consequent autonomy of the Left. The new form of identity (Cypriot political consciousness/subjectivity) first emerged to a large degree within the Left. One can discern a shift in leftist political and literary discourse from the late 1940s towards a growing emphasis on Cyprus.⁴⁷ A decisive moment must have been the late 1950s when the masses/subculture of the Left experienced the anti-communist death squads of EOKA which represented militant enotacist nationalism. A poem⁴⁸ from this period by Pavlos Liasides (who expressed everyday leftist discourse on the village level) is indicative. In the poem, which is dedicated to one of the assassinated leftists, Liasides paints a picture of the dead activist somewhere between a “people’s hero” and a “Christian saint” but the most interesting part comes at the end where in condemning war violence, he is rather clearly rejecting the Greek national anthem for a new future anthem which will praise/recognise ‘love’/ayapi, not war.⁴⁹

But the educational apparatus of the post-colonial state adopted and articulated the official hegemonic discourse of ellinochristianismos (which was the legitimising ideology for the Right’s claim to power), and thus Cypriot consciousness was excluded – whether it was coming from the Left or the liberal Centre.⁵⁰ As such the

existence of one hegemonic discourse (expressing class and status interests) which excluded other existing (ideological) discourses from the state apparatuses was not something unique to Cyprus in the period – and in the specific geographical/geopolitical area. Yet in Cyprus there was a contradiction between the hegemonic ideology and the ongoing historical reality, which was analysed perceptively by Th. Papadopoulos from the early 1960s. In a seminal article⁵¹ he noted the clear contradiction between the (alleged) historical cultural continuity of Hellenism in Cyprus, and the historical-institutional reality which was leading to different sociological and political realities. The G/Cs believed, and were taught to believe, that they were Greeks and that their goal should be union/annexation to Greece. But Cyprus, as Papadopoulos noted, had a different historical trajectory than the lands comprising contemporary Greece – and this different historical experience was finding its expression in the new reality of the independent state. That state needed its own legitimation, while ironically the “educational apparatus” was propagating in part the legitimation of Greek cultural/political identity – and thus annexation to the Greek state. The key apparatus producing/articulating subjectivity was partially functioning on colonial patterns – albeit here on a cultural rather than a direct political form of colonialism. And there was an internal “root”: Greekness was perceived as a form of being civilised – a form of “white mask” to cover a “dark skin”, to paraphrase Fanon.

We now move our attention therefore to compromises achieved within the apparatus of education – and the related discourses. The educational apparatus in the G/C community was the product of multiple influences – and, thus, it was less homogenous than one might have expected.⁵² In its origins in the nineteenth century, education was financed by local communities and the church but the latter demanded control and influence over it.⁵³ When the British assumed control of the island, they laid the foundations of modern mass education. After the 1920-1930 period the colonial authorities also became involved in efforts to control the curriculum and limit the influence of nationalisms – which, in the case of the Greek one at least, started to produce symptoms outside the boundaries of “Anglo-Greek friendship” such as the riots of 1931. From the 1920s to the 1940s, when the church and the British colonial state were in conflict over the apparatus of education, teachers emerged at times as an autonomous force.⁵⁴ It is noteworthy, for example, that the leader of the moderate reformists⁵⁵ in the 1920s who supported social and economic reforms started as a teacher, had extensive involvement in educational matters, and was even involved in early trade union organising.⁵⁶ And two prominent members of AKEL’s leadership in the 1940s (F. Ioannou and A. Adamantos) also came from the teaching profession – with F. Ioannou being a general secretary of the teacher’s union too. The church fought vehemently the presence of leftists in schools and it issued calls for spying and reporting to the authorities on “communist teachers” from the late 1920s. But the antagonistic

relation between the church and the colonial authorities on the one hand, and the general turmoil of the period on the other,⁵⁷ did not help the church's efforts. In effect the church was apprehensive not only of teachers but also of the new ideas of modernity which were surfacing from the educational apparatus as Loizos commented.⁵⁸

In the great class confrontation of 1948 the church and the British also found themselves in the same trenches of the anti-communist crusade in the educational apparatus: the schools started to be "cleared" of leftists.⁵⁹ Ellinohristianismos seemed to be on the path for absolute hegemony – especially in secondary education. The British tried to control the nationalism of the Right, but it was evident that what concerned them most (in the broader framework of the Cold War) was the Left. The church itself moved ahead decisively with its own bodies of "monitoring/policing" the educational apparatus. In 1948 the *katihitika* (church classes/lessons designed to promote religious, and, in that context, nationalist and anti-communist discourses) were introduced, while Makarios III inaugurated a body (the educational council of the ethnarchy) assigned to watch the school apparatus.⁶⁰ The fact remains that EOKA used the *katihitika* as a recruiting pool, while the pool from which demonstrations were organised in support of the church organised armed group⁶¹ was attributed to the secondary education sector and both were a consequence of the above. In the 1960s a new split emerged in the seemingly homogenous G/C school apparatus: between those loyal to the state, Makarios and ultimately independence, and those loyal to enosis and the cultural/political identity linking Greekness to the Greek state – which had its own influence in Cyprus through the provision of textbooks and the education of secondary school teachers. Also, the new conflicts were not only ideological/political – but involved issues of status often within the Right⁶² itself: if in the 1940s it was the ideas of modernity which seemed to threaten the church as an apparatus, in the late 1960s status conflicts were translated into resentment against English higher education, language etc. As Loizos put it:

"Crudely stated, the less English one knows, the more ideologically important Hellenism becomes; the more one is committed to Hellenism the more important it becomes to denounce the 'dilution' or 'contamination' of Greek culture by English or American influence, whether in education, in dress, personal style, sexual mores, political values or anything else that comes to mind."⁶³

The military defeat of 1974 brought a shift in the form of the subjectivity promoted by G/C education. This time, the shift was more of a compromise, recognising the multiple forces and influences interested in and being affected by, the educational apparatus. As far as historiography is concerned, as Papadakis⁶⁴ noted, the G/Cs shifted from a narrative in which the T/Cs were at best a "left-over"

problem, into a narrative of “peaceful coexistence”. This shift was not a new invention. It was part of the repertoires of attitudes towards the T/Cs which have been “available” to the G/Cs historically. It may not have been much in evidence during the period 1955-1974 but one could see it in the climate of the period which produced Michaelides’ poem noted earlier, or which produced leftist bicomunal organising. A period, that is, in which national identity was not essentially the key identity conflict on the island.

The compromise which emerged in the late 1970s completed the shift to G/C subjectivity in which Greekness was the cultural and Cypriot the political identity – thus incorporating rather than resolving the conflict of the two rival forms of subjectivity of the pre-1974 period. The historiographical focus progressively added some references to the labour movement, for example, but the idolisation of EOKA (albeit as precursors/heroes of the independent state now) was maintained. The responsibility of the Greek state was shifted to the “bad guys/traitors” of the junta of 1967-1974, and Makarios’ supporters’ front in the pre-1974 period was vindicated as the “democratic and patriotic” position. The contradictions in the new narrative were left to be resolved by adult society – as the Left and the Right advanced their own narratives in the public sphere. In this new regime of compromise, the Greek state became publicly less intrusive in the political sphere (accepting the slogan/line “Cyprus decides and Greece supports”) but it was still a force very much involved in educational policy – as it was in the military via the Greek leadership and officers of the National Guard. One of the Cypriot ministers of education, actually, acknowledged that the University of Cyprus (proclaimed by Makarios in the pro-Cypriotist post-1974 climate) was delayed till the 1990s because the Greek embassy and successive Greek governments did not want such a university⁶⁵ which might “dehellenise” the island – meaning, among other things, that it could act as a rival to the Athens-based educational monopoly on high school teacher education. But the fact that this view was supported by Cypriots (even in the 1990s) and that educational reforms in the 1970s faced intense internal institutional opposition, should also remind us that apart from the cultural colonialism of the Greek state, “Greek subjectivity” was a key asset in internal status conflicts.

In broader terms we may call the compromise that emerged after 1974, as a Reform (analogous to the class compromise which emerged after 1948 and in part to the ideological/cultural compromise of 1910) which to some extent mediated the gap between official discourse and reality, but it adapted hegemonic discourse rather than overturned it. The split and the gap moved now onto a new level – internal and external. Externally the G/Cs, who monopolised the state, emphasised their Cypriotness – and thus their openness to the T/Cs. However, internally what was cultivated even in the inconclusive tension of the educational apparatus was a G/C identity. But this Greek Cypriotness was more akin to a spectrum with a fluidity

(depending in conjuncture) in identifications rather than a set of fixed positions. And despite the nationalist comeback of the 1990s, the shift seems to have been decisive: if a G/C nation was born institutionally (but not as a consciousness) after 1910, then this “nation” matured as a political entity in the conflict with the Greek state in the period 1960-1974, and began to articulate its own discourse on subjectivity after 1974. Papadopoulos’ pre-referendum TV speech in 2004 was a carefully crafted message appealing exactly to this imaginary community – and as an indication of the shift, it was the presidential palace (symbolising the resistance of 1974) which acted as a background and not any religious symbolism any longer.

Thus we may say that in broader terms the apparatus of education was an arena of conflicts/contests but its use by the dominant groups in order to promote their ideologies led to separation/partition – starting from the minds of the pupils and spreading/materialising in the real geographical separation of 1974. In a comparative framework one can observe that when the educational apparatus was dominated by one force (nationalism and its adherents) the results promoted further separation – the projection, that is, of the school model on the rest of society. When, on the other hand, education was more open to (or had to deal with) competing influences, the educational apparatus was more flexible, open to compromise, and in general there was a tendency (at least) to mediate the absolutist message of national separation.

Epilogue

In terms of compromise frameworks we may discern three “models” from our historical discussion:

1. Adaptation/transformation which we saw in the transition to modernity. In that case cultural identity managed to modernise and incorporate conflicting perspectives.
2. The second model is negative integration. This is related more to compromises in which there are also economic/class issues – we saw it after 1948, but one can argue that an analogous model was also at work after 1833. In this model conflict is visible in ritual but is frozen. It manifests itself in the existence of rival subcultures but there is also a clear hegemony and a form of autonomy for the rival/oppositional popular culture which is integrated by adoption of part of its agenda by the power structures.
3. The third model is separation/partition which spread, as indicated, from school curricula to geographical division. In this case the two opposing identities confront each other in an incomplete/unresolved conflict. Within the rival, separated alleged homogeneities, there are other/new forms of cleavages (civil vs. national identity, local vs. western/“civilising”

discourses/experiences) which create fluidity in identifications. This fluidity can be seen as the development of residuals but also as a new phenomenon which has been produced by differentiation of power in modernity and the emergence of multiple power centres.

Can a fourth model (or a combination of the above) be reached? Partition in the sense of "hard"/absolute geographical division cannot really function in the age of electronic communication. But historical reality is complex and predictions cannot be part of an analysis like this. The author would rather offer a concluding commentary by elaborating briefly on three generalisations (related to the three levels of analysis employed) that can be gleaned from our exploration into identity formations, shifts and conflicts:

1. Situational: In the historical experience of modern Cyprus there has been a multiplicity of identities and identity-conflicts. The key characteristics of this modern reality were transitional (rather than stable, "natural" and trans-historical) forms of identities, which were shaped by social conflicts and material or ideal (as in status) interests. The conflict between G/Cs and T/Cs was not the only one, and as such it has been mediated by other forms of identity conflict and transformations. In this context it could be expected that the current ethnic division, even though it will probably continue to be of significance, will not remain essentially the decisive fault line of future differentiations: there are already new forms of identity conflicts and differentiations developing (European – Easterner, Cypriot – Outsider) which may become dominant in the future.
2. Structural: Even though transitions and identity shifts are characterised by conflicts, we observed that a key characteristic of Cypriot experience has been a tendency for compromise. These compromises were often de facto realities rather than signed documents. Thus in the current context one should watch not only for the processes of negotiations and the clauses of UN plans, but also for the empirical, everyday, de facto realities which are taking place. The very fact, for example, that G/Cs and T/Cs now move across the island relatively freely, and thus experience in their everyday lives the existence of two distinct cultural-political regions (thus unity but also autonomy in space), is an effective way of experiencing the spatial reality of a bizonal federation.
3. Systemic: Historically a lot of the internal Cypriot shifts in the cultural, economic and political spheres were/are contingent on the "contexts" (dynamics, structures, situations) surrounding the island. A key dimension, in this framework, has been/is its border status. In this context, it seems that apparatuses (and forms of identity) which were under multiple (internal and external) pressures/influences, tended to be more open.

Notes

1. Wallerstein, Immanuel (1989) *The Modern World-System III. The Second Era of Great Expansion of the Capitalist World-Economy*. San Diego, Academic Press, p. 129.
2. Kyrris, Costas (1984) 'Anatomia tou Othomanikou Kathestotos stin Kipro 1570-1878' in *I Zoi stin Kipro IH – IΘ Eona*. Lefkosia: Ekdosi Dimou Lefkosias.
3. The Linovamvaki were a social group/community among the lower classes which adhered to both religions (Islam and Christianity). Under the pressure of national polarisation it disappeared in the twentieth century.
4. Cited in Kyrris (1984). For a popular song preserved among T/Cs which praises the linovamvakos (according to Kyrris) rebel of 1833, Giaour Imam ("he hits, the Ottomans run to leave"), see: Hamza Irkad (1999) 'Ta Dimotika Trayoudia den Iene Psemata' in *Hate*, No. 2, p. 49.
5. Katsiaounis, Rolandos. (1996) *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre.
6. Katsiaounis (1996), p. 30.
7. Katsiaounis (1996), pp. 31-33.
8. See Kyrris (1984) and Katsiaounis (1996) references to Cypriot popular poetry of the Ottoman Empire.
9. "Common language" refers to the Cypriot linguistic form which developed during Byzantine, Latin, and Ottoman times, and which may be said to belong to the "family of Greek languages/dialects" (for the use of the terms see endnote 44). It seems that this was the language used (or at least understood) by the majority of the locals. The example of the Muslims of Kilani discussed subsequently is indicative of the fact that this language was used by people beyond the boundaries of the Orthodox Christian community (See: Kyrris, Costas (1988) 'Ta "Mousoulmanika Sholia" stin Kipro meta to 1878 os Parayon Ethnoyeneseos tis Tourkokipriakis Kinotitos' in *Entos ton Tihon*, No. 37, pp. 18-19). There were also other local linguistic forms used by religious communities (the most significant historically was the language form used by Cypriot Muslims which may be said to belong to the "family of Turkish languages/dialects"), or regional forms such as the alleged linguistic form/code used in the region of Tilliria (katsouvellika) of which today we have only a few remnants in music/song. The relation (of use, interaction, but also of power) between the different linguistic forms on the island before the twentieth century needs to be studied in a comparative framework in order to comprehend the range of multiculturalism in Cyprus before the twentieth century and the subsequent process of nationalist homogenisation.
10. For an analysis of the conflict, see: Kitromilides, Paschalis (1989) 'Imagined Communities and the Origins of the National Question in the Balkans' in *European History Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 149-194.
11. At the beginning of the nineteenth century there were different factions competing for church leadership and at the lower levels of the church hierarchy, there were even figures like Ioanikios the monk, who was one of the leaders of the 1833 uprisings – alongside an Imam.

12. Katsiaounis (1996).
13. Attalides, Michalis (1986) 'Ta Kommata stin Kipro' in Kipriaka 1878-1955. Lefkosia, Ekdoti Dimou Lefkosias.
14. Its chief ideologue was a Greek national who came to Cyprus as a teacher, N. Katalanos.
15. Lymbourides, Achilleas (1985) Meletes yia tin Anglokrotia stin Kipro. Nicosia. The written reports were published by the opponents of Teknopoulos. The issue was taken to the Holy Synod and after the supporters of the bishop of Kyrenia refused to dissociate themselves from the alleged preaching/rhetoric, the bishop of Kitium withdrew from the Synod.
16. There were negative comments in the press, but one should note this choice/decision (for a T/C mayor) precisely because this was also a period in which enosis nationalism was on the rise and it was already creating some tension among the two communities – in 1912 there were, limited still, bicomunal fights in the shadow of the Balkan wars. And there were reports about tensions related to the rise of the enosis movement from the 1890s.
17. A typical example was the fact that during the split/separation of soccer teams in the period 1948-1953, into two rival leagues, T/C teams continued to participate in the 'official' league which was controlled by the nationalists.
18. This "end" is interesting in itself. The modernisers/nationalists took power practically with the help of the colonial power. Despite their disagreements both the nationalists and the British functioned and acted within the logic of a modern institutional framework. The Patriarch, on the other hand, denounced the decision to let the Cypriots choose their archbishop by pointing to the dangers of this trend for the unity-under-the Patriarchy, of Orthodoxy/Romiosini. He pointed out, for example, the possibility of Arab demands for local control of the Orthodox Patriarchates in their area.
19. The shift is well represented in the change of positions of Katalanos. The broader framework was related to the clash in Greece between the modernising social forces which rallied around Venizelos and the defenders of the transitional model established in the nineteenth century around the institution of the monarchy.
20. According to Kitromilides the ideology of the Meyali Idea was developed in the 1840s in the newly formed Greek Kingdom as a form of compromise (invoking "national unity") in the process of the construction of the Greek nation. This ideology shifted the internal identity conflicts of the Kingdom to its external arena – to the efforts to annex/liberate areas from the Ottomans which "belonged" to the imaginary community of the new Greco Christian nation. In this context the Meyali Idea functioned as a culturally colonial ideology.
21. Priests tended to be involved in secular politics and participate as candidates in the elections for the Legislative Council.
22. The Kyrenia camp remained a conservative bastion, even after the victory of Greek nationalism. It became the voice of the ultra conservatives (but in a Greco-Christian framework now) and fanatical anti-communists – till 1974. Its chief ideologue was P. Ioannides.

23. P. Liasides was one of the major poets who wrote in the Cypriot linguistic form. His work has been hailed by some critics as a form of native born futurism in its thematic concerns. Still the basic text with which he worked for a long time was the Bible – even if his work was beyond religious concerns. His references and codes were built on the concepts of the traditional world of Romiosini.
24. Attalides, Michael (1979) *Cyprus Nationalism and International Politics*. St. Martin's Press, New York. See, especially chapters four and six for the structural roots of the rise of the phenomenon of Cypriot consciousness, and the multiple and contextual meanings of the hegemonic discourse of enosis.
25. See, for example: Georgallides, S. G. (1978) *A Political and Administrative History of Cyprus 1918-1926, With a Survey on the Foundations of British Rule*. Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre.
26. Wallerstein (1989), pp. 129-130.
27. Indications of the radicalisation on the Right were the nationalist slogans which characterised the uprising of 1931. In itself the uprising started over a dispute between the Governor and the Legislative Council, but it exploded "out of control" when the "masses" joined the initially civil protests of the elite.
28. Ziartides, Andreas (1993) *Horis Fovo ke Pathos*. Nicosia.
29. Mahloulzarides, Panayiotis (1985) *Kipros 1940-1960, Imeroloyio ton Exelixeo*. Nicosia, Cyprus, pp. 5-6. Mahloulzarides cites a Reuters' report and local newspaper articles – at the end he notes that the newspaper *Eleftheria* has been his main source.
30. Mavratsas' work focuses primarily on the 1990s, but as a framework it can be applied from earlier on. See: Mavratsas, Caesar (1998) *Opsis tou Ellinikou Ethnikismou stin Kipro*. Athens, Katarti, p. 172.
31. When the illegal circles of the communist party and some of their allies organised AKEL as a legal party in 1941, the general line of the Left shifted from independence into an acceptance of "self-determination" which implied enosis. In part this was an effort to create the openings for popular unity/laiki enotita. But on another level, of course, the Left was functioning in a context already determined/shaped by the imported national identities.
32. For a study of the shifts in emphasis on Greece, Cyprus and enosis in the rhetoric of the Left, see the study of the speeches of A. Adamantos: Panayiotou, Andreas (2001) 'I Dimosia Ekfrasi tou Kiprokentrismou tin Dekaeitia tou 1940'. *Ex Iparhis*, No. 27-28.
33. In a rhetorical move the Left suggested to the Right in 1947 to abstain from consultations with the British, if the Right agreed to a call for resignation of its leaders/members from their appointed posts in the colonial apparatuses.
34. See Attalides (1979).
35. For a discussion of the concept see chapter 6 in the unpublished thesis: Panayiotou, Andreas (1999) *Island Radicals: The Emergence and Consolidation of the Cypriot Left*. University of California, Santa Cruz.
36. Roth, Guenther (1963) *The Social Democrats in Imperial Germany: A Study in Working Class Isolation and National Integration*. New Jersey, Totowa.

37. For a good analysis of the conflicts and their results, as well as extensive references to the climate created by the newspapers of the period, see: Katsiaounis, Rolandos (2000) *I Diaskeptiki, 1946-1948*. Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre.
38. In his memoirs Ziartides (1993) had critical comments on Papadopoulos' views and perceptions on the Cyprus problem and the T/Cs. Yet he also acknowledged the "close relation" of the then Minister of Labour and the leftist unions.
39. This framework which appeared as soon as the British arrived, had been very strong (especially for the Cypriot elites – nationalist or not) until the 1920s. The uprising of 1931 revealed the underlying rifts, but still many of the leaders of the Right remained until the 1950s exponents of the thesis that the "national issue" could be resolved within the confines of the alleged geopolitical "friendship". A typical case was T. Dervis, the leader of the right wing party KEK which was the main rival of AKEL in the municipal elections of the 1940s-1950s.
40. The British were very clear on this when they declared AKEL and other leftist organisations illegal in 1955. According to the colonial announcement the leftists were the ones who started the subversion of law and order.
41. Panayiotou, Andreas (2005) 'Sinoriakes Empiries: Erminevontas ton Patriotismo tis Kipriakis Aristeras' in Trimikliniotis, N. (ed.), *To Portokali tis Kiprou*. Athina, Katarti.
42. Makarios continued to be both archbishop and president, but his practice showed a steady emphasis on the political/state role rather than the church/religious one. In this context modernisation continued, and the church as a space was respected but was also losing ground to other apparatuses.
43. The terms "language" and "dialect" are used concurrently since this is a reference to discourses. For the linguistics of Greek nationalism, the Cypriot linguistic form is a dialect. Yet, it might be considered a language (albeit without a state backing it) if one compares it with other linguistic forms (of Slavic, Scandinavian, or Germanic languages) which might have passed or were considered as "dialects", but have become accepted (after being adopted by a state) as "languages". The view that the Cypriot language is threatening "panhellenic"/kini Greek, has been articulated by Menelaos Christodoulou. See: Christodoulou, Menelaos (1993) 'I Simerini Fasis tis Ellinikis Ylossis en Kipro' in *Ellados Fthoggon Heousa*. Nicosia.
44. This logic of linguistic "pollution" and the need of "cleaning" has been a key dimension behind the effort to change the local, regional names/toponimia in maps. The issue indeed caused a major uproar in the early 1990s when the cleaning campaign reached the names of the municipalities in the Nicosia area (Latsia, Ayladjia).
45. Gellner, Ernst (1983) *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
46. For that possibility see: Panayiotou, Andreas (2001) 'I Katastoli tis Dinatotitas Emfanisis Kipriakou Ethnous ton 19o Eona'. *Ex Iparhis*, No. 22-23.
47. For a study indicating analogous shifts among the most well known leftist poets, Anthias and Pierides, see: Peonides, Panikos (1981) 'T. Pierides – T. Anthias, I Kipros sto Eryo ton dio Piiton' in *Tomes se Themata Loyou*. Cyprus.
48. The poem was made into a song during the 1990s and it has become especially popular in leftist cultural, political gatherings.

49. The name of the poem and its last verse are *se ynorizo ayapi* (I recognise you love) in juxtaposition to the opening verses of the Greek National Anthem *se ynorizo apo tin kopsi tou spathiou* (I recognise you from the cutting/blade of the sword).
50. The most well known liberal position had been expressed by Lanitis: see, Attalides (1979).
51. Papadopoulos, Theodore (1964) *I Krisis tis Kipriakis Sinidiseos*. Nicosia.
52. A typical example was/is the difference between primary and secondary education. In secondary education the church managed to retain power, while in primary schools British control created a different set of emphases and criteria. See: Persianis, K. Panayiotis (1978) *Church and State in Cyprus Education*. Nicosia. And: Polydorou, P. Andreas (1995) *I Anaptixi tis Dimotikis Ekpedefsis stin Kipro 1830-1994*. Nicosia.
53. The church in the nineteenth century, as an institution of *Romiosini*, was involved in issues related to the curriculum. See, for example, Katsiaounis' (1996) discussion of the new modern/scientific curriculum introduced by Katalanos (one of the seminal leaders of Greek nationalism) in opposition to the traditional one favoured by the church.
54. Polydorou (1995).
55. Supporters of Venizelos in the broader politics of the imaginary community of Hellenism.
56. Y. Hadjipavlou started as a primary school teacher and subsequently studied Law and he became a lawyer. He was editor of the magazine/journal *Ayoyi* of the "Pancyprian Teachers' Association" in the early 1920s. He was also the "founder" of a workers' club, *Paneryatikos*.
57. And the presence of the bishop of Paphos, Leontios, as the acting archbishop, did not help the conservatives either. Leontios kept the lines of communication with the Left open.
58. Loizos, Peter (1986) '*Allayes stin Domi tis Kinonias*' in *Kipriaka 1878-1955*. Lefkosia, *Ekdosi Dimou Lekosias*.
59. See Katsiaounis (1996) for the calls from the ultra conservatives for a broader "clean up".
60. The officially declared goal was to watch British efforts, but the church was, in that context, establishing its hegemony in broader terms – and in relation to its internal opponents, the leftists. In 1950, for example, six students were expelled "for ever" from the Pancyprian Gymnasium because they were leftists – and the damning evidence was leaflets and books, some of them of poetry. The headmaster of the school was the subsequent Minister of Education, C. Spiridakis.
61. In the urban mobilisations of the period 1955-1959, even if semi-legal, the Left held the upper hand through the organisations of the trade unions (which remained legal). Pro-EOKA demonstrations in the cities were organised by high school students – and as Grivas' diary reveals, this was a planned strategy.
62. It can be seen as a conflict between the "popular Right" (at times associated with the discourses of the extreme right wing) and the elite or middle class wing of Right (which tended to be more liberal). Loizos, in describing this conflict, refers to the critiques of Sampson against Clerides in the elections of 1970.

63. Loizos, Peter (1974) 'The Progress of Greek Nationalism in Cyprus: 1878-1970' in *Choice and Change: Essays in Honour of Lucy Maier*. London, Athlone.
64. Papadakis, Yiannis (1995) '20 Hronia Meta Apo Ti? I Pollapli Noimatodotisi tou 1974' in Peristianis, Tsangaras (ed.) *Anatomia Mias Metamorfofis*. Nicosia, Intercollege Press.
65. Christofides, Andreas (1993) 'I Ylossa sta Mesa Mazikis Enimeroseos' in *Ellados Fthoggon Heousa*. Nicosia.

FAVOURITISM AS A FORM OF INJUSTICE IN CYPRUS: UBIQUITOUS AND ETERNAL?

Savvas Daniel Georgiades

Abstract

It is widely accepted that Cyprus is a nation susceptible to unjust practices of favouritism, as reflected in undeserving appointments, promotions, privileged employment transfers, access to services, and so on. Despite these alarming observations, no previous empirical study illuminated the parameters of this problem in Cyprus or unravelled avenues of its prevention. With this important knowledge gap in mind, the present study set out to measure public opinion in an effort to evaluate the extent of the problem in Cyprus and identify mechanisms for rectifying it. To collect data, a telephone survey was used with a randomly selected sample of 150 Greek Cypriots (a response rate of 74 per cent). The results corroborate anecdotal evidence pinpointing the widespread nature of favouritism in Cyprus and suggest cultural, attitudinal, organisational, and legislative solutions. The findings are situated within a global context, and implications are derived for prevention, social work intervention, cross-national collaboration, and future research.

Cyprus is the third largest and easternmost island in the Mediterranean Sea. Human settlements in Cyprus can be traced as far back as 5800 BC, during the Neolithic Era or New Stone Age. Historically, being the victim of diversified occupations and the exotic destination of adventurous tourists, Cypriot culture had experienced influences from a string of civilisations including Mycenaean, Greek, Assyrian, Egyptian, Persian, Roman, Byzantine, Venetian, Ottoman, and British. However, the Christian-Orthodox religion and Greek culture were the life-styles to prevail on the island.

From the establishment of Ottoman rule in the 1500s and destruction of the Venetian aristocracy, Cypriot society was free of vast disparities in socio-economic status and privilege. Nevertheless, the substantial economic growth evidenced within the last three decades (despite the devastating effects of the Turkish invasion in 1974) meant that by the beginning of the 1990s Cyprus had a highly visible class of the newly wealthy. The island's prosperity was widely shared, however. The average standard of living paralleled those of some other West European countries.

A welfare system reflecting Western European values and standards supported those individuals in need, and education became a primary means of upward social mobility (US Library of Congress, 2004).

Today, Cyprus is an independent sovereign Republic with a presidential system of government and officially joined the European Union in May, 2004. The Cyprus economy is predicated upon free market ideology, with the private sector being the backbone of economic activity and the government's role being confined to indicative planning (Republic of Cyprus, 1999). The population of Cyprus is estimated at 793,000, of whom 77 per cent are Greeks, 18 per cent are Turks and the remainder are predominantly Latins, Maronites, Armenians, and British (Census, 2001, cf: US Department of State, 2004). In 2003, the literacy rate (defined as the percentage of individuals age 15 and over who can read) in Cyprus was 97.6 per cent (The World Fact Book, 2004). The work force in 2003 totalled 316,000 people (58 per cent men and 42 per cent women). About 18 per cent of these individuals were employed in wholesale and retail trade and repairs, 11 per cent in manufacturing, 10 per cent in hotels and restaurants, 10 per cent in construction, 8 per cent in public administration and defence, 7 per cent in agriculture hunting and forestry, 7 per cent in transport, storage, and communication, 6 per cent in education, 5 per cent in real estate, renting, and business activities, 5 per cent in financial intermediation, and so on (Statistical Service of Cyprus [CYSTAT], 2003). Currently, the island's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is 7.3 billion dollars and the unemployment rate about 5.3 per cent (CYSTAT, 2005). About half of the unemployed are high school graduates, one-fifth have tertiary education, another one-fifth have only primary education, and one-tenth have technical education (CYSTAT, 2003). The 2006 Human Development Report by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) puts Cyprus' GDP per capita at nearly \$23,000 a year (PPP) while the corresponding figure for Germany is \$28,000. France and the UK have even higher GDP per capita (PPP).

Cultural Considerations

Unlike traditional Western societies and similar to Balkan and the Middle Eastern traditions, Greek culture is collectively minded (Georgas, 1993; Georgas, Berry, Shaw, Christakopoulou and Mylonas, 1996) placing particular emphasis not only on the needs, values and preferences of the individual and nuclear family but also those of the extended family and close friends (Georgas, Christakopoulou, Poortinga, Angleitner, Goodwin and Charalambous, 1997). The Greek emphasis on inter-connectedness functions in tandem with a strong work ethic, a high regard for academic achievement, and a relentless drive to succeed and be recognised as successful by one's community (Athanasiadou, 1997; Deliyanni-Kouintzi and Ziogou, 1995; Evergeti, 2006; Koutsouvanou, 1997, cf: Tamis-LeMonda, Wang, Koutsouvanou and Albright, 2002; Saloutos, 1964; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2002).

While in the past the emphasis was mostly on interpersonal appreciation and spiritual rightness and growth, today materialism has been crowned as the nucleus of attention in both Greek and Greek-Cypriot society. Accordingly, today every Greek Cypriot feels that he/she is being judged by their fellow citizens on the basis of how much wealth he/she has accumulated, what he/she drives, what type of residence he/she resides in, what type of employment he/she performs, what he/she wears, what social connections he/she has, where he/she vacations, what clubs and other entertainment he/she visits, etc. This leaves Greek Cypriots to feel constantly under the societal microscope, and their assessment of how well they fare with societal expectations, often becomes a barometer for their own self-esteem and self-concept.

Unwarranted Favouritism and Social Injustice: The Social Work Connection

Favouritism is defined as “the disposition to favour and promote the interest of one person or family, or of one class of men, to the neglect of others having equal claims” (Webster Dictionary, 1913), or “an inclination to favour some person or group” (Wordreference.com, 2003). Reflections of favouritism can often be found in (a) the criteria chosen to measure merit, (b) the tests used to assess merit, and (c) the subjective evaluation of another’s performance (e.g. Fraser and Kick, 2000). Meritocracy and equal opportunity are frequently portrayed in the literature as antonyms for favouritism. Son Hing, Bobocel and Zanna (2002) define meritocracy as “a principle or ideal that prescribes that only the most deserving individuals are rewarded (p. 494). Moreover, according to Smith-Winkelmann and Crosby (1994), meritocracy is not plausible within a context that arbitrarily discriminates against a certain section (s) of the population. In a similar vein, equal opportunity “... means that no-one should be debarred from seeking employment on the basis of age, race, ethnicity, sex, gender, religious belief, disability, or any other criterion irrelevant to the standard of performance demanded by the position sought” (Marinoff, 2000, p. 24).

Utterly, the form of favouritism examined herein is in direct antithesis with the term equal opportunity. This type of favouritism does not aim to ensure that oppressed groups are given equal chances for socio-economic rewards and upward social mobility. To the contrary, this sort of favouritism perpetuates disempowerment of the oppressed (these being individuals encountering multiple socio-economic deprivations in their daily lives) by persistently denying them opportunities for life enhancement. Such opportunities are instead discriminately given to ‘favoured’ individuals or groups, merely on the basis of the latter’s social connections with powerful stakeholders in society (e.g. elected officials, political parties, political appointees, etc.) rather than on merit or susceptibility to discrimination.

Indisputably, this malignant form of favouritism is a severe foe to social justice. As Saleebey (1990) explains social justice involves a social mechanism of ensuring that “opportunities for personal social development are open to all with the understanding that those who have been unfairly hampered through no fault of their own will be appropriately compensated” (p. 7). Given that the social work profession’s central mission concerns the promotion of human well-being and the elimination of social injustices (International Federation of Social Work, 2000; National Association of Social Workers, 2005), it becomes imperative that social workers are actively involved in crusades to eradicate malevolent forms of favouritism from society.

International Trends

The international literature is replete with examples of unjust favouritism permeating all domains of human life, socio-economic strata, cultures, and geographic locations. For example, in the context of family life, parental favouritism has been found to exert destructive effects on the psychological development of children in diverse cultural settings (e.g. Ching-Hua, Shih-Jen, Yu, Kuan-Hung, Chiu-Peng and Chen-Jee Hong, 2001; Rohde, Atzwanger, Butovskayad, Lampert, Mysterud, Sanchez-Andres and Sulloway, 2003). In the political arena, President Bush has been recently accused of using family connections to receive privileged treatment in the army during the Vietnam War (e.g. Hirschhorn, 2004). In sports, it has been found that Spanish and German Soccer referees are more likely to act in favour of the home team under social pressure (Garicano, Palacios and Prenderqast, 2001; Sutter and Kocher, 2002). In education, Rosenbloom and Way (2004) found that teachers preferred Asian American students than African American and Latino students on the basis of social stereotypes suggesting that Asians are more likely to succeed educationally and professionally than other racial groups (e.g. Rosenbloom and Way, 2004).

These are only a few examples of unjust favouritism. Additional cases of counterproductive favouritism include (and are not limited to) favouritism towards persons who are not inflicted by disability (e.g. Premeaux, 2001) or a disfigured facial appearance (e.g. Stevenage and McKay, 1999), favouritism based on social connections (e.g. Lomnitz, Sheinbaum and Unam, 2003), national favouritism (e.g. Koomen and Bähler, 1996; Slabbert, 2001; Rulison, 2004), favouritism in hiring (e.g. Rudman and Glick, 1999), employee evaluation (e.g. Sackett and DuBois, 1991), and promotion (e.g. Landau, 1995; Linehan, 2000), favouritism in police (e.g. Correll, Park and Judd, 2002) judicial (e.g. Azar and Benjet, 1994; Meeker, Jesilow and Aranda, 1992), medical (e.g. Furnham, Hassomal and McClelland, 2002; Hatala and Case, 2000), social service (e.g. Jones, 2002; Ryan and Schuerman, 2004), and military decisions (e.g. Roberts and Skinner, 1996; Siskind and Kearns, 1997), and so on.

Theoretical Underpinnings of Favouritism

Favouritism, as examined herein, originates from political corruption and poor governance. Wikipedia (2007) defines political corruption as,

“the misuse by government officials of their governmental powers for illegitimate, usually secret, private gain. Misuse of government power for other purposes, like repression of political opponents and general police brutality, is not considered political corruption. Illegal acts by private persons or corporations not directly involved with the government is not considered political corruption either.”

The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in 2002 expressly linked the realisation of human rights with improvements in national governance. According to this organisation, governance is,

“the process whereby public institutions can conduct public affairs, manage public resources and guarantee the realisation of human rights. Good governance accomplishes this in a manner essentially free of abuse and corruption, and with due regard for the rule of law. The true test of good governance is the degree to which it delivers on the promise of human rights: civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights.”

According to the 2006 survey by the Transparency International Organisation, Finland, Iceland, and New Zealand are perceived to be the world's least corrupt countries, and Haiti is perceived to be the most corrupt. The index defines corruption as the abuse of public office for private gain and measures the degree to which corruption is perceived to exist among a country's public officials and politicians. It is a composite index, drawing on twelve polls and surveys from nine independent institutions, which gathered the opinions of businesspeople and country analysts. The scores range from ten (squeaky clean) to zero (highly corrupt). A score of 5.0 is the number Transparency International considers the borderline figure distinguishing countries that do and do not have a serious corruption problem. Cyprus ranks in 37th place with a very close to borderline score of 5.6 (Infoplease, 2007).

Italian sociologist Etzioni-Halevy (1999) uses the term ultramodern society to describe today's Western society as one that paradoxically reflects both expansion and undue reversal of modern accomplishments. A defining characteristic of ultramodern society is globalisation, which tends to create “a growing polarisation in life chances between the over-endowed and the unemployed or the underemployed (ibid., p. 240).

For Etzioni-Halevy (1999), ultramodern society reinforces inequality and impresses the silence of the highly oppressed. Evidence substantiating her claim include (and are not limited to): (a) in the last thirty years the salary gap between upper and lower classes has risen excessively in countries like USA, Canada, Australia, and the UK; (b) unemployment rates have risen in European nations such as Spain, Italy, Belgium, France, and Germany (ranging from 19 per cent to 11.2 per cent); and (c) in continental Europe about one-fifth of all workers live only on the earnings from a part-time job (*ibid.*, 1999). Clearly, favouritism is executed by those with power and gives preferentiality to the privileged of a society at the expense of the disenfranchised. As such, Etzioni-Halevy's theory seems to imply that favouritism is a natural by-product of ultramodern society, and that to eliminate it would necessitate uprooting of the socio-structural make-up of contemporary society.

Another theory that relates to our critical scrutiny of favouritism is distributive justice theory, which essentially claims that an individual's relative outcomes (e.g. hiring) should be given in proportion to his or her relative inputs (e.g. employment qualifications) (Cohen, 1987; Deutsch, 1975). Along these lines, equity theory suggests that evaluations of unequal distributions are expected to induce negative emotions, which, in turn, motivate individuals to alter their behaviour or distort the cognitions associated with perceptions of unfairness (e.g. Adams, 1965). Likewise, attribution theory (Weiner, 1985) purports that if the perceived fairness of the selection system can be questioned, external attributions are more likely and the outcome of a selection decision will not have a great impact on applicants' self-esteem.

In addition, life chances theory maintains that individuals are motivated to engage in productive roles profiting society when they perceive opportunities for upward social mobility in their social environment. However, when such opportunities are depleted, individuals tend to gravitate towards a path of self-destruction (e.g. Auslander, Slonim-Nevo, Elze and Sherraden, 1998; Dahrendorf, 1979). Taken together, these theories shed light on the harmful psychological effects that favouritism could have on an individual, and bear substantive social work implications for counteracting it. These theories connote that an unjust form of favouritism can be a high risk factor for maladjustment especially for those lacking sufficient social supports and psychological resiliency. Thus, a social worker's ethical responsibility cannot be merely limited to seeking mechanisms of preventing malignant forms of favouritism but extends to empowering individuals to both proactively and reactively enhance their social support systems and psychological stamina against the ill-effects resulting from undue favouritism.

Favouritism and Greek-Cypriot Society

In the nineteenth century, the Greek Government lacked comprehensive strategic planning and merely employed peasants who had left the countryside in search for employment in urban settings (Mouzelis, 1978). This was accomplished through political affiliations and using a practice commonly known as rousfeti. This is a word of Arab origin which means personal favour to supporters and differs from bribery (Broome, 1996). Rousfeti often serves to outshine bureaucratic formalities and serves to favour individuals who have social connections with clout over the sought out outcomes. Heavily impacted by Greece, Cyprus began to imitate Greek patterns of rousfeti once it gained its independence in 1960. While today staffing in the public sector is strictly limited to objective types of entry procedures, personal relations are still important in dealing with the State while political affiliations influence staffing decisions for higher positions (Papalexandris, 1999).

Public protests against favouritism in Cyprus began in the 1960s, namely a few years after Cyprus' liberation from British colonisation and its declaration of Independence (1960). In his historical account of *The Rise and Fall of the Cyprus Republic*, Markides (1977) notes about this time period

“The discrepancy between the overall level of development of the island and the availability of individuals with university degrees was explosive for the government. Unavoidably, as the number of university graduates increased, some would begin turning against the status quo, exposing what they would consider corruption, inefficiency, and favouritism in the civil service” (p. 108).

Upon his election in 2003, the current President of Cyprus, Tassos Papadopoulos, pledged a country of equality, without discrimination and without prejudice, and a society that observes meritocracy (People's Daily Newspaper, 17 February 2003). President Papadopoulos' political emphasis on meritocracy (at the exclusion of other key social justice indicators, e.g. freedom of expression) seems to signal public apprehension about the prevalence of unjust forms of favouritism in Cyprus.

In compliance with the President's assurance, and in response to recent accusations regarding favouritism in the Police, current Minister of Justice and Public Order, Theodorou recently stated that “favours”, “favouritism”, and “party spirit”, would not rule any more and that only the best candidates would be appointed in the Police. Theodorou also talked about the previous system of appointment in the police, describing it as a corrupt regime that treated the competent candidates unfairly. In particular, Theodorou stated that the examination papers revealed cases of cheating in the entrance examinations to the Police Force in 2001 (Philelefttheros Newspaper, 5 September 2003).

However, more recently, the deputy of DISY, the major opposition party in Cyprus, Ionas Nicolaou, insisted on his allegations of favouritism in the Police, on the occasion of recent evaluations and promotions in the Force. On the other hand, Deputy Police Chief and Head of the Evaluation Council Charalambos Koulentis admitted mistakes and failures in the procedure, but did not ascribe any dark motives to the Evaluation Committee (Simerini Newspaper, 7 September 2004).

Clearly, favouritism is not confined to the government sector in Cyprus. Recently, a notorious scandal implicated key members of the Greek-Orthodox Church Administration in a gross enactment of unjust favouritism. According to the allegations, the accused – these being people with strong clout and important inside connections to pivotal administrators in the church – attempted financial exploitation of the church by buying significant amounts of the Church's land at very low cost for personal profit. (This incident is currently under investigation and the findings are therefore pending).

Public Law on Favouritism

In 2001, the Cyprus House of Representatives passed a law (P.L. N. 27(1)/2001), which aims at cleansing public life, eliminating counterproductive mentalities of the past and promoting meritocracy. This new law criminalises acts of favouritism within government in areas such as hiring, promotion, employment transfer, and disciplinary action. A person who contacts a government employee for the purpose of receiving favouritism for himself or herself or another person and a governmental employee who is contacted by such a person for the purpose of receiving favouritism and fails to report this to the Police within three days can both be subject to up to twelve months imprisonment and a fine of up to 1000 CY pounds [i.e. about 2000 USD] (President Glafkos Clerides, 2001). Irrespective of the seemingly good intent of this new law, its effectiveness level remains largely unknown.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

Anecdotal evidence, popular beliefs, and political and historical events reviewed herein coupled with the logic that Cyprus is a geographically small nation, (and therefore, social connections may become more vital for upward social mobility) seem to suggest that Cyprus could be highly at risk for social injustices pertaining to unjust favouritism. Unfortunately, no previous scientific inquiry concerned itself with the problem of favouritism in Cyprus. Therefore, this study aims at filling up this significant knowledge gap by investigating the question: How does the public assess the nature, extent, and feasible solutions to the problem of unjust favouritism in Cyprus?

Another aim of the study is to evaluate the effects of age, gender, and education on public perceptions and feelings about unjust favouritism in Cyprus. These specific predictor effects are scrutinised herein because they could produce knowledge for tailoring interventions to the unique needs of diverse subpopulations in Cyprus, as distinguished by gender, age and education.

It is hoped that the knowledge generated from this study could impact policy makers concerned with issues of favouritism in Cyprus and the effectiveness of the new law. The findings could also help sensitise other key players in Cypriot society and other parts of the world, such as employers, administrators, educators, and other individuals in leadership roles about the detrimental effects of unwarranted favouritism and potential mechanisms of combating it.

Helping resolve unjust issues of favouritism within a society is clearly a humanistic crusade with clear-cut psychological and economic benefits for its citizenry (e.g. Lomnitz, Sheinbaum and Unam, 2003). People tend to be much more productive and innovative within contexts where they feel fairly treated. Such benevolent psychological effects often translate into economic advantages not only for the citizens themselves but also for their families, organisations and communities. Such linkages between dignified societal treatment and personal and economic growth persist in diverse cultures and geographic locations (e.g. Connell, 1999; Connerley, Arvey, Gilliland, Mael, Paetzold and Sackett, 2002; Creegan, Colgan and Charlesworth, 2003; Hays-Thomas, 2004; Nettle, 2003).

Method

Sample

The telephone directory for Nicosia, Cyprus' capital was used to identify prospective respondents; this lists citizens' phone numbers alphabetically by last name. Specifically, all the pages in the directory were numbered and then the table of random digits was consulted to indiscriminately choose a page. For each page randomly selected, all the names were numbered and the participant was chosen at random, again after reviewing the table of random digits. In total 204 Greek Cypriots were called to reach the targeted number of 150 respondents (this number ensured $>.8$ conventional statistical power at a $.05$ significance level, Cohen, 1988). The ensuing response rate of the study was therefore $.74$. This response rate is a little higher than that reported by other survey studies on social issues in Cyprus (e.g. Georgiades, 2003; Georgiades and Potocky-Tripodi, 2000).

From the 150 final respondents, 101 were women (67 per cent) and 49 (33 per cent) were men. Previous research has concluded comparable rates of participation in regards to gender, suggesting that Cypriot women are twice more likely to

respond to surveys than men (e.g. Georgiades and Potocky-Tripodi, 2000). Respondents ranged in age from 18 to 86 years (mean= 43 yrs; SD=15.83 yrs). Respondents' education varied from 4 to 16 years (mean=12 yrs; SD=3.19). Women were on average 44 years old (SD=14.77 yrs; range=18-86 yrs) and had an average of about 12 years of formal education (SD=3.43 yrs; range=4-16 yrs). Men were on average 41 years old (SD= 17.85 yrs; range=18-76 yrs) and had an average of about 13 years of formal education (SD=2.56 yrs; range=6-16 yrs).

Data Collection Procedure

Participants were called between the times of 6.00 p.m. and 9.00 p.m. and had to be at least 18 years of age to be eligible to participate. In cases where the call was placed at an inconvenient time, the researcher followed up with a call back at another scheduled time of convenience to the participant. The researcher presented himself as an Assistant Professor of Social Work at a North American University and explained: (a) that the research was concerned with the problem of favouritism in Cyprus; (b) that the survey included eight questions that would take approximately five minutes to complete; (c) that they had the right to discontinue participation at any time during the survey; (d) that they were allowed to refuse response to any question of the survey if they felt the need to do so; (e) that the researcher would later attempt to publish the results in a professional journal in the hope of improving public policy in the area; and (f) that their anonymity regarding the information revealed in this survey would be fully protected.

For pilot purposes ten respondents were initially contacted and presented with the questionnaire (see appendix, p. 125). Once these pilot respondents completed the study, they were asked to provide feedback on how they experienced the introductory statement of the research and the interview itself. Overall, these respondents found the entire process unambiguous, smooth sailing, and expeditious and suggested that the public should not have experienced undue inconvenience in responding to this survey. However, seven pilot respondents resisted inclusion of a question asking about the respondent's type of employment. The argument was that some people (particularly public sector employees) could have been discouraged to either participate in the study or share honestly information about favouritism when faced with this question because of likely suspicions that their revelations could have repercussions for their employment. With this warning in mind, the employment question was eliminated. For practical reasons, data received from the pilot respondents were used in the final analyses of the study since they did not seem to present potential threats to the validity of the results. Impressively, in the actual study, none of the respondents evaded any of the questions or opted out of the survey prior to its completion.

Data Analysis

Numeric data for questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6a, 7, and 8 (see appendix, p. 125) were entered into an SPSS file and entries were rechecked twice for accuracy until all errors were corrected. Subsequently means, standard deviations (SDs), and ranges were computed, and multiple-regression analyses were run as needed.

Questions 5 and 6b elicited qualitative data, which were subject to content analysis. Specifically, the researcher wrote verbatim all qualitative responses during the interview and later compiled them into separate word processing files for each question. The researcher then searched the data for emerging themes that would accurately represent the data set. A Greek-Cypriot volunteer looked at both data sets and fully agreed on the emerging themes. The researcher then computed frequencies for each theme and repeated these calculations to ensure accuracy.

Results

Table 1 (p. 126) displays the results for reported prevalence and personal frustration with favouritism, degree of unfairness of Greek-Cypriot society, number of known cases of favouritism, and degree of belief in prevention of favouritism. As can be seen, reported prevalence of favouritism fell within the a lot present and extremely present range leaning more towards the latter end; personal frustration with favouritism fell within the a lot and extremely range leaning more towards the former end; degree of fairness of Greek-Cypriot society fell within the somewhat unfair and a lot unfair range leaning more towards the former end. Finally, respondents on average knew about forty-three cases of favouritism in Cyprus.

Table 2 (p. 126) demonstrates the results of multiple regression analyses. The regression model consisting of gender, age, and education predicted small amounts of reported prevalence (4.9 per cent), degree of unfairness of Greek-Cypriot society (4.0 per cent), and public belief in prevention of favouritism (4.3 per cent). Gender was not a significant predictor for perceived prevalence of favouritism while age and education were not significant predictors for degree of unfairness of Greek-Cypriot society or belief in prevention. Being younger and less educated were both associated with perception of higher prevalence of favouritism. Being male was associated with perceiving the Greek-Cypriot society to be more unfair. Finally, being female related to a stronger belief in prevention of favouritism.

Table 3 (p. 127) summarises the content analyses for reported locations of favouritism and prevention methods. Approximately nine out of ten respondents thought that favouritism in hiring, promotion, privileged employment transfer, and access to services is present within government/public sectors; about six out of ten respondents suggested that favouritism existed everywhere, in all aspects of life;

about five out of ten indicated that favouritism was traceable within the semi-public sector; and about one-quarter of respondents accused banks of favouritism. In terms of prevention, seven out of ten respondents believed that favouritism was unavoidable. For the very few who believed in the promise of prevention, seven out of ten recommended that the public mentality be changed; about half emphasised strict enforcement of merit requirements and better training of administrators; and about one-third conceptualised legislative change as an effectual solution to favouritism.

Discussion

The findings of this study provide strong support to previous anecdotal evidence suggesting that favouritism (as reflected in hiring, promotion, privileged employment transfers, and access to services) is highly present in Cyprus (for example, like Russia, e.g. Clarke, 1999; Yakubovich and Kozina, 2000), particularly within the government, the semi-public sector (including public television, electricity, and telephone companies, etc.), and banks.

The study also suggests that the citizens of Cyprus are very frustrated with favouritism on the island, yet very pessimistic about its prevention potential. Ironically, despite the bleak picture that public assessment of favouritism paints in Cyprus, the Cyprus public does not seem to judge Greek-Cypriot society at large as extremely, or even very unjust. The latter observation could be insinuating mitigating strengths within Cypriot communities (such as perhaps cultural characteristics, e.g. collectivity) that could partially dismantle the negative impacts of favouritism and lead its citizenry to assess society more favourably than expected. Another explanation of the latter finding could be cultural denial. Greeks tend to be very fervent about their ethnic identity. They may, therefore, deliberately refuse to accept injustice labels for their society due to the negative connotations that such admission could bear on their sense of ethnic pride.

The very few study respondents (29 per cent) who acclaimed the potential of favouritism prevention in Cyprus, saw light at the end of the tunnel in the form of public mentality change (70 per cent), stricter enforcement of merit requirements and better training of administrators to circumvent situations of favouritism (53 per cent), legislative change (30 per cent) and public protest against favouritism (5 per cent). Clearly, this evidence suggests that the public in Cyprus is cognizant of the coincidence between favouritism and cultural and historical leanings. This observation is congruent with findings claiming that informal hiring practices inherited from the past persevere because the personal networks in which they are embedded sabotage abrupt changes in the social order (Grabher and Stark, 1997). Similarly, Huo, Huang, and Napier (2002) demonstrate that personnel selection criteria are driven by each country's prevalent cultural values.

Like every study, the present research is not free from limitations. For example, despite the effectiveness of a brief telephone survey to ensure high response, it also limits one's ability to investigate in an in-depth, qualitative fashion the social issue of concern. Another caveat of the present study is its holistic reliance on public opinion to draw conclusions on the defining parameters of favouritism in Cyprus. Inescapably, such opinions are subjective in nature, often exaggerated or underreported depending on the contextual dynamics of the research process.

Implications for Prevention and Social Work Intervention

Unjust favouritism is often a phenomenon reinforced by history and perpetuated by culture. Through the passage of time, favouritism becomes ingrained in people's psyches, solidifies itself as a cultural norm, and generates widespread citizen frustration and pessimism about its elimination. The uprooting of unjust favouritism requires structural and psychological interventions that are time-consuming (and perhaps costly), yet essential for success. Education about the harmful effects of favouritism is at the core of prevention. However, education alone, in the absence of supportive legislative change, may not be able to withstand the strong pressures exerted by predisposing cultural, social, political, geographic, and historical factors.

Small geographic contexts (such as Cyprus) may be more susceptible to favouritism by virtue of the fact that social connections are more easily made in such restricted environments. Social nets in these milieus could possibly catalyse upward social mobility processes and become automatic substitutes for merit requirements in areas such as hiring, promotion, access to services, and so on. Citizens in such highly networked societies may feel highly oppressed when their zealous endeavours for upward social mobility fail categorically. Due to perpetuating socio-cultural, political, and historical factors, citizens' collapsing efforts for socio-economic advancement in these environments may be perceived as fatal and inescapable. Such explanations concur with life chances theory and have powerful implications for prevention, the thrust of which is that preventive crusades could not simply reduce themselves to legislative innovation. They need to extend to attesting to the public that their future efforts for fiscal progress and dignified survival in society will be rewarded rather than undermined by society, thereby substantiating the logo that actions speak louder than words. Quick fix solutions are not likely to effectively tackle favouritism in such small contexts, as in the latter favouritism becomes a deeply rooted phenomenon ingrained in the citizenry's psyche (rather than being a periodic symptom resulting from a precipitating social event).

As with other social injustices, public compliance serves as a gigantic fertiliser for the perpetuation of favouritism in society. Activism and community organisation efforts could therefore become vital in the process of eradicating favouritism. Social workers and other human service professionals have an ethical responsibility to

empower citizens to objectively evaluate the origins of their oppression and to train them for social and political action to counteract it. These professionals are unlikely to be successful in such a crusade if they themselves model behaviours that are pessimistic, cynical, and/or compliant in nature, thereby reinforcing the status quo. Cypriot social workers and other social service providers are therefore clearly charged with the ethical responsibility of becoming themselves actively involved in community efforts to annihilate favouritism, either as initiators, supporters of existing initiatives, or both. They also have the moral obligation of encouraging and preparing their clientele, as well as the general public, for involvement in anti-favouritism campaigns. Strengthening the psychological stamina and resiliencies of those adversely impacted or who will likely be victims of unjust favouritism is an additional ethical obligation of social workers. Without such protective factors, the latter individuals could be highly at risk as attribution and life chances theories suggest. Group interventions may be particularly productive and cost-effective in this venture. Groups can simultaneously provide socio-emotional support and be the springboard for social action campaigns, both of which are highly conducive to client empowerment (e.g. Johnson and Johnson, 2003).

Future Research and Cross-National Collaboration

More research is needed in Cyprus, as well as globally, to answer what exactly are the psychological effects of unjust practices of favouritism. For example, an important question that needs to be addressed is whether victimisation by favouritism is a contributing factor for mental health challenges such as depression and anxiety, suicidal ideation, and suicide. This inquiry is particularly formidable when one considers that researchers in Europe and elsewhere report that extended unemployment (which often is an offspring of the absence of meritocratic practices in society) is a high risk factor for behavioural and health problems (Kieselbach, 1988; Winefield, Tiggemann, Winefield and Goldney, 1993). The psychological effects of favouritism will also need to be discerned along important socio-demographic dimensions such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, culture, etc. For example, it would be laudable to evaluate whether the propensity of: (a) younger and less educated individuals to estimate higher levels of unjust favouritism; (b) males to assess their society more unjust than females; (c) and females to be more optimistic about prevention (findings substantiated herein) persist across different cultures, ethnicities, and geographic locations.

Cross-cultural comparisons on the origins, experiences, and effects of unjust favouritism can also enhance our awareness of its universal threads and resiliency mechanisms for coping with its adverse consequences. Cross-cultural assessments of favouritism are particularly significant in our ultramodern society (Etzioni-Halevy, 1999), which seeks to silence the oppressed while magnifying the welfare of the oppressors. Therefore, our improved understanding of the

oppressions of other cultures, in areas such as favouritism, could mobilise us to reach out to other cultures/nations and find common grounds for collective campaigns to institute universal protective measures against global injustices perpetuated by malignant forms of favouritism.

Bibliography

- Adams, J.S. (1965) 'Inequity in Social Exchange' in Berkowitz, L. (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 2. New York, Academic Press, pp. 267-299.
- Athanasiadou, C. (1997) 'Postgraduate Women Talk About Family and Career: The Discursive Reproduction of Gender Difference', *Feminism and Psychology*, Vol. 7, pp. 321-327.
- Auslander, W.F., Slonim-Nevo, V., Elze, D. and Sherraden, M. (1998) 'HIV Prevention for Youths in Independent Living Programs: Expanding Life Options', *Child Welfare*, Vol. LXXVII, pp. 209-221.
- Azar, S.T. and Benjet, C.L. (1994) 'A Cognitive Perspective on Ethnicity, Race, and Termination of Parental Rights', *Law and Human Behaviour*, Vol. 18, pp. 249-268.
- Broome, B. (1996) *Exploring the Greek Mosaic: A Guide to Intercultural Communication in Greece*. Boston/MA, Intercultural Press, Inc.
- Ching-Hua, L., Shih-Jen, T., Yu, Y., Kuan-Hung, Y., Chiu-Peng, H. and Chen-Jee, H. (2001) 'Study of Anticipation in Chinese Families with Schizophrenia', *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, Vol. 55, pp. 137-141.
- Clarke, S. (1999) *The Formation of a Labour Market in Russia*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.
- Cohen, J. (1988) *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences*, 2nd Ed. Hillsdale/NJ, Erlbaum.
- Cohen, R.L. (1987) 'Distributive Justice: Theory and Research', *Social Justice Research*, Vol. 1, p. 1940.
- Connell, J. (1999) 'Does Management Style Make a Difference? Corporate Culture Change Within Two Australian Companies' in Afzalur, R.M. and Golembiewski, R.T. (ed.), *Current Topics in Management*, Vol. 4. US, Elsevier Science/JAI Press, pp. 347-370.
- Connerley, M.L., Arvey, R.D., Gilliland, S.W., Mael, F.E., Paetzold, R.L. and Sackett, P.R. (2002) 'Selection in the Workplace: Whose Rights Prevail?', *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 13, pp. 1-13.
- Correll, J., Park, B. and Judd, C.M. (2002) 'The Police Officer's Dilemma: Using Ethnicity to Disambiguate Potentially Threatening Situations', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 83, pp. 1314-1329.
- Creegan, C., Colgan, F. and Charlesworth, R. (2003) 'Race Equality Policies at Work: Employee Perceptions of the "Implementation Gap" in a UK Local Authority', *Work, Employment and Society*, Vol. 17, pp. 617-640.

- CYSTAT (2003) 'Labour', World Wide Web:
[[http://www.mof.gov.cy/mof/cystat/statistics.nsf/All/7D992D0EE213AF42C2256D40004167E7/\\$FILE/LABOUR-EN-231104.xls?OpenElement](http://www.mof.gov.cy/mof/cystat/statistics.nsf/All/7D992D0EE213AF42C2256D40004167E7/$FILE/LABOUR-EN-231104.xls?OpenElement)], accessed 21 February 2005.
- CYSTAT (2005) 'Latest Economic Indicators', World Wide Web:
[http://www.mof.gov.cy/mof/cystat/statistics.nsf/index_en/index_en?OpenDocument], accessed 21 February 2005.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1979) *Life Chances: Approaches to Social and Political Theory*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Deliyanni-Kouintzis, K. and Ziogou, R. (1995) 'Gendered Youth Transitions in Northern Greece: Between Tradition and Modernity through Education' in Chisholm, L. et al. (eds.), *Growing up in Europe*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.
- Deutsch, M. (1975) 'Equity, Equality, and Need. What Determines Which Value Will Be Used As the Basis of Distributive Justice?', *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 31, pp. 137-149.
- Etzioni-Halevy, E. (1999) 'Elites, Inequality and the Quality of Democracy in Ultramodern Society', *International Review of Sociology*, Vol. 9, pp. 239-250.
- Evergeti, V. (2006) 'Living and Caring between Two Cultures: Narratives of Greek Women in Britain', *Community, Work, and Family*, Vol. 9, pp. 347-366.
- Fraser, J. and Kick, E. (2000) 'The Interpretive Repertoires of Whites on Race-targeted Policies: Claims Making of Reverse Discrimination', *Sociological Perspectives*, Vol. 43, pp. 13-28.
- Furnham, A.F., Hassomal, A. and McClelland, A. (2002) 'A Cross-cultural Investigation of the Factors and Biases Involved in the Allocation of Scarce Medical Resources', *Journal of Health Psychology*, Vol. 7, pp. 381-391.
- Garicano, L., Palacios, I. and Prendergast, C. (2001) 'Favouritism under Social Pressure. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper, No. 8376', World Wide Web: [<http://www.nber.org/papers/w8376>], accessed 23 September 2004.
- Georgas, J. (1993) 'An Ecological-social Model for Indigenous Psychology: The Example of Greece' in Kim, U. and Berry, J.W. (eds.), *Indigenous Psychologies: Research and Experience in Cultural Context*. Newbury Park, Sage, pp. 56-78.
- Georgas, J., Berry, J.W., Shaw, A., Christakopoulou, S. and Mylonas, K. (1996) 'Acculturation of Greek Family Values, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 27, pp. 329-338.
- Georgas, J., Christakopoulou, S., Poortinga, Y.H., Angleitner, A., Goodwin, R. and Charalambous, N. (1997) 'The Relationship of Family Bonds to Family Structure and Function across Cultures', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 28, pp. 303-320.
- Georgiades, S. (2003) 'Domestic Violence in Cyprus: The Voices of Nicosian Women', *Journal of Social Work Research and Evaluation: An International Publication*, Vol. 4, pp. 199-212.
- Georgiades, S. and Potocky-Tripodi, M. (2000) 'Public Perceptions of Social Welfare Services in Cyprus', *Journal of Social Work Research and Evaluation: An International Publication*, Vol. 1, pp. 139-151.
- Grabher, C. and Stark, D. (1997) 'Organising Diversity: Evolutionary Theory, Network

- Analysis, and Post-socialism' in Grabher, G. and Stark, D. (eds.), *Restructuring Networks in Post-socialism*. New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 1-32.
- Hatala, R. and Case, S.M. (2000) 'Examining the Influence of Gender on Medical Students' Decision Making', *Journal of Women's Health and Gender-Based Medicine*, Vol. 9, pp. 617-623.
- Hays-Thomas, R. (2004) 'Why Now? The Contemporary Focus on Managing Diversity' in Stockdale, M.S. and Crosby, F.J. (eds.), *Psychology and Management of Workplace Diversity*. Malden/MA, Blackwell Publishers, pp. 3-30.
- Hirschhorn, P. (2004) 'Professor Says Bush Revealed National Guard Favouritism', *World Wide Web*: [<http://www.cnn.com/2004/ALLPOLITICS/09/13/bush.professor/>], accessed 13 September 2004.
- Huo, P.Y., Huang, H.J. and Napier, N.K. (2002) 'Divergence or Convergence: A Cross-national Comparison of Personnel Selection Practices', *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 41, pp. 31-44.
- Infoplease (2007) 'The 2006 Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index', *World Wide Web*: [<http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0781359.html>], accessed 15 January 2007.
- International Federation of Social Workers (2000) 'New Definition of Social Work', *World Wide Web*: [<http://www.ifsw.org/Publications/4.6e.pub.html>], accessed 15 June 2004.
- Johnson, D.W. and Johnson, F.P. (2003) *Joining Together: Group Theory and Group Skills*, 8th Ed. Boston/MA, Allyn and Bacon.
- Jones, A. (2002) 'Assertive Community Treatment: Development of the Team, Selection of Clients, and Impact on Length of Hospital Stay', *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, Vol. 9, pp. 261-270.
- Kieselbach, T. (1988) 'Youth Unemployment and Health Effects', *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, Vol. 34, pp. 83-96.
- Koomen, W. and Bähler, M. (1996) 'National Stereotypes: Common Representations and Ingroup Favouritism', *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 26, pp. 325-333.
- Landau, J. (1995) 'The Relationship of Race and Gender to Managers' Ratings of Promotion Potential', *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, Vol. 16, pp. 391-400.
- Linehan, M. (2000) *Senior Female International Managers. Why So Few?* Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Lomnitz, L.A., Sheinbaum, D. and Unam, I. (2003) 'Trust, Social Networks and the Informal Economy: A Comparative Analysis', *World Wide Web*: [<http://www.colbud.hu/honesty-trust/lomnitz/pub03.doc>], accessed 25 September 2004.
- Marinoff, L. (2000) 'Equal Opportunity versus Employment Equity', *Sexuality and Culture*, Vol. 4, pp. 23-44.
- Markides, K.C. (1977) *The Rise and Fall of the Cyprus Republic*. New Haven/Ct, Yale University Press.
- Meeker, J.W., Jesilow, P. and Aranda, J. (1992) 'Bias in Sentencing: A Preliminary Analysis of Community Service Sentences', *Behavioural Sciences and the Law*, Vol. 10, pp. 197-206.

- Mouzelis, N. (1978) *Modern Greece: Facets of Underdevelopment*. London, Macmillan.
- National Association of Social Workers (2005) 'About NASW', World Wide Web: [<http://www.naswdc.org/nasw/nasw.pdf>], accessed 21 February 2005.
- Nettle, D. (2003) 'Intelligence and Class Mobility in the British Population', *British Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 94, pp. 551-561.
- Papalexandris, N. (1999) 'Greece: From Ancient Myths to Modern Realities. Chapter submitted for the second Globe Anthology', World Wide Web: [<http://64.233.167.104/search?q=cache:cVcQob2Z8oIJ:www2.hsfulda.de/fb/sw/profs/wolf/One%2520Culture%2520Nation%2520Leadership%2520Studies/Greek/greecechapter.doc+cyprus+rousfeti&hl=en&gl=us&ct=clnk&cd=9>], accessed 20 January 2007.
- People's Daily Newspaper (17 February 2003) 'Papadopoulos Pledges to Achieve Just Cyprus Solution', World Wide Web: [http://english.people.com.cn/200302/17/eng20030217_111752.shtml], accessed 25 September 2004.
- Phileleftheros (5 September 2003) 'The Minister of Justice says: No More "Favours" and Favouritism', World Wide Web: [<http://www.cyprusmedianet.com/EN/article/11531>], accessed 16 November 2004.
- Premeaux, S.F. (2001) 'Impact of Applicant Disability on Selection: The Role of Disability Type, Physical Attractiveness, and Proximity', *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 16, pp. 291-298.
- President Glafkos Clerides (14 March 2001) Official Letter to All Cyprus Government Administrators Pertaining to Public Law N. 27(1)/2001). Republic of Cyprus.
- Republic of Cyprus (1999) *Cyprus: The Way to Full EU Membership*. Nicosia, Press and Information Service.
- Roberts, H.E. and Skinner, J. (1996) 'Gender and Racial Equity of the Air Force Officer Qualifying Test in Officer Training School Selection Decisions', *Military Psychology*, Vol. 8, pp. 95-113.
- Rohde, A., Atzwanger, K., Butovskayad, M. et al. (2003) 'Perceived Parental Favouritism, Closeness to Kin, and the Rebel of the Family. The Effects of Birth Order and Sex', *Evolution and Human Behaviour*, Vol. 24, pp. 261-276.
- Rosenbloom, S. and Way, N. (2004) 'Experiences of Discrimination among African American, Asian American, and Latino Adolescents in an Urban High School', *Youth and Society*, Vol. 35, pp. 420-451.
- Rudman, L.A. and Glick, P. (1999) 'Feminised Management and Backlash toward Agentic Women. The Hidden Costs to Women of a Kinder, Gentler, Image of Middle Managers', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 77, pp. 1004-1010.
- Rulison, L. (3 September 2004) 'Kvaerner Sued in Foreigner-favouritism Case', World Wide Web: [<http://sanjose.bizjournals.com/philadelphia/stories/2004/09/06/story2.html>], accessed 23 September 2004.
- Ryan, J.P. and Schuerman, J.R. (2004) 'Matching Family Problems with Specific Family Preservation Services: A Study of Service Effectiveness', *Children and Youth Services Review*, Vol. 26, pp. 347-372.

- Sackett, P.R. and DuBois, C.L.Z. (1991) 'Rater-ratee Effects on Performance Evaluation: Challenging Meta-analytic Conclusions', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 76. pp. 873-877.
- Saleebey, D. (1990) 'Philosophical Disputes in Social Work: Social Justice Denied', *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, Vol. 17, pp. 29-40.
- Saloutos, T. (1964) *The Greeks in the United States*. Cambridge/MA, Harvard University Press.
- Simerini Newspaper (7 September 2004) 'Nicolaou Insists on His Allegations on Favouritism in the Police', World Wide Web: [<http://www.cyprusmedianet.com/EN/article/26608>], accessed 25 September 2004.
- Siskind, T.G. and Kearns, S.P. (1997). 'Gender Bias in the Evaluation of Female Faculty at The Citadel. A Qualitative Analysis', *Sex Roles*, Vol. 37, pp. 495-525.
- Slabbert, A. (2001) 'Cross-cultural Racism in South Africa-Dead or Alive?', *Social Behaviour and Personality*, Vol. 29, pp. 125-132.
- Smith-Winkelman, C. and Crosby, F.J. (1994) 'Affirmative Action: Setting the Record Straight', *Social Justice Research*, Vol. 7, pp. 309-328.
- Son Hing, S., Bobocel, R.D., Zanna, M.P. (2002) 'Meritocracy and Opposition to Affirmative Action: Making Concessions in the Face of Discrimination', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 83, pp. 493-509.
- Stevenage, S.V. and McKay, Y. (1999) 'Model Applicants: The Effect of Facial Appearance on Recruitment Decisions', *British Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 90, pp. 221-234.
- Sutter, M. and Kocher, M.G. (2002) 'Favouritism of Agents - The Case of Referees' Home Bias', World Wide Web: [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=333341], accessed 26 September 2004.
- Tamis-LeMonda, C.S., Wang, S., Koutsouvanou, E. and Albright, M. (2002) 'Childrearing Values in Greece, Taiwan, and the United States', *Parenting: Science and Practice*, Vol. 2, pp. 185-208.
- The World Fact Book (2004) 'Cyprus', World Wide Web: [<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/cy.html#Intro>], accessed 25 September 2004.
- US Department of State (2004) 'Background Note: Cyprus', World Wide Web: [<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5376.htm>], accessed 27 September 2004.
- US Library of Congress (2004) 'Cyprus: A Country Study', World Wide Web: [<http://countrystudies.us/cyprus/2.htm>], accessed 26 September 2004.
- Webster Dictionary (1913) 'Definition of Favouritism', World Wide Web: [<http://www.hyperdictionary.com/dictionary/favouritism>], accessed 18 September 2004.
- Weiner, B. (1985) 'An Attribution Theory of Achievement Motivation and Emotion', *Psychological Review*, Vol. 92, pp. 548-573.
- Wikipedia (2007) 'Political Corruption', World Wide Web: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_corruption], accessed 20 January 2007.
- Winefield, A., Tiggemann, M., Winefields, H. and Goldney, R. (1993) *Growing Up With Unemployment A Longitudinal Study of its Psychological Impact*. London, Routledge.

Wordreference.com (2003) 'Definition of Favouritism', World Wide Web: [<http://www.wordreference.com/definition/favouritism>], accessed 24 September 2004.

Yakubovich, V. and Kozina, I. (2000) 'The Changing Significance of Ties: An Exploration of the Hiring Channels in the Russian Transitional Labour Market', *International Sociology*, Vol. 15, pp. 479-500.

Appendix

The following questionnaire was used to elicit data:

1. To what extent do you believe there is favouritism in Cyprus today?
Not at All A Little Some A Lot or Extremely?

2. To what extent would you say you feel frustrated with the issue of favouritism in Cypriot society?
Not at All A Little Some A Lot or Extremely?

3. How fair do you assess Cypriot society to be?
Not at All A Little Some A Lot or Extremely?

4. How many persons do you know in Cyprus that have been appointed to a position, or received a promotion based on favouritism?

5. To what areas of life in Cyprus do you feel favouritism is used today?

6. a) Do you believe that the problem of favouritism in Cyprus can be prevented?
b) If so, what ideas do you have for containing this problem?

7. What is your age?

8. How many years of formal education have you completed so far?

* Rousfetti or Meso were the exact Greek words used for favouritism during the interview. If people didn't know the first word (which is a considered a little formal in nature), they were definitely aware of the second word (a very common Greek slang word).

Table 1: Respondents' Assessment of Favouritism in Cyprus (CY)

Favouritism/Social Injustice Indicators	Mean	SD	Range	N
Prevalence of Favouritism in CY	3.65 ^a	.56	2-4	150
Personal Frustration w/Favouritism	3.13 ^b	1.16	1-4	150
Degree of Unfairness of Greek-Cypriot Society	2.41 ^c	1.06	1-4	150
Number of Known Favouritism Cases in CY	43.34	53.96	2-200	150
Belief in Prevention of Favouritism	.29 ^d	.45	0-1	150

^a 0= favouritism is not at all present in CY; 4=favouritism is extremely present in CY society;

^b 0= feel not at all frustrated with favouritism; 4=feel extremely frustrated with favouritism;

^c 0=CY society is not at all unfair; 4=CY society is extremely unfair;

^d 0=favouritism in CY cannot be prevented; 1=favouritism is CY can be prevented.

Table 2: Regression Analyses

Favouritism Descriptors	B			Adjusted R ²
	Gender ^a	Age	Education	
Prevalence	-.09	-.24*	-.19*	.049*
Personal Frustration	-.12	-.02	-.96	.003
Social Unfairness	.22*	-.07	.02	.040*
Number of Known Cases	.08	.12	-.07	.011
Prevention	-.21*	-.05	-.13	.043*

^a 0=female; 1=male; *p<.05.

**Table 3: Content Analyses:
Locations of Favouritism and Prevention Methods**

Theme	N	(%)
<u>Locations of Favouritism*</u>		
Government/Public Sector	134	89%
Everywhere	86	57%
Semi-Public Sector	81	54%
Banks	39	26%
Private Sector	25	17%
Hospitals	16	11%
Code Enforcement/ Property Appraisal Office	13	7%
Education	8	5%
Military	7	5%
Police	5	3%
Legal/Criminal Justice System	4	3%
<u>Prevention Methods</u>		
Public Mentality Change	30	70%
Strict Enforcement of "Merit" Requirements/ Better Training of Administration	23	53%
Legislative Change	13	30%
Public Protest	2	5%

* Addresses areas such as hiring, promotion, privileged employment transfer, and service provision/access.

THE LEVANTINE LEGACY OF CYPRIOT CULINARY CULTURE

Mete Hatay

Abstract

Cyprus, being located in the heart of the Middle East, was always exposed to cultural and religious influences stemming from migrations, invasions and trade. This paper analyses the Arabic influences on Cypriot traditional culinary culture from the rise of Islam to the present day. The paper shows that many dishes today which are considered to be typically Turkish, Greek or Cypriot such as mulihiya, kolokasi, and moussakka, are actually of Semitic, Persian or Arabic origin. The paper also examines when and how these dishes were introduced on the island.

“Gastronomy is not irrelevant or peripheral to political representation ... commensality and dietary practices are ways of inscribing community and feature forms of communication between parties in communion. In other words, gastronomy’s importance lies, on the one hand, in its position as an investigating site of how community is produced in different historical and cultural spaces and, on the other, in the way it figures as a nonlogocentric form of communication” (Constantinou, 1996, p. 126).

Introduction

Following the opening of the border gates on 23 April 2003, the two communities from either side of the barbed wire had a chance for the first time in three decades to meet and mix. Shortly afterwards, some of my Turkish-Cypriot friends invited me and a Greek-Cypriot family to a dinner party at their house. The dishes to be served during the dinner were intended to be traditionally Cypriot. The “Cypriot” surprise chosen by our hosts for this special gathering was the pride of Turkish-Cypriot cuisine: mulihiya [a stew made with Jew’s mallow leaves], a dish which has been utilised by Turkish Cypriots as an “iconic” symbol of their Cypriotness against the insidious influences emanating from Turkey. However, immediately following the proud presentation of this dish my friends were to face a huge shock, because our Greek-Cypriot guests were not at all familiar with mulihiya. In fact, they did not even know that it existed in Cyprus. At this point, I intervened to explain to a surprised group that mulihiya is a typical Levantine or Arabic dish consumed in almost all the

Arabic countries. For reasons unclear to food historians, this particular dish is eaten solely by Turkish Cypriots and is unknown to the majority of Greek Cypriots (apart from those Greeks who settled on the island after living in Egypt). Fortunately, the rest of the food on the table could be regarded as non-Turkish or non-Greek dishes of Cyprus, such as mujendra [rice with lentils], kolokasi [a kind of taro], halloumi [a cheese], bulgur köftesi/koubes [stuffed cracked wheat balls] and herse/resi [mashed chicken and wheat]. These dishes were indeed commonly “Cypriot” and regularly consumed by both communities of the island.

Dishes like the above-mentioned are generally thought to be traditionally and exclusively Cypriot. Not surprisingly, they have become significant symbols in an “identity” construction process that has been evolving north of the green line for the past two decades. Throughout this process, in addition to the Turkish-Cypriot dialect – customs, traditions and dishes which are not found in Turkey have been adopted and presented as cultural elements that distinguish Turkish Cypriots from the Turks of Turkey. Such differences are usually exaggerated in order to serve as a boundary maintaining mechanism and as a manifestation of their Cypriotness. Indeed, this has been part of a movement invented and promoted in recent decades by some pro-unification, anti-nationalist groups on both sides of the island as a reaction to the wide-spread nationalisms (Turkish or Greek) within both Cypriot communities, and particularly to culinary nationalists who have been “nationalising” traditional dishes on the island by labelling them as “true Greek” or “true Turkish” (e.g. coffee, lokoumi/lokum [Turkish delight]). The “anti-nationalist” movement places more emphasis on the notion of Cyprus being a “common homeland” and on a common “Cypriot identity”. Incidentally, this movement has become more vigorous during the most recent efforts to unify the island and during the process of accession to the European Union (EU). Particularly in the case of Turkish Cypriots, the symbols connected with Cypriotness, not least the culinary ones have been celebrated as cultural elements differentiating them from what was regarded as belonging to the “orient”.

Of course, the fact that such dishes as those mentioned above do not exist in the respective “motherlands” definitely makes them relatively indigenous and Cypriot. For the origins of these common dishes, however, any researcher quickly discovers that the answers lie mainly outside of Cyprus and particularly far beyond EU borders in the wider Levant. Ironically what connects the people gastronomically as one community, from both sides of the barbed wire, are the many commonly consumed dishes of Arabic/Persian origin.

In order to understand the influences that play a role in forming or shaping the traditional culinary cultures and cooking habits of any country or region, it is prudent to delve into that region’s social history. In the case of Cyprus, history tells us that migrations, exiles, invasions, religions, trade activities, and economic hardship have

had a major impact on this island and clearly on its present culinary culture. Although cooking, as with any other human activity, is subject to change, it also represents continuity: it is transmitted from one generation to the next or from one geography to another. People may change their religion, become assimilated by another ethnic group, or be forced to emigrate but culinary habits tend to survive. Eventually a whole way of life may change, but the dishes on the dinner table usually either remain the same or survive with only minor changes. Claudia Roden explains that, “[D]ishes are important because they are a link with the past, a celebration of roots, a symbol of continuity” (Roden, 1997, p. 11). Hence by examining these dishes, we are often able to trace the cultural and geographical origin of the people who prepared them. On the other hand, interaction between different groups is also an important influence on culinary traditions. Neighbours learn from each other and integrate, perhaps with adaptations, such influences into their cooking habits.

In this paper, I try to go beyond the common beliefs in Cyprus as regards the nationalised origins of the island’s culinary habits, and investigate the links between Cypriot cooking and the diverse influential cuisines of the neighbouring region throughout history. In this context, I shall look particularly at the influence of medieval Arabic cooking, which undoubtedly constitutes the most important component in most traditional Cypriot cooking common to both communities. In doing so, I intend to illustrate a wider gastronomic togetherness or a communion which transcends the locally constructed political and imagined borders.

On the basis of when the Arabian community arrived on the island, the Arabic influences on Cypriot culinary culture can be studied within three main contents of time:

- Between Arabs and Byzantines
- Crusader and Latin periods
- From the Ottomans Onwards

Between Arabs and Byzantines

According to Clifford Wright, the so-called Dark ages after the fall of the Roman Empire were “dark” only on the European side of the Mediterranean. He also claims that, “the Islamic Mediterranean could hardly be called dark” (Wright, 1999, p. 6). During this period (632-1100 A.D.), the new Arab/Muslim civilisation demonstrated a vast ability for “receiving and absorbing anything new from other cultures and integrating this knowledge to expand the influence of its own civilisation” (ibid.). They introduced new methods and crops in agriculture. At the same time as the production augmented, famines were prevented and poverty was reduced. Many

new crops were discovered and/or diffused by the Arabs. The Arabs also established higher yielding crops and better varieties of older ones. From the new food crops pioneered the most important were sorghum, rice, hard wheat, sugarcane, various citrus fruits such as the sour orange, lemon and lime, bananas and plantains, palm, watermelon, spinach, artichoke, kolokasi, and aubergines (*ibid.*, p. 7).

While the above developments were taking place only seventy miles away from Cyprus, the first Muslim invaders appeared on the island in 632 under the leadership of Abu-Bekr, the father-in-law of the Prophet. The Arab incursions continued, sometimes in large waves, and often in smaller ripples, until the treaty between Abd-al-Malik and Justinian established joint Arab-Byzantine rule over Cyprus from 688-965 (Hill, 1972 [1940], pp. 285-286). The first Muslims to settle on the island comprised a garrison of 12,000 men who had been left behind by Abu 'l-Awar in 653-654 in "a city specially built for them" (*ibid.*, p. 285). Mosques were also erected during this period. Sir George Hill states that, "Cyprus from the seventh to the tenth century was for long periods at the mercy of the Moslem invaders, and could not be reckoned as definitely part of the Byzantine Empire" (*ibid.*, p. 259). On the other hand he also believes that in order to banish monks and nuns to Cyprus in 770, the Byzantines must have had a "sort of control" of the island (*ibid.*, p. 292). The tenth century traveller Muqaddasi, for instance, commented that Qubrus (Cyprus) "is full of populous cities, and offers the Muslims many advantages in their trade thither, by reason of the great quantities of merchandise, stuffs and goods, which are produced there. The island is in the power of whichever nation is overlord in these seas" (Cobham [translation], 1908, p. 5). R.J.H. Jenkins disputes this, however:

"All these statements and assumptions seem to me to be based on a false hypothesis, namely, that Cyprus was during these years the territorial possession of whoever was strong enough to occupy her. It appears, on the contrary, that the island was a demilitarized and neutral no-man's land, in which Christians and Moslem settlers lived side by side, under pledges of mutual toleration and protection; that the taxes were collected by the representatives of each empire, and allotted in equal shares to each" (Jenkins, 1953, p. 1007).

Whatever the case concerning ultimate political control, we can safely assume that there was considerable interaction between the Muslim Arabs and the inhabitants of the island of Cyprus (Christians, Muslims and Jews) during those years of Arab-Byzantine rule. There are unfortunately few available sources concerning what foodstuff dominated the culinary habits of the time. However, we know that, for example, mujendra, herse (resi), and kolokasi were among the most popular dishes in contemporary Arab cuisine and it seems likely that they were introduced to the

island either during this period or with the Christian Arab's migration to Cyprus, that according to Guita G. Hourani, took place in the eighth or tenth centuries (Hourani, 1998).

Moujendra (Greek or Turkish Cypriot) or mujaddara (Levantine Arabic) is a classic dish on the family tables of Cyprus, Syria, Egypt and Lebanon. Mujaddara literally means, "having smallpox" (Arberry, 1939, p. 45), which, as Clifford Wright suggests, probably refers to the impression of a pockmarked visage that lentils mixed with the white rice creates (Wright, 1999). Mujendra is mentioned and described by al-Baghdadi in his thirteenth century cookbook as a dish of the poor.

Herse (Cypriot Turkish) or resi (Cypriot Greek) are names derived from the Arabic verb *harasa* meaning to pound or to crush. This traditional Cypriot dish, which is served at weddings, was a very prominent dish around the whole of the Levant in the seventh century. During the reign of the Ummayyad caliph Mu'awiya (A.D. 661-680) a delegation of Arabian Jews visited him in Damascus. The first question he asked them was whether they knew how to prepare the delightful harissa, which he himself had enjoyed on a visit to Arabia (Wright, 1999, p. 100). On the other hand Claudia Roden portrays this dish as an ancestral soup representing the diet of the mountain Kurds (Roden, 1985, p. 181). She also claims that it is traditionally served on Assumption Day (*Id es Saidi*) in Syria and Lebanon. Anissa Helou adds that in the same regions harissa is treated as an alms dish and distributed from churchyards to the poor (Davidson, 1999, p. 365).

Cypriot Kolokasi or kolokas (*Colocasia esculenta*) is native to the "Old World". The cultivation of kolokasi spread westward, arriving in Egypt around 100 B.C. There it came to the notice of the Latin writer, Pliny, who called it "the arum of the Egyptians"; and allocated the Greek name kolokasi to it (Davidson, 1999, pp. 783-784). Even though this root crop was known in the West, it did not attract in western cuisine the same degree of prominence that it enjoyed within Egyptian, Cypriot, or Syrian culinary traditions. It is also notable that kolokasi does not exist in the cuisines of Greece and Turkey, the two "motherlands" of Cyprus. Although we have not been able to establish the exact arrival date of kolokasi to Cyprus, it was claimed by Geo Jeffrey that it was used in the wedding feast of Richard the Lion Heart in 1191:

"Preparation for a great feast had of course been made in such a way as to provide for the entertainment of the whole body of the Crusaders, and for a great many invited guests as well. A large number of ovens and kitchens had been constructed in the town, and all who could be pressed into service as cooks were busy with the supplies of food, which had been brought into Amathus from all parts of the island. Goatskins filled with wine were being unloaded off donkey[s] back[s], sheep and lambs were being slaughtered,

bread was being baked and huge quantities of wild turnips, (calocass) and other more or less wild roots ... seem to have constituted a great part of the medieval cuisine were being collected into heaps" (Jeffrey, 1973, pp. 107-108).

Crusaders and Latins

In 1191, the Crusader army of Richard Lion Heart landed in Cyprus marking the beginning of Latin rule. A year later the island was sold to Guy de Lusignan. The Crusaders were mostly mercenaries, off to fight a religious war against the infidels. They had no practical experience in farming and cooking and when they settled in the Holy Land and in Cyprus; they tended to adopt the local food habits rather than maintaining their own. Their journeys to the Holy Land "were military in nature, not alimentary". As a result, the Crusaders suffered a constant lack of food, and were preoccupied with raiding the surrounding lands for grain and vegetables (Wright, 1999, p. 21).

Upon the initiation of his reign over Cyprus in 1192 A.D., Guy de Lusignan announced that those cavaliers, warriors or members of the bourgeoisie who wished to have fiefs or land should come to him (Hourani, 1998). As a result, besides some adventurous noblemen from the west and European merchants, many communities belonging to the Eastern rite of the Christian church from nearby locations started to arrive en masse in Cyprus. Amongst them were Greek Orthodox Syrian Melkites, Maronites, Nestorians, Armenians and Copts who brought their culinary habits and cultures with them. The final Muslim conquest of the Holy Land in 1291 also caused a massive exodus of Latins and Syrians to Cyprus. The presence on Cyprus of a large contingent of families originating from the Holy Land was remarkable. As is clear from Genoese documentation, Syrians from all social levels came to the island (Balletto, 1995). Arabic became one of the everyday languages on Cyprus and many new Arabic and Syrian dishes found their way into medieval Cypriot cuisine (ibid.). Benjamin Arbel also claims that the influx of immigrants continued under the Venetian period (1490-1570) as well. He reveals that:

"The security and relative prosperity which developed on Cyprus under Venice transformed the island into a haven for Christian Syrians, who were hard pressed on various occasions under the Mamluks and Ottomans. The spectacular rise in Cyprus's population under Venetian rule can only be explained in the light of these waves of immigration" (Arbel, 1995, p. 178).

He also explains that regarding the neighbouring countries, "beside the tension and the occasional incidents", the sources which he studied disclose, "a much richer and nuanced relationship, characterised by strong economic interdependence and intensive human contacts, which were no doubt influenced by the confluence of the

long-lasting experience of Frankish Cyprus and the even longer tradition of the Venetian presence in the East” (Arbel, 1995, p. 178).

Making paluze [a pudding made from grape juice] (paludeh in Arabic and Persian), muhallebia [a pudding made with rice flour and milk], halloumi cheese (hellim in Cypriot Turkish), usage of rosewater, moussakka [a layered dish made with aubergine, potato and minced meat] etc. were common in those neighbouring countries where the refugees and immigrants came from. The usage of rosewater, a more primitive version of qada’if [pastry with nuts cooked in syrup], moussakka and muhallebia has been previously mentioned in Al-Baghdadi’s thirteenth century cook-book (Arberry, 1939). The Arabic names of these dishes still survive with only minor changes in the Cypriot dialects.

Halloumi most likely came to Cyprus with the Egyptian Copts, who settled in Cyprus in the twelfth century. The name Halloumi, hellim (in Turkish) or hallum (in Arabic) is one of the few words from ancient Egypt to have survived in Coptic. It was written ialom; the modern pronunciation is hallum (Davidson, 1999, p. 367). The origin of moussakka appears to be unknown. Real Tannahill proposes that the ancestor of moussakka can be found in this recipe for Maghmüma (which in Arabic means covered) or Muqatta’a (which in Arabic means chopped up) from the Baghdad cookery book (Tannahill, 1973, p. 147):

“Cut fat meat small. Slice the tail thin and chop up small. Take onions and egg-plant, peel, half-boil, and also cut up small: these may, however, be peeled and cut up into the meat-pot, and not to be boiled separately. Make a layer of the tail at the bottom of the pan, then put on top of it a layer of meat: drop in fine-ground seasonings, dry coriander, cumin, caraway, pepper, cinnamon, ginger, and salt. On top of the meat put a layer of egg-plant and onion: repeat, until only about four or five fingers space remains in the pot. Sprinkle over each layer the ground seasonings as required. Mix best vinegar with a little water and [a] trifle of saffron, and add to the pan so as to lie to a depth of two or three fingers on top of the meat and other ingredients. Leave to settle over the fire: then remove” (Arberry, 1939, pp. 39-40).

The ancestor of kadeyif (qada’if) is also identified in the following thirteenth century recipe by Al-Baghdadi:

“This is of various kinds. Stuffed qada’if are baked into long shapes, stuffed with almonds and fine-ground sugar, rolled round, and laid out: then sesame-oil, syrup rosewater, and fine-ground pistachios [are] thrown on. Fried qada’if are baked into loaves, stuffed with almonds and fine-ground sugar kneaded with rose-water, rolled, and fried in sesame-oil [in] a dish and immersed in sesame-oil, then syrup is added, rosewater, and fine ground pistachios” (Arberry, 1939, p. 213).

In addition to the new spices, vegetables and dishes that the Christian Arab settlers and Latins from the crusader kingdoms in the Middle East brought to Cyprus, they also introduced sugarcane cultivation. From the Holy Land the most important food product transported to the West was sugar, which the Crusaders found being cultivated already when they occupied these territories. They learned how to produce it from the locals and continued its cultivation, with the main centre of the industry housed in Tyre in Lebanon. After the fall of Tyre and Acre, cultivation was relocated to Cyprus (Wright, 1999, pp. 20-22). Sugar soon became synonymous with prosperity on the island; Cyprus exported several thousand “light weight quintals (50 kilos) of sugar in the fifteenth century”. Maguelonne Toussaint-Samat notes that, “the last queen of Cyprus, beautiful Catherine, wife of the last Lusignan king, was also an heiress of the patrician Cornaro family of Venice; the Cornaros were the sugar kings of their time, and much richer than any king who ruled merely by divine right” (Toussaint-Samat, 1992, pp. 552-555).

From the Ottomans Onwards

After the conquest in 1571 the Ottomans established themselves on the island, and started to practice their multiethnic culinary habits. The Arabic influences on Cypriot culinary culture during the Ottoman period can be divided into two categories: direct influences and indirect influences.

Direct Influences:

According to Turkish Cypriot historian Ahmet Gazioğlu, Cyprus had always been the centre of the trade route between East and West. Its natural resources and agricultural products such as corn, oil, honey, silk, wool, barley, wheat, cotton, and salt were a great attraction for merchants trading with the Middle East (Gazioğlu, 1990). Merchants from Cyprus, Christians as well as Muslims, travelled regularly in Anatolia, to Aleppo and to Egypt. According to Ronald Jennings, disputes over trade were settled at the court in Nicosia (Jennings, 1993, p. 334). As Ottoman subjects, the people of Cyprus thus continued their interaction with those who were now their Ottoman neighbours, the Arabs of the Middle East. In addition to trade, pilgrimages, of both Muslims and Christians, and official emissaries helped to maintain the links between Cyprus and the Arab countries. Among the Arabic culinary influences from this time we have shammali [baked semolina cake with syrup], shamishi [fried pastry with semolina filling], bumar [sausage stuffed with minced meat and rice], bulgur köftesi (koubes), houmous [chick pea paste mixed with tahini], and mulihiya.

After the conquest, the Ottoman authorities transported a lot of people from Anatolia for re-settlement in Cyprus. In addition, two hundred Muslim families of various professions and occupations arrived from Aleppo in Syria (Gazioğlu, 1990, p. 78). The exact arrival date of Syrian sweets such as shammali and shamishi to

Cyprus is uncertain but it is possible that the sweets came to Cyprus with these families. Sham is the Arabic name for Syria and Damascus. On the other hand, these two sweet dishes are commercially produced and are not particular to home cooking. They might, therefore, have arrived at a later date, brought by professional Syrian pastry makers who regularly visited and sometimes settled on the island during the latter part of the nineteenth century, when transport was much improved.

For a “true” Cypriot dish, *bumbar*, has too many sisters and brothers in Arabic countries. For example, the Iraqi *mumbar* is stuffed intestine with minced meat, chopped liver and rice, flavoured with powdered cloves, cardamom, cinnamon and peppers (Roden, 1997, pp. 364-365). Syrian Jews stuffed intestine castings with a minced shoulder of lamb and rice filling, flavoured with allspice and cinnamon (ibid.) A well known food writer, Alan Davidson, has the following to say about bulgur *köftesi* or (*koubes* in Cypriot Greek), the honour of the contemporary Cypriot Cuisine, also known as *kibbeh* in the Levant:

“Kibbeh a versatile paste of grain, onions, and meat that forms the basis of many dishes in Lebanon and Syria, Egypt (*kobebia*), Israel (*cubbeh*), Iraq and extreme SW Iran (*kubba*), the Persian Gulf (*chabab*), and southern Turkey (*bulgur köftesi*). It is known among the western Armenians as *kuefta*” (Davidson, 1999, p. 431).

Kibbeh is the most characteristic dish of the eastern Arab world, but there is no evidence of it in medieval cookery writings. The Iraqi community claim *kubba* was invented in Mosul, and this may be the case. *Uruq* is another Iraqi speciality which is made in a similar fashion by combining roughly equal quantities of grain, meat and onion mixture, but in the latter case bread dough is used rather than bulgur (Davidson, 1999, p. 431).

Houmous, meaning chickpeas in Arabic, is the most famous dish of the Middle East. In the Arab world, every family has its own *houmous* recipe. In Cyprus it is not very common on the family tables and is mostly used as *meze* in the restaurants or taverns. This indicates that its history in Cyprus is not very old. Some Greek Cypriots claim that *houmous* came to Cyprus almost 150 years ago (around the 1840s) when many Greek Cypriots, who had sought safety in Lebanon from the persecution of Küçük Mehmet in 1821 (Ottoman governor of the island in 1820s), returned to Cyprus (Davies, 1990, p. 15).

Mulhiya or *melokhiya* is one of Egypt’s national dishes with its roots anchored in ancient Egypt. It is portrayed in Pharaonic tomb paintings and described in Coptic legends. “In his present lies the past,” Claudia Roden writes, and continues “*fellah* gives himself entirely to the soil, in return, the soil yields to him his food; *melokhiya*” (Roden, 1985, pp. 161-162). *Mulhiya* is a dark green leaf (*corchorus olitorius* or

Jew's mallow in English), which can be cooked fresh or dried and stored for the winter. It is much appreciated by the Turkish Cypriots, especially in the villages and towns of the Mesaoria plain, but for some reason it is not popular among the Greek-Cypriot community.

Even though mulihiya has a very old history in the neighbouring countries, its presence in Cyprus is a recent phenomenon. Some, for example Mahmut İslamoğlu, have argued that it arrived on the island in the early twentieth century with the visits or return to the island of women who had been married off to Arabs (İslamoğlu, 1981). However, conversations with elderly Cypriots lead me to believe that the introduction of mulihiya took place at an earlier date. One possibility is that mulihiya was introduced at the time when contacts between Cyprus and the Arabs were at their most intense; for instance after 1821 when due to the perceived threat to their rule in Cyprus the Ottomans brought four thousand soldiers from Syria (mostly Arabs and Levantines), to garrison the island. We know that a large number of the Egyptian soldiers of Mehmet Ali Pasha might also have brought this military food to the island (which may explain why it was not adopted by the Greek Cypriots). We know too that many Egyptians migrated to Cyprus after the British took control of the island in 1878. As explained in the introduction, mulihiya has recently acquired a symbolic and patriotic importance for Turkish Cypriots in order to authenticate their distinctiveness from mainland Turks. Ironically, Egyptians also use mulihiya as a symbol to manifest their national, popular taste as opposed to the more 'snobbish' taste of the old regime (Roden, 1985, pp. 161-162).

Indirect influences:

In addition to the Arabic dishes which were introduced in pre-Ottoman times as a result of direct contacts between Cyprus and the Arab world, Arabic influences continued to have an effect on cuisine during the Ottoman period. It was itself, a product of early Persian-Arab synthesis blended with Turkish steppe and local Anatolian cuisines. As Wright reminds us:

“Culinary influence in the Mediterranean is a two way street, complicated by transferences that occurred in different historical epochs. For example, it is not the whole story to say that the Spanish influence the cooking of Naples, that the Turks influenced Arab cooking, or the Greek is indebted to the Turks. One must also keep in mind that in these cases, respectively, Spanish cuisine was mostly Arab-influenced during the 700-year era of Islamic Spain, that Arab dynasties in Baghdad and Damascus of the early Islamic period influenced Turkish cooking hundreds of years before the Ottoman Turks began conquering the Arab world” (Wright, 1999, pp. 34-35).

Many famous sweets such as helva, baklava [sticky and sweet pastry layered with nuts and syrup], lokummi or lokma [little donuts], sahlep [hot milk drink made with sahlep powder and served with ground cinnamon or ginger] and dishes like pilavs

and kebabs were brought to Cyprus by the Ottomans. Some of these dishes clearly have Arabic or Persian roots. For example köfte or kofta is derived from the Persian *koofteh*, meaning pounded meat. According to Alan Davidson, the first evidence of Persian meatballs is found in early Arabic cookery books (Davidson, 1999, p. 434).

The word kebab has an interesting history as well. The Arabic word kebab meant fried meat in the Middle Ages. According to a fourteenth century dictionary, *Lisdan al-Arab*, *kabab*, is a dish of fried pieces of meat, usually finished with some liquid in the cooking (*ibid.*, p. 429).

Helva or *halva* is a word derived from the Arabic root *hulw*, sweet. In seventh century Arabia, the word meant a paste of dates kneaded with milk. By the ninth century, possibly by assimilating the ancient Persian sweetmeat *afroshag*, it had acquired the meaning of wheat flour or semolina, cooked by frying or toasting and worked into a more or less stiff paste with a sweetening agent such as sugar syrup, date syrup, or honey, by stirring the mass together over a gentle heat. Usually flavouring was added such as nuts, rosewater, or pureed cooked carrots. The finished sweetmeat could be cut into bars or moulded into fanciful shapes (Davidson, 1999, p. 367).

Another important Arabic/Semitic culinary tradition that was brought to the island by the Ottomans was coffee. Originating in Abyssinia, it had appeared in Mecca by 1511, and was introduced to Istanbul in 1517 from the Yemen after the Ottoman conquest of Egypt and Hicaz (Wright, 1999, p. 330). After the introduction of coffee to Istanbul, it became very popular among the common people of the Empire. Coffee houses not only spread all over Istanbul but also in provinces such as Cyprus, often in the possession of pious foundations (*vakif*) (Jennings, 1993, pp. 331-332). According to Jennings, the earlier references to coffee in the Nicosia sicils (court documents) concern trade in coffee; first “between Mehmed bn Ahmed and Hüseyin bn Abdullah, and then, for 10 *vakiye* [a measure] coffee, between Hasan and Usta Piri of (?) [sic] village” in the year 1610 (Jennings, 1993). The existence of several coffee houses called *kahvehane* in Turkish is also mentioned in the *vakif* documents concerning the establishment of pious foundations:

“A coffee house in the walled town of Magosa [Famagusta] was among property dedicated as *vak[i]f* by Ca’fer Pasha in 1601 ... Coffee houses were among the property in Lefkosha [Nicosia] made *vak[i]f* by that same Ca’fer Pasha ... A coffee house of the *vak[i]f* of Suleyman Beg rented for four *akce/day* or 120 *akce/month*, the revenues going to the Mevlevi Tekke” (Jennings, 1993, pp. 331-332).

The demand for coffee and coffee houses had increased considerably by the eighteenth century, and for Cypriots, it became an inescapable ingredient of daily life.

Apart from the visit or return of the Muslim Turkish women who had been married off to men from neighbouring Arab countries (İslamoğlu, 1981) the Arabic influences during the British period were few. Some of the women came back to settle on the island with their husbands who opened pastry shops or houmous soup kitchens. In these shops, they served all sorts of Arabic and Turkish sweets (keshkül [a milky pudding], ashure [a pudding made with wheat, forty different pulses, dried fruits and nuts], muhallebia, shammali, shamishi). In the soup kitchens, houmous salad or houmous soup were offered. The most famous pastry shop in Nicosia during the British period was called “Bedevi Pastahanesi”, meaning Bedouian pastry shop. Another Arabic dish of this time was felafel [fried minced vegetable balls], cooked and sold only on religious Muslim festivals and bayrams by some Turkish Cypriots who are, in fact, the descendants of Palestinian refugees who had escaped from the war in their country of origin following 1947.

After 1974, there was a considerable influx of people from Turkey to the northern part of the island. These immigrants and settlers, especially those from the south-eastern part of Turkey, brought additional Arabic/Persian specialities to the island: Dishes that are now among the most popular in restaurants, such as lahmacun, the “Turkish pizza”, or as it is called in its country of origin, Syria, lahm bi ajeen. It is important to note, however, that lahmacun was already popular among the Armenian community of Cyprus even before the division.

Conclusion

A somewhat genealogical attempt has been made in this paper to reveal some of the principal historical events that might be considered to have had an influence on the culinary culture of Cypriots. Contrary to commonly held beliefs, many of the dishes consumed by Cypriots either originate in entirety from the cuisines of territories in the vicinity of Cyprus, or else were heavily influenced by the medieval Arabic/Persian cuisine. This does not mean, however, that Cypriot cuisine possesses no authentic dishes of its own. From tsamarella (dried mutton or goat meat) to sheftalia (a kind of sausage), and from the wild asparagus to the herbs indigenous to Cyprus, there are several such examples still found to be employed in Cypriot cuisine. There are also many undeniable similarities between Cyprus’ cuisine and those that predominate in both Turkey and Greece. Unfortunately, though, it lies beyond the scope of this study to cover all such ties. I conclude, therefore, by proffering another anecdote regarding the same families mentioned at the outset who had met after the opening of the borders.

Following the referenda held in April 2004 to unify both sides of the island there was a marked spike in the polarisation between the two main communities of Cyprus. Owing to the clear refusal of the Greek-Cypriot population to accept the UN-proposed unification plan, there ensued a powerful sense of bitterness among

those Turkish Cypriots who had said “Yes” to the same plan. In order to “re-break” the ice, the same Turkish-Cypriot friends and I were invited to dinner by the same Greek-Cypriot family with whom we had dined a few months earlier. This time the rendezvous was to the south of the Green-line. When our Greek-Cypriot friends asked us what kind of restaurant we would like to go to for this reconciliatory dinner, my suggestion was Lebanese. Neither family was acquainted with Lebanese food but they accepted my proposal and we booked a table at a leading Lebanese restaurant in Nicosia. During the dinner our main topic was, of course, the outcome of the referenda and Cyprus’ accession to the EU, the Republic of Cyprus having acceded the very same day, albeit without reaching a settlement and leaving the northern part of the island outside the EU. Following the main meal and the sweets we ordered our coffees (not Turkish or Greek, but Arabic coffee). While we sipped from our cups, the restaurant owner switched on the radio to tune-in to a live broadcast from Brussels in which the president of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Papadopoulos, was delivering a speech concerning the accession of Cyprus. The Turkish-Cypriot family was still a little saddened by the fact that the Turkish Cypriots were in practice excluded from this momentous event, so I moved to change the subject and asked my Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot friends for their impressions of the Lebanese food they had just consumed. After a brief pause the Turkish-Cypriot lady, with a contented gleam in her eyes, said: “The food was very good, but it was especially interesting that most of the dishes were similar to our Cypriot dishes, just more spicy and tasty”. Meanwhile the voice on the radio grew louder, as Mr. Papadopoulos repeated his thanks to all the EU member states, “for offering Cyprus the possibility to accede where it belongs historically, geographically, politically and culturally”.

Bibliography

- Arbel, B. (1995) ‘Venetian Cyprus and the Muslim Levant, 1473-1570’ in Coureas, N. and Riley Smith, J. (eds.), *Cyprus and the Crusades*. Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre.
- Arberry, A.J. (transl.) (1939) ‘A Baghdad Cookery Book’, *Islamic Culture*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 21-47, 189-214.
- Balletto, L. (1995) ‘Ethnic groups, Cross-Social and Cross-Cultural Contacts on 15th Century Cyprus’, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, Vol. 1-2, pp. 35-48.
- Cobham, C.D. (transl.) (1908). *Excerpta Cypria*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Constantinou, C.M. (1996) ‘On the Way to Diplomacy’, *Borderlines*, Vol. 7. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Davidson, A. (1999) *The Oxford Companion to Food*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Davies, G. (1990) *The Taste of Cyprus*. London, Interworld.

- Gazioğlu, A.C. (1990) *The Turks in Cyprus*. London, K. Rüstem and Brother.
- Hill, Sir G. (1972 [1940]) *History of Cyprus, Volume I*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hourani, G.G. (1998) 'A Reading in the History of the Maronites of Cyprus', *Journal of Maronite Studies*, Vol. 2, pp. 1-12.
- İslamoğlu, M. (1981) *Türk Mutfağı Sempozyumu Bildirileri*. Ankara, Ankara University.
- Jeffrey, G. (1973) *Cyprus under an English King in 12th Century*. London, Zeno.
- Jenkins, R.J.H. (1953) 'Cyprus Between Byzantium and Islam, A.D. 688-965' in Mylonas, G.E. and Raymond, D. (eds.), *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson on His Seventieth Birthday, Volume II*. Saint Louis, Washington University, pp. 1006-1014.
- Jennings, R.C. (1993) *Christians and Muslims in Ottoman Cyprus and the Mediterranean World, 1571-1640*. New York, New York University Press.
- Roden, C. (1985) *A New Book of the Middle Eastern Food*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- — —. (1997) *The Book of Jewish Food*. London, Viking.
- Tannahill, R. (1973) *Food in History*. London, Penguin.
- Toussaint-Samat, M. (1992) *A History of Food*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Wright, C. (1999) *A Mediterranean Feast*. New York, WMAC.

Commentary Article

VOLUME 18
NUMBER 2



8th July 2006: The Unappreciated Breakthrough

Alexandros Lordos

When Mr. Ibrahim Gambari, Under-Secretary General of the United Nations for political affairs, visited Cyprus last July, most observers implicitly assumed it would lead to nothing. Most likely, it was assumed, Mr. Gambari would simply return to New York with yet another 'Report to the Security Council regarding Cyprus', 'highlighting once more the absence of progress and exhorting the parties to engage in dialogue.' At that time, it was actually thought unlikely that the two leaders would even get to meet in a three-way conference with Mr. Gambari. The prospect that the two leaders would not just meet, but actually utilise such a meeting in order to pave the way for Comprehensive Settlement negotiations, sounded outlandish at best.

On the 8th July, following a meeting of the two leaders with Mr. Gambari at the residence of Michael Moller, it became apparent that all these assumptions and predictions were wrong. For the first time in twenty-nine years, the leaders of the two Cypriot communities shook hands and actually agreed on a set of principles regarding a number of vital issues. Nevertheless, despite this surprising development, the 'breakthrough' did not cause much excitement, neither among the diplomatic nor among the academic and journalistic communities. The dominant pessimism of the times, it would seem, forced its own gloomy narrative on this political development as well. "It's just a political trick", commentators argued, "all sides needed to buy time and appear as if they are making progress, but deep down their intentions are not sincere". The issue was left at that, and the various 'Cyprus experts' closed shop and left for their summer holidays. Outside the narrow circle of individuals and institutions which have been actively involved in putting this agreement to practice, the whole issue was soon dismissed, 'archived' and forgotten.

And for all that, if one examines the content of the agreement without allowing 'Cyprus Problem Fatigue' to influence his or her judgement, the significance of the agreement is not difficult to discern. At one level, the specific terms of the agreement were a way to break the post-Annan Plan deadlock by re-affirming and re-agreeing the fundamental framework for bicomunal negotiations. On a deeper level, the terms of the agreement have important implications as to the methodology through which a Comprehensive Settlement will henceforth be pursued. Neither of these aspects of the agreement were chance developments. In fact, the specific

terms of the agreement reflect all the painful experiences which the UN and the two sides learned from, through the whole process leading up to the Annan Plan, the ill-fated referendums of April 2004, and the aftermath of that failure.

The first issue which the 8th July agreement deals with is the matter of what type of solution the two sides are seeking. Specifically, the agreement affirms that the two sides are seeking a solution according to the framework of “a bizonal bicomunal federation, with political equality, in accordance with relevant security council resolutions”. Cynics are arguing that this statement adds nothing new; that this framework was already agreed upon in the high level agreements of 1977 and 1979; and furthermore, that this statement is actually a setback insofar as it “ignores all the progress that was made in recent years, in making the transition from basic principles long ago agreed to a comprehensive peace plan in the form and shape of the Annan Plan”. And yet; the true significance of this statement cannot be understood without reference to the very negative political climate which both sides found themselves in after the failure of the April 2004 referendum.

Among the Greek Cypriots, during the immediate post-referendum period, any type of reference to the Annan Plan would cause the majority of politicians and public opinion to cringe. While segments of the international community and the Turkish-Cypriot side may have continued referring to the Annan Plan in good faith – insofar as they saw it as a good example of what a federal solution would ‘look like’ in the case of Cyprus – the Greek Cypriots could not bring themselves to separate the essence of federalism from the various weak aspects which in their evaluation existed in the specific plan. Therefore, the mere suggestion that the Annan Plan should form the basis of a new round of negotiations would be met with defensiveness, not surprisingly, given that many Greek Cypriots saw the Annan Plan as a gestalt – an integrated whole – with various unacceptable elements inextricably blended in as opposed to seeing it as a basic template for a future federal settlement which could be worked upon and improved.

In an equally problematic manner, Turkish Cypriots perceived the Greek-Cypriot rejection of the Annan Plan as a generic rejection of federalism, and specifically as a rejection of the fundamental principle of political equality. On the whole, Turkish Cypriots either did not understand or did not believe Greek-Cypriot explanations of their own ‘No’ vote. It was felt that Greek-Cypriot expressed concerns over security, or over functionality, or over the application of human rights, were ‘mere excuses’ which the Greek-Cypriot leadership was using in order to ‘reject the Annan Plan in a face saving manner’, while pursuing a hidden agenda of shifting the basis of negotiations away from federalism and towards what many at the time called a ‘European’ solution in which Turkish Cypriots ‘would become a minority within a Greek-Cypriot-dominated unitary state.’

In combination, the underlying attitudes of the two communities worked together to form a powerful vicious circle, wherein the mere mention of the Annan Plan would throw Greek Cypriots into a state of paranoid suspicion, eliciting from them a vociferous rejection, which in turn would throw Turkish Cypriots into a state of bitter resentment of “Greek-Cypriot intransigence”. Clearly, the label of the Annan Plan, with all the complex symbolism it had accreted in previous years, had unfortunately become a burdensome liability which was standing in the way of a comprehensive settlement; the solution being pursued required a new name, which both sides could agree to, and which would form the basis of a common language within which a new round of negotiations would take place. This new name, holding the promise of a new common language, has been in existence since the 8th July last year. Both sides have now committed themselves that what they are seeking is “a bizonal bicomunal federation, with political equality, in accordance with relevant security council resolutions”; a statement which contains important concessions from both sides, while at the same time securing their fundamental and valid concerns.

For Greek Cypriots, the agreed statement is a concession insofar as it blocks out any future possibility of abandoning federalism and political equality in favour of a unitary and ‘European’ solution based on simple majority rule. At the same time, the agreed statement secures Greek-Cypriot interests insofar as it allows for flexibility in negotiating a federal solution, without having the specific template of the Annan Plan impose itself as the basis of a, limited in scope, future give-and-take. Similarly, for Turkish Cypriots the statement is a concession insofar as they are letting go of the Annan Plan, which for them represented an acceptable and balanced compromise, agreeing instead to pursue a fresh round of negotiations with an open agenda and potentially unpredictable results. And yet, the agreed statement does include important safeguards meant to re-assure the Turkish Cypriots that negotiations will not veer towards an unacceptable direction: Not only is bizonality and bicomunality re-affirmed, but furthermore the principle of political equality is confirmed to a greater extent than even in the high level agreements of 1977 and 1979.

The agreed statement, in other words, can best be interpreted as the result of a very prudent and careful analysis on behalf of the UN of the post-referendum situation in Cyprus. It should also be interpreted as an indicator of goodwill on behalf of the leaderships of the two communities, both of whom illustrated sufficient qualities of statesmanship in order to let go of their entrenched positions – for or against the Annan Plan – and agree to a new common position which holds promise of bringing the negotiations back on track.

Even so, the statement regarding the type of settlement being pursued was merely an introductory aspect of the 8th July agreement, meant to unravel the

confusion and mutual suspicion which came to dominate Cypriot politics in the aftermath of the April 2004 referendums. The greatest innovation inherent in the 8th July agreement was in fact not the statement concerning the type of settlement being pursued, important though it was, but rather the agreement concerning the method and process through which comprehensive settlement negotiations would henceforth take place. On this matter, the 8th July agreement brought to the forefront a totally new negotiating philosophy, one never before attempted in the case of Cyprus.

The first process-related innovation inherent in the 8th July agreement has to do with the agenda of bicomunal discussions. Historically, efforts of the UN to assist Cypriots have tended to oscillate between two extreme positions. Either the whole focus would be on 'agreeing the terms of a Comprehensive Settlement', as was the case during the development of the Ghali Set of Ideas and in the development of the Annan Plan, or in contrast the focus would totally shift towards confidence building measures (CBMs) and matters of day-to-day co-operation between the two communities – as was the case during the development of the 1994 'package of CBMs'. And yet, both extremes have in the past proven to be problematic. Whenever Comprehensive Settlement negotiations have been exclusively pursued – ostensibly to 'cut through the chase by focusing on the essentials' – the result has been high profile failure due to the fundamental mistrust of the two sides. And similarly, whenever the focus turned to CBMs – in order to 'improve the climate so that Comprehensive Settlement negotiations could take place in the future' – the process would eventually be regretted as a 'waste of valuable time which could have been more profitably used', while the proposed CBMs themselves would tend to lose their steam due to the lack of a clear end-game on which they could be grafted.

The 8th July agreement, for the first time, suggests that CBMs and Comprehensive Settlement negotiations could and should take place in tandem. In fact, the agreed process forms an organic whole, wherein each aspect of the negotiations would support the other and lend it credibility. Specifically, agreement on CBMs and issues of day-to-day co-operation would help reduce some of the suspicions which typically cause the two sides to up their ante during Comprehensive Settlement negotiations. At the same time, the fact that discussions of CBMs will be taking place within an overall climate of Comprehensive Settlement negotiations will reduce fears that 'agreeing on CBMs will ultimately lead to an unacceptable end-game'. Any success in one of the two spheres may have a knock-on effect onto the other sphere, leading to multiple gains perhaps in a short period of time.

The specific agenda of the various working groups and technical committees that are being proposed is certainly ambitious in scope. Within the category of

‘substantive issues’, such issues will be brought forward as Security, Property Rights, Territorial Issues, Governance, EU Matters, Citizenship and Immigration, and the future Economy of a Federal Cyprus. Within the category of ‘daily issues’, the matters which will be discussed include co-operation on matters of Crime, Health Issues, Water and Energy Management, Trade and Economic Co-operation between the two communities, Protection of Cultural Heritage, Road Safety, and the Environment. In other words, the implementation of the 8th July agreement will involve both ‘future-talk’, in which the vision of a united Cyprus will be conceived, but also ‘present-talk’, through which the two communities can experience a sense of pragmatic and tangible progress while also learning first-hand the potential value of power sharing and bicomunal co-operation.

Another important change in philosophy that has become evident through the 8th July agreement, involves the locus of control during the process of bicomunal negotiations. In prior rounds of negotiations – most notably in the process leading up to the Annan Plan – the substance of the Cyprus Issue was essentially discussed between the two leaders only, with the UN acting as arbitrator and deadlock-breaker whenever the two leaders found it difficult to agree on a certain issue. While committee work was also involved in earlier efforts, this was mostly limited to secondary technical issues, which were thought to be comparatively ‘non-political’ and therefore did not directly impact on the bargain being sought between the leaders of the two communities. This time, however, and in accordance with the 8th July agreement, the ‘hot issues’ themselves will be discussed in expert bicomunal working groups as well. Without negating the level of leadership, the expert working groups will make a first attempt to bridge the gap on substance between the two communities. Only if they fail to resolve the issues will these be brought up to the level of the leaders. Similarly, if the two leaders fail to resolve a certain issue which they themselves are negotiating, this will neither be the end of the road nor will it require ‘UN deadlock-breaking’, since the issue can be taken back to the working groups in order for them to generate new alternatives for the two leaders to consider.

This new emphasis on committee work is once again a development based on prior experiences: During the Annan Plan process, the only aspect of bicomunal negotiations which was successful was the work taking place in the various technical committees. Within a matter of months, the Annan Plan committees managed to agree on thousands of pages of federal legislation. During this same period, the political process in which the two leaders were the primary actors produced nothing but a persistent deadlock. With this in mind, it is no surprise that the UN decided to upgrade the role of working groups in the upcoming round of negotiations, so that for the first time ever they will be deeply involved with the essence of the problem, no less so than the two leaders. Many are pointing out that

this process is not really a UN innovation, insofar as it represents the process by which the European Union reaches its decisions: At first, issues are dealt with on a level of permanent representatives, then if needed the issues are taken up to the level of foreign ministers, and then, only if necessary, matters are discussed and resolved by the leaders themselves. Through this simple yet powerful method the European Union manages to operate with the agreement and consent of twenty-seven different parties. By comparison, in the case of Cyprus – where it is only two communities that are asked to come in agreement – we can expect that a similar process of multi-layered negotiations will produce surprisingly rapid results.

Having analysed the positive elements of the 8th July agreement, some qualifications and reservations are in order.

Firstly, it is important that the technical committees and working groups be allowed to freely explore the issues and brainstorm alternative solutions. While regular coordination between the committee members and their respective leaderships is both essential and desirable, at the same time it is important that the committee members should not be burdened down by excessively strict instructions as to what should or should not be said; such that would destroy group dynamics and quench creativity. After all, the responsibility for final decisions belongs with the two leaders, who are the ultimate owners of the process; it is they who stand to gain if the committees and working groups produce original and yet workable ideas to deal with issues that have been deadlocked for a number of years.

Secondly, an effective method needs to be devised whereby the wider public will be consulted over the proposed solutions, before final decisions are made. This need is particularly urgent for those issues which are experienced as personally relevant by significant proportions of the population, such as the Property Issue, Security, and the Economic Conditions that would prevail after a Comprehensive Settlement. Ignoring the public – Greek Cypriot or Turkish Cypriot – at this preparatory stage, is tantamount to asking for trouble further down the road, when the public will be asked to vote over any new plan which might arise out of this process.

As of January 2007, six months after the 8th July agreement, the technical committees and working groups had not yet been convened. This in itself is a disturbing fact, which suggests that maybe it is not just outside observers who fail to realise the true potential of this process, but also, perhaps, some of the main actors as well. It is a known fact that fear tends to be a more powerful determinant of human behaviour than hope. The Turkish-Cypriot side tends to fear that “the process will just drag on, becoming an academic talking shop, and at the same time Greek Cypriots will be pursuing a different agenda at the EU level”. The Greek-

Cypriot side fears that “Turkish Cypriots will only be interested in the ‘daily issues’ aspect of the agreement while blocking any progress on substantive issues, thus abusing the process to bring about a normalisation of relations between two separate states, as opposed to a Comprehensive Settlement” – and both sides tend to interpret the fearful behaviour of the other as further evidence of ill-will and an aggressive stance, thus enhancing their own fear-induced behaviour.

In the final analysis, the only way to put these fears to rest – either by confirming their validity and declaring a disappointing deadlock or by denying them as fantasies and moving forward towards a settlement – is to actually implement the process and see first-hand how the other side manages its presence at the negotiating table. In the same manner that the signing of the 8th July agreement was received by many as an unexpected development and an intriguing surprise, so the actual implementation of the agreement, along with the very real progress which it might lead to, may prove to be an equally surprising development.

Book Reviews

VOLUME 18
NUMBER 2



The British and the Hellenes: Struggles for Mastery in the Eastern Mediterranean 1850-1960

**Robert Holland and Diana Markides
Oxford University Press, (London, 2006) 266 pp.
ISBN O 19 924996 2**

Students of the Cyprus Problem as it developed in the 1950s must have had the feeling that it had all happened before, what with the Ionian Problem, the Cretan Problem, the Dodecanese Problem. When in 1829 the independence of Greece had been grudgingly acknowledged and the Powers of the so-called Concert of Europe subsequently fixed the niggardly Volos-Arta line as the full extent of the new Kingdom, they had in truth inserted a cause of permanent instability into the Mediterranean world. Admittedly Volos-Arta was an advance on the initial attempt to confine the new state to the Peloponnese, with the insufferable consequence of a Greece which excluded Athens, but to the Greeks it represented a starting point from which to gather in the wide fragments of land where the Greek language was spoken and Greek culture was to be found.

On this notion of enosis (union with Greece) being explained to him by Field-Marshal Papagos in relation to Cyprus in 1953, Sir Anthony Eden rather fatuously observed that “there was a considerable Greek population in New York but he did not suppose that the Greek Government was demanding enosis for them”. This was an interview that was to have unfortunate consequences for the British in Cyprus.

From the outset of independence, therefore, the Greeks were committed revisionists, wanting a substantial mainland advance in the north and an expansion into the Mediterranean to gather up the substantial number of islands, some with names made magic by the genius of Homer, which had a Greek-speaking majority though with often a Muslim minority. Most of these were part of the Ottoman Empire but an important group, including Corfu and Ithaca, had been placed by the Congress of Vienna under the protection of Britain. For many present-day Greeks their country is not a mainland with an add-on of islands; for them the islands are the mainstream. It is about them and their rickety relationship with the British that this crisp, lucid, enjoyable book has been written.

It must be said that the content of the book is considerably less than the main title would suggest. It is concerned primarily with the islands and only marginally with Anglo-Hellenic relations as a whole. Even the subtitle is odd since the authors choose to start not with 1850 but with the arrival of the Great Philhellene, Mr Gladstone, fresh from publishing three volumes on Homer, in Cephalonia at the end of 1858. The most memorable event in 1850, the bombardment of the Piraeus by the Royal Navy on behalf of the claims of a British subject, Don Pacifico, is relegated to a footnote on page 48.

The authors' description of Gladstone's few months as Lord High Commissioner in the Ionian Islands is, however, a joy to read. His main purpose was to convince the islanders that, however much they might agitate for union with Greece, they were in no circumstances going to get it, so they might as well pay attention to his proposals for reform. The Ionians wanted enosis and were not very interested in reform. The final outcome was that in 1864 the British Government – no thanks apparently to Gladstone who was serving as Chancellor of the Exchequer at the time – recognised the accession of the Ionians to Greece as part of the dowry of a new King of the Hellenes, a seventeen-year-old prince from Denmark, the previous Bavarian monarch having been despatched into exile. Between the two monarchs there had been a considerable hiatus, during which time the vacant throne had been traded humiliatingly around the dynasties of Europe.

The book devotes an hilarious passage to the Greeks' sudden but emphatic infatuation for Prince Arthur, the second son of Queen Victoria, as their King, from which prospect Queen and advisers ran a mile. The episode was typical of the ambivalence of the British-Hellenic relationship. Officially the British were pro-Hellenic, largely on account of the sentiment arising from the classical education enjoyed by the British governing class. Those who believed in the clash of civilisations would back Christians against Muslims. Weak Greece, needing to lock in a strong supporter, turned naturally first to Britain. But British foreign policy was for the most part committed to preventing Russia getting through to the Mediterranean and for this purpose the integrity of the Ottoman Empire was to be supported. Greek islanders relying on British sympathy had therefore plenty of occasions to feel let down. On the other hand the petty-mindedness of politicians in Athens caused patience to be lost with what Lord Salisbury described as "the blackmailer of Europe".

Crete remained on the agenda of Europe between 1866 when a Greek (or, as it was usually expressed at the time, a Christian) uprising against the Turks (Muslims) was brutally suppressed, and 1913 when enosis with Greece was finally confirmed. In between Crete was a running irritation for European diplomacy. The sequence in 1866 was described by a French observer, quoted by Holland and

Markides, as “successive phases of agitation and quiescence, a Muslim retreat into the towns, destruction of crops and homes, cordons separating the sides, and a European proclivity to become involved without effecting any resolution of fundamental conflicts”. The British attitude in 1866-1867 was that there were enough Turks and Egyptians on the island to make the suppression of the revolt a mere question of time. Therefore humanitarian intervention on behalf of the Cretan Greek majority was ruled out on the ground that it would only prolong the agony. Greece itself was summed up by a diary entry by the Foreign Secretary, Lord Stanley, as “Brigandage undiminished, finances hopeless, anarchy everywhere: great excitement on the subject of the war, stimulated by the politicians who use the national feeling as a means of displacing one another”.

Both Greece and Cretan Greeks were inclined to act as if Turkey’s difficulties were their opportunity. They more than once miscalculated, an invasion of Thessaly in 1854 while the Turks were preoccupied with the Crimean War confrontation with Russia brought a British and French occupation of the Piraeus for three years and no extra territory. But after 1866 Crete remained fairly quiet until 1878, though the Powers had been attempting to sponsor constitutional reforms. In 1878 there was a Greek uprising and the usual mutual barbarities followed. The British reaction to this was different from what it had been in 1866; it was the year of the Congress of Berlin and the Sultan was more open to international pressure. The British consul played a key role in brokering the Halepa Pact, under which, as the authors put it, “An authentic legislature brought with it the ‘real’ politics that the wider availability of public spoils implied”. The British consul was two years later able to report “the unusual spectacle ... of a mixed mob of Christians and Mussulmans cheering a successful Christian candidate and hooting his Christian opponent”.

But this could not last. By 1885 the Ottomans were clawing back some of their power and from 1889-1890 there was once more fighting between the races. In 1896, partly provoked by a Greek revolutionary committee, the Ottomans with some 30,000 troops made a last ruthless effort to stamp their rule on the island, producing reports of a Christian massacre which the revolutionaries intended would result in international intervention. While the Christians were very visibly suffering in the main towns, hundreds of isolated Muslim villagers were being killed. Europeans were reluctant to intervene and it was not until February 1897 that marines representing Britain, Russia, France and Italy were put ashore at Canea, the capital. Subsequently Crete was divided up between the Powers under a temporary occupation run by European admirals without, according to the authors, any clear political direction or idea of an outcome. On the mainland, the Greek army, prodded by the action of irregulars hoping to gain territory in Thessaly was again defeated. The European Powers showed themselves out of sympathy with what they regarded as unsuccessful opportunists and only the most strenuous efforts of

Russia were able to prevent a Turkish march on Athens. Holland and Markides show that the belief of the Greeks that Britain would give them any more protection than the offer of a destroyer to take off the Greek royal family had proved untrue.

Hitherto in this crisis the Greeks had strained the patience of almost all the European Governments; yet by 1898 the Turks, by trying yet again to assert themselves in Crete and thereby coming into conflict with the British peace-keeping unit stationed in Candia, had at last produced the situation the Cretan Greeks had long sought, namely the patronage of Britain. The outcome was the appointment by the Sultan as High Commissioner of the Greek Prince George. Turkish sovereignty remained but Turkish power had gone and the apparatus of Turkish administration was dismantled.

The Turkish flag had, however, to be flown and the authors explain how, with the Turks having departed, this was raised by British and French troops.

If the British supposed that this arrangement would keep Greek Cretans quiet for long they were in for a disappointment. For one thing Greek Cretan politics were at work, Prince George had stirred up substantial opposition and the impressive opposition leader, Eleftherios Venizelos was proclaiming an insurrection with the rumoured approval of the British consul. "In the great tradition of Cretan insurrections", say the authors, "the goal was not to win a military victory but to seduce, and if necessary extract by blackmail, the sympathy and political action of Europe – and especially of Great Britain". The book discusses in intriguing detail the manoeuvres of the consuls on the spot but also the higher strategic consideration that prompted Sir Edward Grey to send a personal assurance to the Sultan that union between Crete and Greece remained impossible. "One cannot spend one's day making jam for Cretans", he observed to an official.

The internal tensions in the island had reached such a pitch during 1906 that the body of consuls, led by the British consul Esmé Hamilton, ordered European troops commanded by the British to occupy the Assembly building and evict the members of the legislature. Also evicted (with the collusion of the King of the Hellenes) was Prince George, who had by now made himself a cause of bitter division among Greek Cretans. Holland and Markides devote a further chapter to the means by which the Greeks were finally able to make use of the Balkan wars of 1912-1913 to bring about the aim along, although at times it was unstated, of enosis, union with Greece.

The story of the Dodecanese islands was much less dramatic in that their inhabitants played a much smaller part in determining their future. With 80 per cent of the population Greek, 8 per cent Italian and 8 per cent Turkish, after the First

World War, in which Turkey was defeated, they would have seemed to have been well qualified for transfer from Turkey to Greece. But unfortunately their ownership was Italian and victorious allies were not in the mood to give territory to each other. Count Sforza, the Italian Foreign Minister at the time, once told the present reviewer that Italy might well have agreed to surrender Rhodes (the largest of the Dodecanese) if Britain would lead the way by presenting Cyprus to Greece. One hesitates to think of the amount of trouble this would have avoided, bearing in mind that the Turkish Cypriots (then known as Muslims) would presumably have been included in the population exchange arranged by Venizelos and Ataturk.

Given that Italy was on the other side for the Second World War, it was comparatively simple to bring about enosis. But even so it took two years until 1947, during which the islands remained under British military government. Reading the authors' account one is left with an impression of meanness on the part of the occupiers which must have seriously diminished any legacy of goodwill.

There remained Cyprus. The build-up to the EOKA uprising and the subsequent grant of what Sir Hugh Foot called "agreement rule" rather than standard independence has been often described, but the efficient account contained in this book is well worth reading precisely because it is written in the context of what has gone before.

At the end of the story one is left with the fact that the Hellenic will finally prevailed, except of course most disastrously in Anatolia, where military defeat was this time not to be reversed over time. Despite other military defeats, the failure, documented in this excellent book, of the hoped-for British champion to appear promptly on the field at the first hint of Christian massacre and the petty politics forever interfering with loftier matters, the Greeks, with the above-noted terrible exception, have always in the end prevailed. Time and again islanders such as those of Corfu, Crete and Cyprus were asked by outsiders whether they really wanted to yoke themselves to impoverished and disorderly Athens. With certain exceptions this is what they wanted. It might seem a little odd after all this that, handed down what they were told was independence in 1960, Greek Cypriots accustomed themselves with some but not too much difficulty to a state different from though (normally) very friendly to Greece. Cyprus has paradoxically become the great enosis exception.

Keith Kyle

Britain in Cyprus Colonialism and Post-Colonialism 1878-2006

**Edited by Hubert Faustmann and Nicos Peristianis
Bibliopolis, (Mannheim and Möhnesee, 2006) 660 pp.
ISBN 3 933925 36 3.**

This book constitutes a remarkable contribution to the study of the history of Cyprus during the period of British rule (1878-1960), and beyond. As such its appearance is an important publishing event for at least two reasons. First, it contains 35 papers of good or high standard, which cover many aspects of the relations between British colonial power and the people of Cyprus. Second, the book's contents provide evidence that the intellectual culture of Cyprus has reached a significant point of maturity and self-consciousness. Roughly, half of the essays are written by Cypriot authors and some others by non-Cypriots who are working in various academic institutions in the northern and southern areas of Cyprus; and this indicates that there is now, in the country, a small professional community of scholars of history, social and political science, and international relations who employ their abilities and energies to study the historical development, political and economic character, and a variety of issues of Cypriot society in accordance with the established canons of their disciplines. Older Cypriot scholars most probably gained their initial interest in Cypriot history and politics by reading material of low scholarly value at school and in newspapers and journals, which was often designed to serve narrow political purposes. Irrespective of whether one judges the information or analysis contained in this or that essay convincing, nobody will find any of the essays to be other than works of serious scholarship, based on the proper use of historical sources, and aimed at discovering and presenting, in Ranke's famous phrase, "what actually happened".

The essay topics in this volume can be roughly grouped under the following themes:

Early Colonial Period, 1878 – 1931

This group includes good essays by Heinz Richter, Diana Markides and Andrekos Varnava on the general subject of British strategic interests in the Eastern Mediterranean in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, which motivated Britain to secure an agreement with the Ottoman government to take over the

administration of Cyprus in exchange of protection for the Ottoman Empire. The 'big picture', long established by C.W.J. Orr and George Hill, is enriched by little known details about the British micro-politics and micro-diplomacy in response to changing power relations in the Mediterranean region before, during and after World War I. The image of Britain which pervades these and several other essays is that of a cunning imperial lion roaming the jungle of international society driven by its desire to expand its power and territory and secure its material interests with scant regard for the rights of small or weak creatures.

Marios Constantinou offers an interesting discussion – interesting when it is not obscured by abstruse theoretical terminology – intended, as he puts it, “to rethink Weber’s sociology of domination in terms of charismatic stratification, conflict and change against the background of Cyprus’ transition from Ottoman province to British colony”. This and some other essays present versions of the view that the process of secularisation, which was part and parcel of British administrative and economic reforms, created for the population a new set of values – modernisation, education, health and a better standard of life – which the Church could only combat by appeal to the monolithic aim of enosis. This aim, or talk about this aim, inevitably set the Greek-Cypriot nationalistic bourgeoisie not only against the colonial government, but against the Turkish-Cypriot bourgeoisie.

Rebecca Bryant focuses on the development of literacy within the Greek and Turkish communities of Cyprus in the early part of the twentieth century – another theme familiar to historians of Cyprus – and she traces its expression in the use of the print media, and in relations between (a) the two ethnic communities and (b) each of the communities and the colonial bureaucracy. Some aspects of the preceding themes are developed by Dimitra Karoulla-Vrikki who emphasises the link between language and ethnicity. This remarkable essay makes skilful use of primary sources from the period, especially correspondence between leading members of the two communities and the colonial government, which are interestingly kept (as I believe) in the little used Cyprus State Archives.

Hansjoerg Brey writes about the Cypriot economy under British rule and with special reference to the mining industry and the benefits which the cooperative movement bestowed on the rural – predominantly agricultural – population of the island. The author struggles honourably to collate, organise and make sense of badly incomplete economic data. A comprehensive and serious economic history of Cyprus remains to be written, but this will only be possible if and when the economic and financial documents of the British administration are made available to students of history.

Middle Colonial Period, 1931 – 1945

Heinz Richter re-enters the collection to offer a review of political developments in the period starting with the march of Greek-Cypriot demonstrators on Government House on 21 October 1931, leading to a period of illiberal rule, and the end of World War II, when the Attlee government began to consider more liberal governmental arrangements for the people of the island. Given that the 'October events' and their aftermath are well documented, a reader may have expected a more detailed treatment of the character and underlying causes of the first explosion of collective Greek-Cypriot anger at colonial power, as well as the tyrannical and blunt reaction of the latter. That period created standards of behaviour for the two sides (for example, unwillingness to talk and negotiate with the other side, violence and suppression) which were to be developed and applied in 1955 – 1959.

Martin Strohmeier offers an essay explaining British plans for a university in Cyprus or another place in the Near East. Many readers will be grateful to the author for bringing to the public domain little known facts on the subject. Jan Asmussen writes about Cypriots in the British army. It is well known that a considerable number of Greek and Turkish Cypriots joined the British armed forces in 1939, even before the outbreak of the Greek-Italian war, but this essay provides details from sources that are not easily available.

Late Colonial Period, 1945 – 1955

This part of the book contains essays on the development of strong and distinct national identities among Greek and Turkish Cypriots – identities which owed much to the national consciousness of Greece and Turkey respectively – and their expression in various political forces on the island. Two significant Turkish-Cypriot scholars Niyazi Kizilyurek and Huseyin Mehmet Atesin write enlighteningly about the little studied subject of how the Turkish-Cypriot community organised its social and political forces and articulated its political discourse, partly in reaction to increasingly vocal Greek-Cypriot demands for enosis. Nicos Peristianis, Christophoros Christophorou and Vassilis Protopapas provide sound and intelligent analyses of what, in retrospect, may be regarded as the creation of permanent cleavages between Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot political forces, and within Greek-Cypriots forces between those of leftist orientation and those of rightist-clericalist character. What seems to be missing from this section is a detailed discussion of the positions expressed by the two main Greek-Cypriot parties, AKEL and KEK, and the various Turkish-Cypriot groupings vis-à-vis the British proposal to offer the people of Cyprus a more liberal constitution containing certain inchoate elements of home rule. The public domain already contains some interesting material on this subject, which raises the question of why no Greek-Cypriot political group finally dared to take up and test the admittedly ungenerous British offer.

Final Colonial Period and the Road to Independence, 1955 – 1960

By the early 1950s Britain's view that it had to maintain Cyprus as a military base came into conflict with both the Greek-Cypriot demand for enosis and the Turkish-Cypriot demand for the partition of the island between Turkey and Greece. George Kelling, Evanthis Hatzivassiliou, Oliver Richmond and Brendan O'Malley – all authors with established credentials – discuss this dramatic and violent period of Cypriot history mostly at the level of diplomatic and political activity. Joseph S. Joseph looks at the Zurich and London Agreements, and Hubert Faustmann considers the negotiations on the detailed treaties and the constitution of the new republic. There is a tendency among scholars to look at the circumstances in which the Zurich and London Agreements were concluded without giving a chance to the representatives of the Greek and Turkish communities to negotiate. They point to the privileges accorded to the Turkish community and the complicated power-sharing formulas in the 1960 constitution, and draw the conclusion that the constitution was at least a part of the reason why the settlement broke down in December 1963. These scholars are silent over the question, if Archbishop Makarios and his advisers were to have been given an opportunity to negotiate a political settlement with Kuchuk and Denktash, could they realistically have been expected to reach an amicable agreement? Another well-known writer, Makarios Drousiotis, who has researched the shadowy world of para-military organisations and conspiratorial right-wing politics in Greece, Turkey and Cyprus, contributes a gripping essay on what he calls "the Greco-Turkish para-state" and its impact on developments in Cyprus. Finally Robert Holland offers a thoughtful assessment of the historiography of late colonial Cyprus.

Post-Colonial Period 1960 to Present

Various parts or aspects of British policy during the post-colonial period are discussed by Claude Nicolet, James Ker-Lindsay, Alan James, Keith Kyle and Tim Potier. None of these authors are Cypriot – indeed, the last four are British – and none of them, as far as I can tell, doubts British goodwill towards the people of Cyprus, at least to the extent that it seemed compatible with the protection of British strategic interests on the island. If an opinion poll were conducted among the people in the Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot communities, each of them would produce the overwhelming result that the British discriminated against them and unjustly favoured the other side. The even-handedness which the British government tried to display after December 1963 earned it the mistrust of politicians on both sides of the divide, that it is Greek-Cypriot politicians who wanted a unitary state under majority rule and Turkish-Cypriot politicians who, in effect, wanted partition. Klearchos Kyriakides' discussion of the continuing value of the Sovereign Base Areas provides convincing evidence for the keen interest which Britain still has in the achievement of a federal settlement to the Cyprus problem acceptable to the two sides.

The collection includes three essays on the politically motivated ways in which Cyprus was depicted by British and other visitors to the island in photography, painting and writing, and literature. Mike Hajimichael argues that John Thomson's photographic expedition in Cyprus in autumn 1878 produced a famous set of photographs with accompanying text which offered "a distinctly colonial representation of Cyprus and its people". Rita Severis argues in rather similar vein that British artists – mostly amateur painters – produced pictures which represented Cyprus as a country with its own distinct social character and culture identity, a prominent feature of which was that Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots peacefully lived side by side, under the benevolent rule of the British colonial elite, without any unfulfilled political aspirations. The most prominent intellectual villain of the piece for both Rita Severis and Petra Tournay-Theodotou was Lawrence Durrell, who edited the colonial government's *Cyprus Review* in the 1950s and wrote *Bitter Lemons* with its famously patronising portrayal of local people. The Greek nationalist reply to Durrell's book was Rodis Roufos' *Age of Bronze* and Costas Montis' *Closed Doors*.

The collection ends with three pieces described as 'documents'. One is an English translation of a pamphlet published in Greek in 1945 by HajiMatheos HajiNikola, an early Greek-Cypriot radical thinker. His pamphlet 'The Agrarian Class in Cyprus' offers an account of the plight of poor farmers in rural Cyprus, criticises the system of finance used by the bourgeoisie to exploit the farmers, and proposes a set of measures to alleviate rural suffering. This document is preceded by an introductory piece by Peter Loizos which offers some information about HajiMatheou and his times. Finally, there is a paper by former President George Vassiliou on 'Britain and the EU Accession of Cyprus'. Given that Vassiliou knows more than anybody else about the Cyprus Republic's negotiations for EU accession, and that the final accession of the country was widely held to be the greatest success of the Republic in the field of international relations, his judgment that "the relations between Cyprus and the British government, during the whole period of the accession process, had been harmonious" gives Cyprus-British relations a positive twist.

If I have any major criticism for this book, it is not so much that it contains this or that error, this or that weakness – errors and weaknesses can be found in every book – but rather that a study of its contents reveals a yawning gap, which undermines its claim to comprehensiveness. The book contains no detailed discussion of the EOKA revolt – the actual attacks by Greek-Cypriot guerrillas on British soldiers, civilians, property and installations, as well as attacks on Turkish policemen, countered by the violence and oppression by the colonial authorities against Greek-Cypriot people. This historical experience has marked indelibly British-Cypriot relations for a generation. The collection does not include any detailed discussion of the Turkish-Cypriot anti-enosis campaign, the formation of

Volkan and TMT, and the killing of Greek Cypriots outside Guenyeli, and the inter-communal violence of the summer of 1958 which created great tension between the two communities and led (with British consent) to the de facto creation of a Turkish municipality first in Nicosia and later in other towns. The development of relations between the colonial government and the Turkish-Cypriot community in the late 1950s is a badly under-studied subject, and even now there are many Greek Cypriots – including people of some education – who have no idea that British troops killed Turkish-Cypriot rioters and they persist in the illusion that Dr Kuchuk and Rauf Denktaş were collaborating with the colonial authorities to achieve British policy objectives.

Another area within the colonial period which is under-studied is the fact that there existed throughout the British period a large group of Greek-Cypriot people who did not support enosis. Such people were either more or less content with the colonial system or they were apathetic to political agitation, or in some cases they were opposed to violence and they positively disliked and feared EOKA. This group – not the majority, but certainly a considerable minority – consisted of diverse sub-groups, for example substantial numbers of civil servants, teachers in government schools and policemen; Greek-Cypriot judges, members of the colonial legal service and other senior cadres of the administration who enjoyed the friendship of colonial administrators; British-educated civilians – lawyers, doctors, engineers and other professionals – who felt a kind of loyalty to the country of their education and considered its culture superior to that of Greece; businessmen who traded with British firms and resented the EOKA-enforced boycott of British products; AKEL supporters who had no love for communist-baiter Grivas and EOKA or indeed “monarcho-fascist Greece”, and a certain number of leftists paid for their beliefs and indiscretions with their lives, to the dismay of their family and friends.

In fact the group of ‘philangloi’ (as the enosists called them) was large enough, and indeed educated and talented enough, to have retained its existence and influence into the era of independence, and it helped retain a good feeling and a cultural link with Britain, to the chagrin of nationalists. The basic elements of Anglophilia among Greek and Turkish Cypriots lie deep in their collective souls, and I venture to suggest that it has to do with a strong need of the Cypriot people to be accepted by the world as European, as part of the West, rather than East Mediterranean, let alone the Middle Eastern. During the colonial days British officials offered Cypriots (as they offered Indians and Africans and other colonial peoples) an image of what it is to be a European gentleman – an image of an English-speaking, smartly dressed, relatively prosperous, educated and articulate, well-mannered and refined man exuding quiet authority and confidence – and many ambitious young Cypriots took this image to their hearts.

Zenon Stavrinides

Divided Cyprus: Modernity, History, and an Island in Conflict

**Edited by Yiannis Papadakis, Nicos Peristianis and Gisela Welz
Indiana University Press, (Bloomington, 2006) 235 pp.
ISBN 0 253 21851 9**

Of the various publications on contemporary Cyprus that deal with the issues of modernity, history, identity and the “Cyprus Problem”,¹ *Divided Cyprus* ranks amongst the better in quality and value. This is because of the calibre of the editors and contributors. Nevertheless, the book, despite its quality and timeliness from an academic and also from a more general standpoint, is not above criticism.

One of the main reasons for the level of the publication being so high is the quality of its editors. Yiannis Papadakis, an Assistant Professor of Anthropology in the Department of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Cyprus, has managed, within a few years, to elevate his name to the top of the tree of anthropologists dealing with the “Cyprus Problem”. His personal and thought-provoking book *Echoes from the Dead Zone* provides something that most studies do not, an understanding of the “Cyprus Problem” from a grass roots level, as well as from an enlightened academic framework. In more recent years, Nicos Peristianis, the Executive Dean of Intercollege, one of the better university colleges in Cyprus, has come out of his shell and helped produce some quality publications, such as *Britain in Cyprus* (with Hubert Faustmann). Peristianis, a sociologist, has not produced a major work in his own right, and seems content to assist in churning out and contributing to valuable collected works. Gisela Welz, Professor of Cultural Anthropology and European Ethnography at Goethe University, is perhaps the lesser known of the editors, but this does not detract from her work or as one of the editors of this publication. It is evident from the well written introduction, the very high standard of the contributors and the gelling together of their contributions, that the editors exerted appropriate control over the academic quality, scope and aims of the book. By comparison the closest competitor, *Cyprus in the Modern World*, published by the unknown Vaniias publishing house, is patchy in quality, showing the lack of experience, control and vision from its editors. Michális Michael, a Research Fellow at La Trobe University, in Melbourne, has been attached to that university for the best part of twenty years, and yet has produced few publications until now. His co-editor, Anastasios Tamis, the Director of the National Centre for Hellenic Studies and Research at La Trobe University, has produced works on Greek migration, especially to Australia, which might be valuable to the non-academic reader, but

lack thorough research, analyses and contextualisation, and are ethnocentric in approach, thus lacking any real value to scholars and higher-education students.² Despite some contributions ranging from the excellent to the very good from Maria Hadjipavlou, Greg Deftereos, Caesar Mavratsas, Nayia Roussou, and a few others (including the interesting introduction by Michael), the publication is overly long, does not gel well, and has some poor contributions. Without question, *Divided Cyprus* is focused, well structured and researched, and works as a whole while each chapter also works individually.

Although some are more known than others, all the contributors to *Divided Cyprus* have carved out names for themselves. Here I wish to briefly comment on some of the contributions, space limiting comment on all, let alone more thorough analyses.

One colleague and friend has referred to Michael Herzfeld, a Professor of Anthropology at Harvard University, as “the Great Herzfeld”, reflecting his influence on the study of identity of the pre-modern and modern “Greek” world. It was to my fortunate surprise that when it came to writing the chapter on identity formation for my PhD on early British Cyprus, I found that nobody had situated the primary source material within Herzfeld’s theoretical context, where I determined it fitted nicely; indeed, ironically, one anthropologist examining Cyprus had rejected Herzfeld’s approach.³ In his contribution, he mentions but does not explore the triumph of European models of identity construction applied during the British period over the socio-cultural integration and religious cohabitation that had prevailed in the pre-modern era (34, 38). Herzfeld has argued that Europeans created a unitary ideal of Ancient Greece during the Enlightenment, and then created a unitary ideal of Modern Greece, which was even after 1830 largely under Ottoman control. I have shown that the British officials – primarily those in London – situated Cyprus within such an ideal, and so when it came to ruling Cyprus, the Liberal government after 1880 gave it a very liberal constitution, which introduced modern governmental and political structures. They also rejected introducing English to schools because Greek was a more than civilised language from which to progress the learning of the inhabitants.⁴ The effect on the traditional approach to understanding identity formation and the origins of the “Cyprus Problem” are evident.

Rebecca Bryant, Assistant Professor of Anthropology at George Mason University, has, in a short amount of time, carved a name for herself as the pre-eminent historical anthropologist of Cyprus, primarily through her excellent book, *Imagining the Modern*. In *Divided Cyprus* she examines the relationship between modernity and nationalism in Cyprus, revealing the continuities and discontinuities of tradition. Bryant argues that from the beginning of British rule the Greek Cypriots claimed to be the real ancestors of Europe by virtue of their Ancient Greek past,

using a quote from a Greek language newspaper in 1889. This is true for only a very very small section of the population, most of whom were Cypriot by virtue of having migrated from places such as the Ionian Islands to Cyprus. The majority of the population, including the clergy – and the archbishop, Sophronios III – did not identify with Ancient Greece and called themselves Romiee, that is, Orthodox Christians of the Eastern dogma, whose homeland was Cyprus. Greece, and being Greek, was rarely mentioned in early correspondence with the British. The Hellenic discourse does not begin to gain momentum until after Sophronios died in 1900 and does not become institutionalised as the focus of political demands until 1910, when the archiepiscopal dispute is resolved with a nationalist victory. Bryant's alternative explanation to account for the rise of Greek and Turkish nationalisms to British "divide and rule" is the set of ideas the British allowed to flourish and which the negotiation of the Cypriots rejected, accepted and/or adapted. This I agree with, however it takes the British out as actors to a large extent when they are equal actors in this process, especially given the clear and significant transformations in identity.

Papadakis' chapter on the propaganda and ethno-centrism of both Cypriot communities, although on the odd occasion reading like a summary of Echoes from the Dead Zone, is fascinating for its analysis of official government publications, such as those of the respective Public Information Offices. His discussion of the denial of each antagonistic sides opposing understanding of the past and the use of "evidence" in official publications to endorse the respective ethnocentric versions of the past is excellent.

Peristianis' chapter is also of interest, especially since he is one of the few sociologist contributors and because there has been little if any focus on civic nationalism in Cyprus. His approach is to look at social structures and political party formations. Peristianis argues that Greek-Cypriot society is divided between those who take an ethnocentric view of the past and their identity and those who take a civic-centric view. He claims that President Archbishop Makarios turned from ethno to civil nationalism in the late 1960s when he made his famous "what is desirable is not always feasible" speech. But in this speech Makarios only abandoned enosis temporarily and so he was not moving from ethno to civil nationalism permanently and therefore he was not abandoning his ethnic identity for a civil identity at all. Further complications in Peristianis' thesis arise where he claims that concessionists and rejectionists over a solution to the "Cyprus Problem" correspond to civic-centricism and ethno-centricism respectively. If Makarios adopted a civic-centric approach after the late 1960s, he certainly was no more concessionist to the Turkish Cypriots, as Glafkos Clerides has shown,⁵ while he may have changed after the invasion of 1974, but this was not immediate, as Makarios Droushiotis has revealed.⁶ Also, Peristianis' distinction (which is quite right) that AKEL (Progressive Party of the Working People – left-wing) has

traditionally been civic-centric, while DISY (Democratic Rally – right-wing) was founded on ethno-centrism contradicts his theory because DISY has traditionally been as concessionalist as AKEL, and this it showed when it was the only major party to support the UN peace plan put to the people in the referendum of 2004, while AKEL supported the rejectionist camp. This camp also included the party founded to represent Makarios' political principles. Nevertheless, Peristianis' chapter is thought-provoking on other levels, especially when he analyses his quantitative data and reveals how certain interviewees believed that rapprochement was impossible because of the different versions of the past that members of each community held.

Lack of space forces me to now make passing reference to the other contributions, all of which are very interesting, well researched and provoke food for thought. Yael Navaro-Yashin, a Lecturer in Social Anthropology at the University of Cambridge, challenges Political Science and other disciplines that define the "Cyprus Problem" as an ethnic problem by highlighting the political and social conflicts that have arisen since Turkish Cypriots and mainland Turks have come into contact after the 1974 war. Spyros Spyrou, Assistant Professor of Anthropology and Sociology at Cyprus College, looks at how national education determines a child's outlook on identity and history. In this most interesting chapter, he reveals the contradiction that Greek-Cypriot children are taught that the Turkish Cypriots are the barbaric "other" and yet in the official Greek-Cypriot political discourse the Turkish Cypriots are as Cypriot as the Greek Cypriots. Paul Sant-Cassia, a Reader in Anthropology at the University of Durham, and well known for his book *Bodies of Evidence*, examines how the exhumations at Lakatamia sustain social order through the emotion of suffering and mourning. Meanwhile, Anne Jepson, a Research Fellow at the University of Edinburgh, shows how gardens preserve social memory for those who left homes behind in 1974. Floya Anthias, a Professor of Sociology at Oxford Brookes University, reveals how a new underclass of foreign workers (from eastern Europe and the Sub-continent) are often erased from public awareness or more often legitimised by the prevailing racist stereotypes. Anthias is right in proposing that the government must be more aware of Cyprus' role as a translocation place and where the flow of ethnicities effect and are effected by social structures. The last chapter sees Vassos Argyrou, a Senior Lecturer in Social Anthropology at the University of Hull, reflect on the impossibility that the anthropological project can escape ethnocentrism because it divides the world and does not unite it.

The only weakness of *Divided Cyprus* is that the subtitle *Modernity, History, and an Island in Conflict* implies that History will be a focus of the book, and yet there is no contribution by an historian. Although the word "history" can of course simply mean "the past" and historians do not have a monopoly over the past, but they are the primary members of academia that deal with the past and for them History is a

discipline that has its own unique methodologies and approaches. The book only comprises contributors from the anthropology and sociology disciplines. Perhaps this is a reflection on the fact that when it comes to Cyprus' past there is a dearth of serious historians interested in it and it is left to other disciplines to attempt to fill this void. In analysing the history of Cyprus (see Introduction), the editors do an excellent job. They look at significant works, such as those by Paschales Kitromilides, Adamantia Pollis, Stephen Xydis, Richard Patrick, Hugh Purcell, Vamik Volkan and manage to produce a thoroughly progressive sketch, but not all of the above were produced by historians, while there have been other works by historians that may have been considered, namely George Georghallides, Rolandos Katsiaounis and Robert Holland. If one of the main aims of the book was to "analyse the issues concerning the construction and uses of the past" (6) and one of the focuses was the British period, where, as the editors admit, the coloniser was in the peculiar situation of sharing the same repertoire of myths with the majority of the natives (4-5), a chapter or two on this exact subject – the imperial encounter within the context of the British cultural and imperial imagination – might have been appropriate. An historian, too, would have known that the quote on page four attributed to Sir Richard Palmer, was from Sir Richmond Palmer, and would have referenced the original source, his published speech,⁷ and not a secondary source.

My other criticisms of *Divided Cyprus* are more minor. One of the most annoying errors virtually throughout this publication (which is also in evidence on the back of the book) is the persistent use of Cyprus's (which means more than one, such as: "how many Cyprus's are there?) to mean Cyprus' (an example: Cyprus' strategic importance was more imagined than real"). Aside from this and a few minor stylistic quibbles, which are present in most publications, the book is very well written.

Of the recent publications on the "Cyprus Problem", *Divided Cyprus* ranks amongst the best. It is scholarly, very well conceived, nicely structured, and expertly executed. Most importantly, it is thought provoking. I highly recommend it to any serious scholar of Cyprus' past and present, and to those interested in its future progress.

Andrekos Varnava

1. William Mallinson, *Cyprus: A Modern History*, IB Tauris, London, 2005. See my review of Mallinson's book on the University of Melbourne Repository [<http://eprints.infodiv.unimelb.edu.au/archive/00001951/>]; (ed.), Michális Michael and Anastasios M. Tamis, *Cyprus in the Modern World*, Vantias, Salonica, 2005.

2. See my review of Tamis' *The Greeks in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2005, *Melbourne Historical Journal*, XXXIII, 2005, pp. 80-82.
3. Rebecca Bryant, *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*, IB Taurus, London, 2004, p. xi.
4. See my paper entitled 'The Emergence of Greek National Identity amongst the Orthodox Cypriots: British Imperialism and Modernity, 1878-1910', presented at the conference *Nationalism in a Troubled Triangle: Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*, at the University of Cyprus, 10-11 November 2006.
5. Glafkos Clerides, *Cyprus: My Deposition*, 4 Vol., Alitheia Pub, Nicosia 1989, Vol. I, 356-360, Vol. II, pp. 75-77, 204-207.
6. Makarios Droushiotis, *Cyprus 1974*, Bibliopolis, 2006.
7. Sir Richmond Palmer, 'Cyprus', *Royal Central Asian Society Journal*, 1939, pp. 599-618.

Call for Submissions

The Cyprus Review invites submissions for papers, which may address any topic relevant to Cyprus. We also welcome critical reviews of recent scholarly books of interest to the Island. We are interested in topics relating to the social sciences including primarily Anthropology, Business Administration, Economics, History, International Relations, Politics, Psychology, Public Administration and Sociology, and secondarily, Geography, Demography, Law and Social Welfare, pertinent to Cyprus.

Scholarly essays should be written in English and range in length between 4,000 and 9,000 words. The use of graphics or illustrations is supported where appropriate.

Please send four copies of the manuscript together with a 3.5 inch disk compatible with Microsoft Word and saved as rich text format, with the author's name deleted from two copies, to

The Editor
The Cyprus Review
Research and Development Centre
Intercollege
PO Box 24005
1700 Nicosia
Cyprus

For more information

Tel: +357 22-353702 ext 301

Fax: +357 22-353682

E-mail : cy_review@intercollege.ac.cy

THE CYPRUS REVIEW (TCR)

Subscription Invoice

Volume 19, Number 1, 2007 and Volume 19, Number 2, 2007

Payment is Due in Advance

Please Complete the Appropriate Blanks Below

Annual Institutional Rate

Annual Personal Rate

US\$70 _____

Renewal _____

US\$48 _____

Cyp£35 _____

New Subscription _____

Cyp£18 _____

UK£48 _____

UK£30 _____

Euro€60 _____

Euro€30 _____

Two and three year subscriptions are accepted at the current rate.

Single copies are available at half the annual subscription rate.

Back Issues are available (details on request).

Make cheques or bank drafts payable to

Research and Development Centre-Intercollege.

Send to The Cyprus Review, Research and Development Centre, Intercollege,
P.O. Box 24005, 1700 Nicosia, Cyprus.

Name/Institution _____

Address _____

City _____

State or Province _____

Country _____ Zip / Postal Zone _____

Date _____

Subscribers are requested to notify the Editor immediately of change of address.
Please give both old and new addresses.



GLOBAL DIALOGUE

Gain a deeper understanding of the forces shaping today's world



- *Analysis and debate on questions of international concern*
- *Articles and book reviews by leading scholars and thinkers*
- *Themed issues, providing in-depth coverage of specific topics*
- *Ideas, information and argument on world affairs, politics, economics, culture and society*

For a truly global perspective on today's issues and events,
subscribe to *Global Dialogue*

Annual rates: individuals US\$60, institutions US\$192

Send subscriptions to: Global Dialogue, P.O. Box 23992, CY-1687 Nicosia, Cyprus

Published by the Centre for World Dialogue [www.worlddialogue.org]

39 Riga Fereou Street, CY-1087 Nicosia, Cyprus

Telephone: 357-22511782. Fax: 357-22311752. E-mail: info@worlddialogue.org

Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans

EDITOR

Vassilis Fouskas, Kingston University, UK

Supported by an Editorial Board and an International Academic Board

Southern Europe and the Balkans and the Near East, as a region, is currently undergoing major geo-political and geo-economic significance, giving Mediterranean and European studies a particular immediacy and calling for a reconsideration of many widely held assumptions.

Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans is a peer-reviewed interdisciplinary journal, published with the support of the *Association for the Study of Southern Europe and the Balkans* (ASSEB) aiming at academic analysis of the region with a comparative perspective. In an increasingly globalised world, this can involve the re-examination of historical claims and of political or economic arguments concerning the geo-strategic position of the region and its individual nation-states in Europe and the world. In this context, the journal addresses, in a historically and theoretically informed way, the complex geo-political and geo-economic issues facing the Mediterranean, the Balkans and the Near East in the light of global developments and, in particular, European integration. Thus, the journal encourages comparative approaches and views, and aims to construct an academic forum to bring together different viewpoints.

This journal is also available online.

Please connect to www.tandf.co.uk/online.html for further information.

To request a sample copy please visit: www.tandf.co.uk/journals/online/sample.asp

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

2005 – Volume 7 (3 issues)

Print ISSN 1461-3190 Online ISSN 1469-963X

Institutional rate: US\$382; £232

Personal rate: US\$104; £63



Carfax Publishing
Taylor & Francis Group

ORDER FORM

cjsb

PLEASE COMPLETE IN BLOCK CAPITALS AND RETURN TO THE ADDRESS BELOW

Please invoice me at the institutional rate personal rate

Name _____

Address _____

Email _____

Please contact Customer Services at either:

Taylor & Francis Ltd, Rankine Road, Basingstoke, Hants RG24 0PR, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1256 330002 Fax: +44 (0)1256 330045 Email: enquiry@tandf.co.uk Website: www.tandf.co.uk

Taylor & Francis Inc, 325 Chestnut Street, 8th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19106, USA

Tel: +1 215 6258900 Fax: +1 215 6258914 Email: info@taylorandfrancis.com Website: www.taylorandfrancis.com

**Add a
dimension to
your
sociology
research...**



sociological abstracts

*Comprehensive, cost-effective, timely coverage of current ideas
in sociological research*

Abstracts of articles, books, and
conference papers from nearly 2,000
journals published in 35 countries;
citations of relevant dissertations as
well as books and other media.

Now featuring:

- Cited references
- Addition of abstracts
covering 1963-1972

Available in print or electronically through CSA Illumina
(www.csa.com).

Contact sales@csa.com for trial Internet access or a sample
issue.



ILLUMINA
www.csa.com

Mediterranean Historical Review

EDITORS:

Irud Mulkin, *Tel Aviv University, Israel*

Benjamin Arbel, *Tel Aviv University, Israel*

Mediterranean Historical Review encourages the study of issues whose significance transcends a particular area or period. It integrates various problems in the ancient, medieval, early modern and contemporary history of the Mediterranean basin.

Mediterranean Historical Review aims to publish articles which emphasize contacts, relations and influences within the Mediterranean context as well as questions of a comparative and comparable nature.

Topics on which the journal has focused recently include:

- Defining the Mediterranean
- Cross-Cultural Contacts among Mercenary Communities in Sute and Persian Egypt
- Mediterranean Humanism
- Israeli Poetry
- Criminal Anthropology and Anarchist Terrorism in Spain and Italy.

This journal is also available online.

Please connect to www.tandf.co.uk/online.html for further information.

To request an online sample copy please visit:

www.tandf.co.uk/journals/onlineSamples.asp

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

2005 - Volume 20 (2 issues)

Print ISSN 0951-8967

Online ISSN 1743-940X

Institutional rate: US\$234; £153

Personal rate: US\$63; £41



Frank Cass

Taylor & Francis Group

ORDER FORM

fmhr

PLEASE COMPLETE IN BLOCK CAPITALS AND RETURN TO THE ADDRESS BELOW

Please invoice me at the institutional rate personal rate

Name _____

Address _____

Email _____



Register your email address at www.tandf.co.uk/eupdates to receive information on books, journals and other news within your areas of interest.

Please contact Customer Services at either:

Taylor & Francis Ltd, Rankine Road, Basingstoke, Hants RG24 8PR, UK

Taylor & Francis Inc, 325 Chestnut Street, 8th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19106, USA

EDUCATION WITH A GLOBAL OUTLOOK

A Brief College Profile

Intercollege is the largest college of tertiary education in Cyprus, with campuses in the three main cities. It offers a wide range of undergraduate programmes covering Business Administration, Accounting & Banking, Computer Science & Engineering, Education, Communication, Design, Pre-Medicine, Hospitality Management, Tourism Management, Law, International Relations, Psychology and others.

At graduate level, degrees are available in Business Administration (M.B.A.), Psychology (M.A.), International Relations (M.A.) and Education (M.Ed).

With a global outlook and philosophy, the college's development has been tailored towards fostering a dynamic international academic and social environment. It aims to promote both high academic standards and prepare students for the professional world.

Intercollege is actively involved in the community with campaigns for various social causes including environmental protection. In recognition of this work the college has received the prestigious "Global 500" award from the United Nations. Other examples of community service include the organisation of cultural performances, athletics and campaigns for fighting world hunger and raising funds for worthy causes. In one such community project on prisons, inmates were taught Computing, Art and Psychology.

The Research and Development Centre

The Research and Development Centre – Intercollege, is an independent non-profit institution researching issues relating to Cyprus in political, social and economic fields. A number of Units within the Centre help to advance its goals and assist in the surveys and studies undertaken. They include Units of European and International Affairs, Turkish and Middle-Eastern Studies, Socio-economic Studies, and Environmental Studies.

The Centre participates in academic and research programmes of the European Union and frequently organises high-level conferences with participation of senior academics, diplomats and advisors from around the globe.



INTERCOLLEGE

NICOSIA - LIMASSOL - LARNACA

Published by the Research and
Development Centre - Intercollege



INTERCOLLEGE

TYPESETTING, ELECTRONIC PAGINATION & PRINTING
BY CASSOULIDES PRINTING WORKS

