# CYPRIOT NATIONALISMS IN CONTEXT

## HISTORY, IDENTITY AND POLITICS

EDITED BY
THEKLA KYRITSI
NIKOS CHRISTOFIS

# Cypriot Nationalisms in Context

Thekla Kyritsi · Nikos Christofis
Editors

# Cypriot Nationalisms in Context

History, Identity and Politics

palgrave
macmillan

*Editors*
Thekla Kyritsi
Political Science and History
Panteion University of Social
    and Political Sciences
Athens, Greece

Nikos Christofis
Center for Turkish Studies and School
    of History and Civilization
Shaanxi Normal University
Xi'an, China

# Acknowledgements

Rolandos Katsiaounis (Fig. 12.1) and to all the people at Palgrave and the reviewers of the chapters.

Nikos Christofis would like to thank his partner in life, Liana, for her continuous support (and patience) throughout the writing and editing process of this volume. Thekla Kyritsi would like to thank her husband, Giorgos, and her parents, Kriti and Pambis, for each of them has been an endless source of warm encouragement throughout the making of this project. She'd also like to deeply thank Savvas for his continuous feedback and support.

As a collective volume dealing with controversial and highly political issues, this book includes different and often contradictory views on the Cyprus issue. Without necessarily agreeing with every position, the editors have included all perspectives and opinions, as expressed by each individual author. Finally, the editors would like to note that both editors contributed equally in the preparation of the volume, as well as in the introduction of the book.

# Contents

**Part IV   The Local and the Global**

# Notes on Contributors

**Alexios Alecou** is teaching History at the University of Cyprus and has been a Fellow at the Institute of Commonwealth Studies of University of London. He is the author of the books *Communism and Nationalism in Postwar Cyprus* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2016) and *1948: The Greek Civil War and Cyprus* (Power Publishers, 2012). Current work includes the study of post-war Greece and Cyprus, contemporary political history and British colonialism.

**Mustafa Çıraklı** is the deputy director of the Near East Institute at Near East University. He completed his doctoral studies in Politics at Lancaster University (UK). During this time, he taught on various undergraduate and postgraduate courses at Lancaster University and the University of Manchester on comparative politics, IR theory and European studies. His primary areas of interest lie in the fields of identity, immigration and citizenship. His more recent work is on unrecognized states and kin-states in international relations which has grown out of his work on local responses toward patron-states and their role in constructing counter-hegemonic/hybrid identities.

**Nikos Christofis** is an Assistant Professor at the Center for Turkish Studies and at the School of History and Civilization at Shaanxi Normal University, Xi'an, China. He has published extensively in peer-reviewed journals and edited volumes in Greek, Turkish, English and Spanish. He is the author of Turkey in the Long Sixties: *The Left and the*

*Radicalization of the Student Movement* and edited, and contributed to, *Cyprus, the Left and (Post)Colonialism* (both in Greek). He is a member of the editorial board of the journal *New Middle Eastern Studies.*

**Maria Ioannou** is a Lecturer at the University College Groningen, in the Netherlands. Prior to her appointment, she was a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Cyprus and a Senior Researcher at the inter-communal NGO 'SeeD' in Cyprus. Her research interests fall in the area of Conflict Resolution more broadly, and intergroup contact and prejudice reduction more specifically.

**Dimitris Kalantzopoulos** completed his Ph.D. in History at King's College London (Department of History and Centre for Hellenic Studies) in 2015. His thesis was titled *Competing Political Spaces in Colonial Cyprus, 1931–1950.*

**Sossie Kasbarian** is Senior Lecturer (Associate Professor) in Comparative Politics at the University of Stirling. Her research interests and publications broadly span diaspora studies; contemporary Middle East politics and society; nationalism and ethnicity; transnational political activism; refugee and migration studies. She is co-editor of the journal *Diaspora—A Journal of Transnational Studies.*

**Angelos P. Kassianos** is a postdoctoral Research Associate in the UCL, Department of Applied Health Research. He studied in Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences in Athens and obtained his Ph.D. in Health Psychology from the University of Surrey in the UK.

**Yiannos Katsourides** is the Director of the Prometheus Research Institute and teaches political Science at the University of Cyprus. His research interests include Cyprus and Greek politics, radical left and extreme right political parties and political participation. He is the author of three books: *The History of the Communist Party in Cyprus* (I.B. Tauris, 2014); *The Radical Left in Government: The Cases of SYRIZA and AKEL* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2016); *The Greek Cypriot Nationalist Right in the Era of British Colonialism* (Springer, 2017). His articles have appeared in *West European Politics*, *South European Society and Politics*, and in the *Journal of European Integration*, among others.

**Şevki Kıralp** was born in 1986 in Famagusta, Cyprus. He is an Assistant Professor of Political Science, having studied Modern Greek Language and Literature at Ankara University. He completed his Masters and

Doctoral degrees in Politics and International Relations at Keele University. He now teaches Politics and History at Near East University in Nicosia, Cyprus. His ongoing research covers the Cyprus question, Cypriot history and politics, Turkish history and politics, ethnic conflicts, and nationalism. He is also on the editorial board of the Turkish Cypriot journal *Gaile*.

**Thekla Kyritsi** is a Ph.D. candidate in Political Science and History at Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences in Athens, Greece. She has an interdisciplinary backgound of studies on history, social sciences, political theory and gender issues, and she has published academic chapters dealing with women's history in relation to gender, nationality and political ideology in Cyprus. She is a founding member of the Cypriot NGO Center for Gender Equality and History, where she currently works as a researcher.

**Iliya Marovich-Old** currently works at Flinders University in South Australia. After working in the Law early in his career he returned to his interest in History. He has researched and written about British Imperialism focusing on the Mediterranean and the Levant in the twentieth century. He completed his Ph.D. at Flinders University in 2016. His thesis is titled *Challenges to British Imperial Hegemony in the Mediterranean, 1919–1940.*

**Petros Nikolaou** is a Ph.D. candidate at the Turkish and Middle Eastern Studies Department, University of Cyprus. His dissertation topic is *Class, Nationalism and Intercommunal Relations in Cyprus, 1878–1954.*

**Meltem Onurkan-Samani** is an Assistant Professor of History at the European University of Lefke. She is currently the special adviser of the Turkish Cypriot leader Mustafa Akıncı on political affairs and history. She is a former co-president of the Association for Historical Dialogue and Research, Cyprus. Among her research interests are the impact of colonial policies on (political) culture of the (Turkish) Cypriots, the development of Turkish Cypriot nationalism, the role of history education and textbooks in Turkish Cypriot politics. She holds a B.Sc. and a Ph.D. in History, respectively, from the Middle East Technical University and Hacettepe University, Turkey.

**Eugenia Palieraki** received her Ph.D. from the Sorbonne (Paris) and she is associate professor in Latin American Studies at the University of

Cergy-Pontoise. Her current research focuses on political connections and the circulation of revolutionary ideas, practices and activism between Latin America and the Mediterranean. She is the co-editor of two volumes and four journal issues published in the UK, Chile, Argentina, and France. Her monograph *¡La revolución ya viene! El MIR chileno en los años 1960* was published by LOM Ediciones in Chile in 2014.

**Andrekos Varnava** FRHistS, is Associate Professor at the University of Flinders, Australia and Honorary Professor at De Montfort University, Leicester. He is the author of two books in the Studies in Imperialism Series of Manchester University Press: *Serving the Empire in the Great War: The Cypriot Mule Corps, Imperial Loyalty and Silenced Memory* (2017) and *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878–1915: The Inconsequential Possession* (2009; paperback, 2012) and has edited/co-edited six volumes. He has published articles in *English Historical Review*, *The Historical Journal*, *Historical Research*, *War in History*, *Itinerario*, *Britain and the World* and *First World War Studies*.

# Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| AAPSO | Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization |
| AKEL | [Ανορθωτικό Κόμμα Εργαζόμενου Λαού] The Progressive Party of the Working People |
| AKP | [Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi] Justice and Development Party |
| CTP | [Cumhuriyetçi Türk Partisi] Republican Turkish Party (northern Cyprus) |
| DIKO | [Δημοκρατικό Κόμμα] Democratic Party (Cyprus) |
| DP | [Demokrat Parti] Democratic Party (northern Cyprus) |
| EAKX | [Εθνικόν Αγροτικόν Κόμμα Χιτών] National Agrarian Party of Chites |
| EAM | [Εθνικό Απελευθερωτικό Μέτωπο] National Liberation Front |
| EDA | [Ενιαία Δημοκρατική Αριστερά] United Democratic Left |
| EDEK | [Ενιαία Δημοκρατική Ένωση Κέντρου] United Democratic Union of Center |
| ELAM | [Εθνικό Λαϊκό Μέτωπο] National People's Front |
| ELAS | [Ελληνικός Λαϊκός Απελευθερωτικός Στρατός] The Greek People's Liberation Army |
| Enosis | Union with Greece |
| EOKA | [Εθνική Οργάνωσις Κυπρίων Αγωνιστών] National Organization of Cypriot Fighters |
| Evkaf | Muslim charitable endowment |
| GD | [Χρυσή Αυγή] Golden Dawn |

| | |
|---|---|
| KKE | [Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα Ελλάδας] Communist Party of Greece |
| KKK or CPC | [Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα Κύπρου] Communist Party of Cyprus |
| Kurtuluş Savaşı | Turkish War of Independence |
| NAM | Non-Aligned Movement |
| National Party of Chites | Εθνικό Κόμμα Χιτών ("Χ") |
| NATO | North Atlantic Treaty Organization |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organization |
| PAK | [Πανελλήνιο Απελευθερωτικό Κίνημα] Panhellenic Liberation Movement |
| PASOK | [Πανελλήνιο Σοσιαλιστικό Κίνημα] Panhellenic Socialist Movement |
| PEO | [Παγκύπρια Εργατική Ομοσπονδία] Pancyprian Federation of Labour |
| PIO | [Γραφείο Τύπου και Πληροφοριών] Press and Information Office |
| SEK | [Συνομοσπονδία Εργαζομένων Κύπρου] Cyprus Workers' Confederation |
| Taksim | Partition |
| TİP | [Türkiye İşçi Partisi] Workers' Party of Turkey |
| TKP | [Toplumcu Kurtuluş Partisi] Communal Salvation Party (northern Cyprus) |
| TKP | [Türkiye Komünist Partisi] Communist Party of Turkey |
| TMT | [Türk Mukavement Teşkilatı] The Turkish Resistance Organization (Cyprus) |
| UBP | [Ulusal Birlik Partisi] National Unity Party (northern Cyprus) |
| UN | The United Nations |

# List of Figures

# Introduction: Cypriot Nationalism(s) in Context

*Nikos Christofis and Thekla Kyritsi*

The word "nation" stems from the Latin verb *nasci*, "to be born," initially coined to define a group of people native to the same area. The word has assumed various meanings throughout the centuries: Once referring to students coming from the same region or country, it later acquired a new sense as a designation of the social elite representing any political or spiritual authority in the medieval arrangement (Dieckhoff and Jaffrelot 2005, p. 2). By the sixteenth century—largely as a result of political liberalization in England—its meaning had crystallized, coming to be identified with "the people," thereby elevating the latter as the new bearer of sovereignty, a concept that is, of course, closely linked with the state. As Dieckhoff and Jaffrelot (2005, p. 2) suggest "sovereignty became embodied in a state which had acquired the profile of a centralized apparatus." Thus, from the state as a political entity ruled by

N. Christofis (✉)
Center for Turkish Studies and College of History and Civilization,
Shaanxi Normal University, Xi'an, China

T. Kyritsi
Political Science and History, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences,
Athens, Greece

1

the monarch, or the state as *being* the monarch—reflected in the famous quote *L'etat, c'est moi* which is attributed to the French king Louis XIV—we passed to *L'etat, c'est le peuple*, namely to the nation as *being*—and ruled by—its people.

This led many theorists to argue in favor of the idea of nationalism (like sovereignty) as a quintessentially modern phenomenon. Kedourie (1960), for example, argued that nationalism is "a doctrine invented in Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century" (p. 9), while Gellner (1983) asserted that it was a necessary political doctrine that appeared in the modern world after the industrial revolution because political units were organized along nationalist principles, suggesting that "the political and the national unit should be congruent" (p. 1). Hobsbawm (1990) supplements Gellner's views with an understanding of nationalism as a tendency to collective identification, which is concomitant with the state's extending reach (p. 9). This collective identification for Anderson (2006) is depicted in the widely used notion of *imagined community*. In other words, we could agree, at least as a starting base, with the following definition, suggested by Antony Marx (2003, p. 6):

> Nationalism… [is] a collective sentiment or identity, bounding and binding together those individuals who share a sense of large-scale political solidarity aimed at creating, legitimizing or challenging states. [And] as such, nationalism is perceived or justified by a sense of historical commonality which coheres a population within a territory and which demarcates those who belong and those who are not.

Nationalism, broadly conceived, has penetrated and interacted with a whole array of different ideologies and political attitudes, ranging across the political spectrum, including some segments of the Left. For example, many historians have observed that, in its initial stages, nationalism was associated with liberal movements (such as the French nationalism linked to the French Revolution) but through time it was "increasingly taken up by conservative and reactionary politicians" (Heywood 2007, p. 145). Similarly, one can talk of liberal nationalism as well as left-wing nationalism or anti-colonial nationalism et cetera (e.g., Nimni 1994; Christofis and Palieraki in this volume).

Relevant to that last point, and Cyprus for that matter, is the contribution made by anti-colonial scholars and Marxist ideas. For example, the leftist and anti-colonial intellectual Aimé Césaire (2000), although he removed himself from association with the USSR, made reference to Marxism and the role that socialism could play in the liberation of colonized people: "It is a new society that we must create… For some examples showing that this is possible, we can look to the Soviet Union" (p. 11). For Césaire—as for many leftists—the oppressed people under the term proletariat remained "the only class that still has a universal mission, because it suffers in its flesh from all the wrongs of history, from all the universal wrongs" (p. 24). A few years later, the Marxist philosopher and revolutionary, Frantz Fanon (1963) argued that "The Third World must not be content to define itself in relation to values which preceded it" (p. 55), namely the capitalist and the socialist system. For Fanon, the underdeveloped countries "which made use of the savage competition between the two systems in order to win their national liberation, must, however, refuse to get involved in such rivalry" (p. 55).

Fanon's analysis was quite revealing in many respects for the case of Cyprus, when he argued that "the colonialist bourgeoisie frantically seeks contact with the colonized elite" (p. 9), referring to the colonial powers' attempts to maintain control of the colonies through control of the "independent" governments. For Fanon, the process of decolonization as a response to colonialism was part of the struggle that the colonized faced to become free. He advocated that decolonization unified the people "by the radical decision to remove [it] from heterogeneity, and by unifying it on a national, sometimes a racial bias" (p. 30). Indeed, decolonization brought with it the rise of nationalism, which would rally anti-colonial movements and solidify cultural identity, and in doing so it would exclude other groups. This is apparent in the case of Cyprus where anti-colonial forces within the Greek Cypriot majority brought nationalism forward while "a Greek national identity missed out those who identified themselves as Turkish or as other minorities living within the two major ethnic groups" (Papastavrou 2012, p. 97).

It becomes evident that nationalism has proved to be one of the most powerful forces in the modern world (Hutchinson and Smith 1994, p. 3). As is well known, it has come to permeate, in various degrees, almost all aspects of daily life, from politics to economics and social

relations. Nationalism is, however, not static; it therefore makes no sense to talk about a single nationalism; rather we must give credence to the existence of multiple nationalisms. Beyond the different forms of nationalisms based on internal characteristics and their relationships with other identities or affiliations—e.g., liberal/conservative/socialist/feminist nationalism—different distinctions between nationalisms have been suggested by scholars according to criteria such as their characteristics and their place in the history or the geography of the world. For example, some scholars have advanced a distinction between *formal/informal* (Eriksen 1993) and *official/unofficial* nationalism (Özkırımlı 2002). While official nationalism ought to be understood as a process imposed from above—involving bureaucracy and state institutions to structure and support it, becoming thus part of the official ideology that seeks to homogenize and discipline society (Katsourides, Kalantzopoulos, Christofis in this volume)—unofficial nationalism refers to more sentimental and reactionary values closely related to daily life. Of course, the two forms inevitably form a symbiotic relationship, even if at any given moment they are in harmony, overlap or are in competition with each other (Özkırımlı 708–709; also, Öztan 2015, p. 75). Another distinction, which is quite evident in some of the chapters in this volume (e.g., this chapter and Kıralp), is Smith's (1991) distinction between "civic" and "ethnic" nationalism. The former refers to a specific nationalism putting emphasis on common civic or political belonging and shared territory, while the latter refers to a national identity stressing common ethnicity, culture, and traditions—characteristics which could also be linked with "liberal" and "conservative" nationalism, respectively.

This brings us to the geography of nationalism and the distinction between Western/non-Western nationalisms. Although there is a distinct and recognizable continuity with nineteenth-century European forms and ideologies, there have been at the same time inevitable mutations, as nationalism has adapted to or been reconstructed by cultures with different traditions from the West. In this scheme, the dichotomy between colonizers and colonized nationalisms is quite relevant. It can be argued, as Krishna (1999) pointed out, that "the metaphor of nation as journey, as something that is ever in the making but never quite reached [is] central to nationalisms everywhere" (p. 17). In the non-Western space, however, this is a process which "[s]ecures the legitimacy of the postcolonial state by centering its historical role in the pursuit of certain desired futures. [And] it undergirds the legitimacy of the state by securing for it

both time and space." Yet, one must bear in mind that this never-ending journey in subaltern, non-Western spaces shares commonalities with that of Western nation-states even as there are also significant differences. While in the latter, "the endless deferment is on the question of extending the idea of community to a global space," in the "space called the postcolony, the endless deferment is on the question of achieving national unity itself" (Krishna 1999, p. 18).[1]

The tendency therefore to locate nationalism on the "periphery" and to overlook the nationalism of Western nation-states has also been criticized on legitimate grounds. In other words, the sense that "those in established nations at the center of things are led to see nationalism as the property of others, not of 'us'" (Billig 2008, p. 5; Papadakis et al. 2006; also Christofis in this volume) is a false sense, resembling Orwell's (1953) observation—quite familiar to the Cypriot public—that "the nationalist not only does not disapprove of atrocities committed by his [or her] own side, but he [or she] has a remarkable capacity for not even hearing about them."

Following the end of World War II, the experience of decolonization, coupled with general developments in the social sciences, saw an intensive and prolific period of research on nationalism (Connor 1984; Young 2001; Özkırımlı 2010). There is no doubt that nationalism has attracted growing attention from scholars in a range of disciplines—sociology, anthropology, history, politics, even literature, and philosophy. This rich scientific work, some of which is mentioned above, has formed a core of theoretical approaches that have informed case studies on specific nationalisms. Although there is a booming literature on nationalism in general, and on Cyprus in particular (Christofis 2018), scientific research that looks at the phenomenon of nationalism in Cyprus in an interdisciplinary way and from the perspective of global developments remains underresearched (see also Trimikliniotis and Bozkurt 2012; Karakatsanis and Papadogiannis 2017). The present volume is an attempt in that direction, one that seeks to qualify the heterogeneity of nationalism in the Cypriot context.

## Nationalisms and the Cyprus Question[2]: Past and Present

Cyprus is an ethnically mixed island in the Eastern Mediterranean (see Figs. 1.1 and 1.2). Its central geostrategic position in the Mediterranean basin has made the island a target of outside conquest over the centuries:

**Fig. 1.1** Eastern Mediterranean Sea (*Source* http://d-maps.com/carte.php?num_car=33798&lang=en)

the Assyrians, Persians, Hellenes and Romans in ancient times, through to Byzantine, Lusignan, Venetian, and Ottoman rule across the medieval, premodern, and modern period; and, finally, the British from the nineteenth century. In its modern form, the Cyprus Question can be defined and analyzed "as a confrontation between two nationalisms on Cyprus, namely Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot nationalism, which were forms of Greek nationalism and Turkish nationalism" (Carpentier 2017, p. 237). In that respect, the Ottoman rule of the island, especially the nineteenth century, as well as the British colonial administration of the island shaped the modern and contemporary history of Cyprus.

After three centuries of Ottoman rule (1571–1878), Cyprus became part of the British Empire in 1878. That year should be considered as a milestone in the process of transition from traditional social structures

**Fig. 1.2** Map of Cyprus (*Source* http://d-maps.com/carte.php?num_car= 58294&lang=en)

to what is called modernity. As in other regions of the world, Cypriot modernity involved economic capitalism (Katsourides 2014); a modern system of transportation and technology (Varnava 2009); the development of the print world, mass media, and mass education (Katsiaounis 1996); along with the emergence of new ideas and movements, such as nationalism, socialism (Katsourides 2014; Alecou 2016), and feminism (Kyritsi in this volume).

However, modernity has not been experienced the same way everywhere in the world. In Cyprus, the legacy of the Ottoman Empire would shape the Cypriot experience of modernity itself (Anagnostopoulou 2015). The nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire was defined by a specific form of multi-culturalism, the *millet* system, which saw the subjects of the Empire categorized based on their confession or ethnoreligious community (*millet*). Each *millet* was internally autonomous, under the guidance of its respective religious authorities. When the British conducted the first census of the island, in 1881, this reality would be reflected in the multi-communality of the Cypriot population. According to the census, in a population of 186,173 people (Colonial Office 1881), the largest community were the

Orthodox Christians—the *millet-iRum* in Ottoman parlance—who made up 73.9% of the population. The second largest was the Muslim community, being 24.4% of the people. The rest—1.7%—belonged in other communities; more particularly, 0.7% of the population were Roman Catholics, then came the Maronites (0.4%) and the Protestants (0.4%). Moreover, there were 0.1% identified as Armenians or Copts and finally a small number of Jews and Gypsies (Colonial Office 1881).

In the scheme of the *millet* system, the representative of the Orthodox community of Cyprus was the Archbishop of the autocephalous Orthodox Church of Cyprus while the *kadı* (judge) and the *müftü* (interpreter of the Sharia law) made up the religious leadership of the local Muslim community (Aymes 2014). However, the arrival of the British in 1878 came at a moment when the Ottoman *millet* system had already begun to rupture under the influence of modern nation-states. The Greek War of Independence and the official recognition of the newly founded Greek state in 1830 played a central role in this process which in the case of the Greek Cypriot community would soon feed a desire for *enosis* (i.e., union with Greece). By the end of the nineteenth century, a small body of educated individuals within the Orthodox majority of the island had begun to think of their community in terms of ethnic identity.

That said, nationalism "was not… a constant feature in this Mediterranean isle's history, nor did it emerge as an axis of tension in a sudden instant" (Altay 2005, p. 11). Members of the literate minority—including teachers, lawyers, small business owners, as well as educated clerics—were the first to be affected by the ideology of Greek nationalism in Cyprus. This identity which was at first embraced by a small group of educated elites, such as the Greek immigrant teacher, politician, and journalist, Nikolaos Katalanos (Katsiaounis 1996, pp. 215–223), would gradually spread to the lower strata (Sakellaropoulos 2017) by the 1930s and 1940s.

The British arrival in Cyprus disclosed—and in a way, accelerated—the formation of the preconditions for nationalism to become a mass movement. Immediately upon their arrival, the British introduced a quasi-representative body, the Legislative Council—although its representativeness was undermined by the fact that even at the beginning of the twentieth century fewer than one in 10 people on the island were eligible to vote, due to age, property and gender-based exclusions (Protopapas 2012, p. 49). This, however, became the first time that Cypriots were engaged

in a process of modern elections and politics. At the same time, immediately after the arrival of the British in 1878 the first Greek newspaper circulated on the island. By 1890, seven Greek-language newspapers existed, reaching approximately 3000 subscribers while 450 books had been published (Bryant 2004, p. 33).

In the same year, the sole Turkish language weekly, *Saded*, had only 64 subscribers (Bryant 2004, p. 33; also, An 1997). Like Turkish nationalism, the Turkish language press developed after the Greek. Nevertheless, after 1908 the Young Turk movement who had begun to act in the Ottoman Empire affected Cyprus. A number of Young Turks—exiled from the Ottoman Empire due to their opposition to the sultan's regime—arrived in Cyprus in the early 1890s and contributed to the publication of the Turkish newspapers *Zaman* and *Kıbrıs* (Bryant 2004, p. 34). During this period—and especially after the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 in the Ottoman Empire—a patriotic identity of "Ottomanism" started to affect the literate intellectuals among the Muslim Cypriots (Altay and Hatay 2009; Altay 2005).

The foundation of the Republic of Turkey by Mustafa Kemal (later Atatürk) in 1923 and his circle provided the conditions for the development of a Turkish Cypriot nationalism. The Kemalist modernization project, with its emphasis on secularism, republicanism, and nationalism, had a strong appeal for the Turkish Cypriots—or Muslim Cypriots as they were labeled at the time (Carpentier 2017, p. 244). In Cyprus, the Muslim Turks were redefined as Turks in the 1930s (Kızılyürek 2005), and other reforms, such as the Latin alphabet and Western forms of dress, were enacted almost simultaneously with those in Kemalist Turkey. Indeed, as Altay (2005) rightly pointed out, "the rise of Turkish nationalism on the island had become appreciable by the time of the October Revolt in 1931" (p. 442; also, Carpentier 2017).

Meanwhile, up until the 1920s, the Greek Cypriot alliance with the Greek state soon led all segments of Cypriot society to espouse *enosis*, except for the Communist Party of Cyprus (CPC) established in 1926 (Leventis 2002; Katsourides 2014). In that respect, during the twentieth century, the Greek Orthodox Church, the oldest institution in Cyprus, would be a key factor in the gradual development of a Greek national identity and an ethnic Greek nationalism, stressing ethnicity, tradition and cultural roots. The demand for *enosis*, however, did not constitute

a threat to British rule during this period, and the same held true for Turkish Cypriots (Kızılyürek 2002). The nationalist sentiments of the Greek Cypriots were rather sporadic and carefully kept within the framework of cooperation with the colonial ruler and the friendship between Greece and Britain. From the late nineteenth century to the 1920s, nationalist opposition was rather mild and was thus generally tolerated by the colonial powers. Cypriot national demands did not go beyond resolutions and verbal claims, and remained strictly within the framework of legality (Faustmann 1999, p. 22).

However, in 1931, a nationalist Greek Cypriot Revolt was met with a harsh reaction from the British administration and a despotic crackdown against any expression of national sentiment for the remainder of the decade (Rappas 2014). Nevertheless, by the 1940s both Greek and Turkish nationalisms had crystallized and come to dominate their respective communities on the island. Following World War II, the Greek Cypriots felt that freedom and self-government was their due. In a Church-run referendum held between January 15–22, 1950, no less than 95.73% of the entire Greek Cypriot community recorded their votes in favor of independence (Loizides 2007, p. 175). The conflicting nature of the Cyprus Question can be traced to the 1950s, when the armed struggle against British rule unfolded alongside inter-communal violence among the two largest communities living on the island, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, amid rising waves of nationalism (Yüksek and Carpentier 2018, p. 6). In the context of a growing nationalism and dissatisfaction with British rule, right-wing Greek nationalists formed the National Organization of Cypriot Fighters (*Εθνική Οργάνωσις Κυπρίων Αγωνιστών*, EOKA) in 1955, which conducted a guerrilla insurgency with the aim of ending the British rule in Cyprus and achieving *enosis* (Alimi et al. 2015, pp. 98–128). While Greek Cypriots strove for *enosis*, Turkish Cypriots, who initially opted for the continuation of British rule, demanded taksim—the partition of the island into two separate territories (Bahcheli 1990; Papadakis et al. 2006, pp. 2–4).

This gave nationalists, along with the political Right and the Church, a leading role in the anti-colonial movement, which during the 1940s was threatened by the growing anti-colonial forces of the Left and a vibrant labor movement—with the popularization of trade unions and the establishment of the new leftist Progressive Party of the Working People (*Ανορθωτικό Κόμμα Εργαζόμενου Λαού*, AKEL). Emerging in 1941, AKEL rapidly gained massive support as the legal umbrella party

of the Left; in contrast to the low membership of the illegal and strictly communist CPC which had existed since 1926.

Drawing symbols from the "national center" of Greece, EOKA initially planned to initiate its actions on the anniversary of the 1821 Greek revolution, on 25 March 1955, also a major Orthodox religious holiday (Loizides 2007, p. 176; Papadakis 1999, p. 25). In addition, the leadership of EOKA, with Georgios Grivas at its head—known for his ultra-nationalist and anti-communist tactics and ideas during the Greek Civil War (1946–1949)—not only excluded the Turkish Cypriots and the Leftists from its lines but soon turned against them (Pollis 1979; Drousiotis 1998; Michael 2016).

On the nationalist front, a few years after the establishment of EOKA, in 1958, Turkish nationalists formed the Turkish Resistance Organization (*Türk Mukavemet Teşkilatı*, TMT), which would play a significant role in the following decades. In the meantime, Cyprus gained its independence in 1960 as the Republic of Cyprus, which was recognized as an independent state of 600,000 people, 80% of whom were Greek Cypriots and 18% Turkish Cypriots (Papadakis et al. 2006, p. 2). Independence was accompanied with particular conditions. These included retention, by Britain, of specific zones/areas of the island to be used as military bases and recognition of Greece, Turkey, and Britain, as the "guarantor" powers holding the right to take action to "re-establish the current state of affairs in Cyprus" if the latter was in jeopardy.

The relatively peaceful coexistence between the two communities of the island would not last for long. Following a constitutional crisis in 1963, a new wave of inter-communal violent conflicts re-emerged, and rejuvenating, if at all forgotten, the old demands for *enosis* and *taksim*. Beyond the human casualties—which this time impacted more the Turkish Cypriots in terms of casualties (Papadakis et al. 2006, p. 2), considering that one-fifth of them were gradually displaced during 1963–1967 (Patrick 1976)—the conflicts also resulted in the first geographical division between the two communities in some areas of the island, where the Turkish Cypriots were secluded in enclaves, or purely Turkish villages (Bryant 2004, p. 3). Since this time, the United Nations has maintained a continuous presence on the island.

In 1974, a *coup d'état* against the Cypriot government occurred—initiated by the military junta in Greece and supported by the Greek Cypriot ultra-nationalist paramilitary organization, EOKA B. This is considered the climax of confrontations between the competing groups within the

Greek Cypriot community. The coup was swiftly followed by a Turkish invasion of the island, on 16 August 1974, Turkey's pretext being the protection of the Turkish Cypriots, which it was pursuing as a guarantor power; a right vested in Ankara by the London–Zurich Agreements of 1959. The Turkish invasion saw more than 200000 people turning into refugees and internally displaced, 6000 killed and approximately 1500 missing (Kovras 2017, p. 159). This time, the Greek Cypriots were more affected in quantitative terms and almost one-third of them were displaced (Loizos 1981; Papadakis et al. 2006, p. 3). Moreover, the invasion forced the de facto division of the whole island into two parts; Greek Cypriots fled to the south and Turkish Cypriots moved to the north while Turkish forces occupied the northern part of Cyprus—some 36.2% of Cypriot territory.

Since 1974 Cyprus has remained divided in two: one part covering the southern part of the island, controlled by the internationally recognized Republic of Cyprus. The northern part declared itself unilaterally the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" in 1983, but is recognized only by Turkey. Even as the de facto partition continues, the two communities continue to be in reunification talks to solve the issue on the grounds of a bizonal, bicommunal federation. This should allow one central Cyprus government but two autonomous—more or less—zones/states. In the meantime, the bipolarity of this whole historical scheme has forced the smaller ethnic groups of Cyprus to in effect "choose" one or the other side; indeed, the 1960 Constitution recognized only two national communities—Greek and Turkish Cypriots—and minorities such as the Maronites, Armenians and Latins were seen as religious communities and were asked to choose which of the two national communities they wished to join (Kasbarian, this volume). Overall, the assumption of homogeneity regarding each "pole" has left little space for visible multi-culturalism and diversity, and continued to undermine other forms of identity beyond ethnicity.

## THE SCOPE OF THE VOLUME

If there is a theoretical assumption that holds the chapters of this volume together, it would be the historical approach to nationalism, namely the view that the world of nations, ethnic identity, and national ideology are neither *eternal*, nor *ahistorical* or *primordial* but are rather socially constructed and function within particular historical and social contexts. Another premise of this volume is that Cyprus, as a place that was, and still is, marked by the collision of opposed nationalisms—that is, Greek

and Turkish—constitutes a fertile ground for examining the history, the dynamics and the dialectics of nationalism.

The volume is a collection of chapters by authors of different perspectives and academic fields. Taking Cypriot nationalisms as its case study, it examines moments of nationalism; as a form of identity, as a form of ideology and as a form of politics. While the scope of the book is mainly empirical, in the sense that it does not aspire to discuss a universal definition or theory of nationalism, it draws heavily on the hypothesis that the case of Cyprus can illustrate general theories of nationalism and can be an interesting case to evaluate their central postulates.

Without following a strict chronological order, nor an order of "importance," that is, without suggesting that the particular subjects are the (only) key events or perspectives that have shaped the culture of nationalism in Cyprus, the chapters presented in the book examine specific moments in the development of nationalisms on the island. The goal is for this diversity to present a range of perspectives on the broader canvas of the Cypriot experience, presented in a comparative and interdisciplinary framework that underscores nationalism's relationship with other forms of identities and loyalties, such as religion, class, gender, and political orientation. The readers of the book will notice that "nationalism" is given its plural form in the title, not only to stress the existence of the opposing nationalisms (Greek, Turkish) that continue to shape Cyprus, but also because of the non-static nature of the phenomenon and the existence of internal distinctions.

## Part I: Early Agents of Nationalism

The first part of the volume examines early expressions of nationalism in Cyprus. In a global context, this historical period corresponds to phases A and B in the famous schema suggested by Miroslav Hroch (2012) regarding the historical phases of nationalist movements. According to Hroch, there are three phases in such movements: phase A refers to an initial period in which "activists [are] above all devoted to scholarly enquiry into and dissemination of an awareness of the linguistic, cultural, social and sometimes historical attributes of the non-dominant group—but without, on the whole, pressing specifically national demands to remedy deficits" (2012, p. 81). Phase B includes "a new range of activists" who "[seek] to win over as many of their ethnic group as possible to the project of creating a future nation, by patriotic agitation to 'awaken' national consciousness among them" (2012, p. 81). Finally, phase C refers to the formation of a mass national liberation movement.

The first chapter of the volume, by Yiannos Katsourides, emphasizes the social groups and institutions which consisted the first agents of Greek nationalism in Cyprus during the rise of Greek Cypriot Nationalism in the early twentieth century. Katsourides' contribution can be used also as a general introduction to the early agents of nationalism in Cyprus. Katsourides examines how an educated body of individuals, along with institutions such as the Church, the schools and the press, systematically promoted the new nationalist ideas. The second chapter, authored by Petros Nikolaou, unfolds the moments in which the relationship between the Greek Cypriots, as the *national self,* and the Turks or Turkish Cypriots as the *national other* was constructed. This is achieved through a detailed examination of an early agent of nationalism in Cyprus, that is, the Greek-language newspapers established between 1878 and 1914.

However, as Rebecca Bryant (2004) observes "there is no real contradiction between defining one's group in opposition to a constructive Other, and getting along with those others when in contact with them" (p. 2). The contradiction emerges in our case when "in modern representative politics claiming rights entails defining oneself as a certain type of person—a citizen—with claims on a particular state. It is there that the theoretical articulation of experience—namely, ideology—comes into play and divides." This process in the first years of the British rule in Cyprus was expressed by the Legislative Council, which was the body that the British administration introduced to supposedly represent the Cypriot communities.

The Legislative Council was the first institution resembling Western structures of representation in Cyprus, although it was characterized by limited authority and extremely limited representation. This is the subject of the third chapter of the volume, by Meltem Onurkan-Samani, who explores the role of this Council in the transition from religious to national identity and from traditional to modern sociopolitical structures. From 1882 to 1931, especially, the Council affected and expressed early nationalist sentiments as well as ethnic division and the competition between the two communities in the framework of a modern colonial Cyprus.

The final chapter of this part, penned by Thekla Kyritsi, examines the role of women in the first steps of the nationalist ideology in Cyprus. The analysis focuses on the strong attachment between the first feminists and the early national sentiments. Although the dominant narrative has