Contributions to Political Science

Yiannos Katsourides

The Greek Cypriot Nationalist Right in the Era of British Colonialism

Emergence, Mobilisation and Transformations of Right-Wing Party Politics

Springer

Contributions to Political Science

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/11829

Yiannos Katsourides

The Greek Cypriot Nationalist Right in the Era of British Colonialism

Emergence, Mobilisation and Transformations of Right-Wing Party Politics

Springer

Yiannos Katsourides
OED 1
University of Cyprus
Nicosia, Cyprus

ISSN 2198-7289 ISSN 2198-7297 (electronic)
Contributions to Political Science
ISBN 978-3-319-55534-8 ISBN 978-3-319-55536-2 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55536-2

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017936140

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Preface

In the last two decades, there has been a remarkable flourishing of studies targeting Cyprus history and politics. To a degree, this growth in research can be explained by and conforms to international trends that point to both the expansion of higher education and a growing interest in social studies. In Cyprus, there has also been a renewed interest in historiography—particularly studies that try to reconstruct aspects of the past. The body of social and political research—regardless of the period of study—tends to focus on topics such as the Cyprus problem, the Church of Cyprus and international relations. This book examines internal politics in the Greek Cypriot community in the first half of the twentieth century, an area of study usually ignored. Very few studies have made political parties their primary focus (e.g. Katsourides 2013; Protopapas 2012; Attalides 1986), and most research into political parties has looked at the more recent years where information is more accessible (e.g. Ellinas and Katsourides 2013; Katsourides 2012; Christophorou 2006a). Thus, the majority of extant studies on the Cyprus political/social scene make but limited reference to the early stages of party formation with the result that there is no clear and complete history of political parties in Cyprus. This book tries to fill in this void without overlooking the Cyprus problem wherever appropriate, since Cyprus politics cannot be understood without reference to it.

My intention in this book is to outline the fundamental axes/factors of Greek Cypriots' nationalist politics as these were reflected in the ideological and political patterns that emerged in the first half of the twentieth century. The study of these ideological and political patterns/schemes allows the researcher to detect the mechanisms through which political antitheses emerged, political choices were made and political changes were implemented in Cyprus. By focusing the research on internal politics factors, I aim to stimulate critical thinking in political analysis that goes beyond the mere displacement of responsibilities and sources of bad luck in external actors (that are obviously present). The analysis of internal dynamics within the Greek Cypriot community can contribute to identifying the real effect of these external influences, as well as the limited choices left available for a small people like Cypriots to pursue.

The book's focus is political, more specifically, political developments in the broader context of social, ideological and economic determinants. This book is concerned with processes of political change in Cyprus during the first decades of the twentieth century. This means looking at changing forms of political life, the way in which the political sphere reconstituted itself generally, and a specific set of changes in the ideology and organisation of the Greek Cypriots. The book considers these issues by looking in detail at a particular political space, i.e. the nationalist Right. This was the dominant social and political actor at the time (and also later), represented mainly by the Church of Cyprus and certain organisations/pressure groups advocating union with Greece (*enosis*), which in the 1940s crystallised into political parties, trade unions and other associated organisations.

My aim is not to produce formal histories of these groups/parties, although to some extent this is unavoidable; my aim is to use the histories to open up larger questions that relate to forms of political mobilisation and organisation within a specific colonial context. My concern is to use these specific histories to clarify the larger political relationships in which they were situated. These histories were located in an overall perspective of change initiated by the Ottoman regime in the second half of the nineteenth century and accelerated by British colonial reforms, through which the political contribution of the nationalist organisations and parties may be assessed: the conditions of their formation, their internal social relations, the character of their ideology, their mode of political practice and the internal dynamic of their development. Events and processes in these organisations illustrate the main features of the evolving relationship between the nationalists and the existing system of politics.

More precisely, the book analyses the processes and factors that contributed to the emergence, constitution and eventual consolidation of the Greek Cypriot Nationalist Right in the era of British colonialism. The Greek Cypriot Right was—and still remains—a political and cultural space that expressed the interests of the Greek Cypriot ruling classes and the dominant ideology of nationalism, as is the usual case with right-wing political forces in every country. Nevertheless, for long periods of time throughout the twentieth century the nationalists remained trapped in conflicting positions and practices that led to unexpected and often tragic consequences (e.g. the October riots in 1931 and the coup in 1974).

My examination focuses on explaining internal politics in Cyprus—and specifically nationalist right-wing politics—as an expression of a modernity very specific to Cyprus society rather than considering such a political bent to be merely a consequence of serious faults within Cyprus society. Nationalist party politics is a perfect example for this. Moreover, the radicalisation of nationalist politics that occurred intermittently was in fact a threefold response: a critique of Cypriot modernity's limitations; a reaction to British inertia and denial towards their claims; and advances of the communist Left. It is key, therefore, to consider the source of their radicalisation. Nationalist, right-wing politics occurred on two levels of the public realm. The first was the intra-community level (e.g. the Church, the press, etc.); the second was the civic/state level that included elections for the Legislative Council and/or the Municipal Councils and appointments in the state apparatus.

The book offers research and analyses related to the development of a new political movement and organisation in Cyprus. Furthermore, it addresses the social, religious, economic and political environment of nationalist politics in a small country inextricably linked with Greece, Turkey and Great Britain. Overall, the book's scope is to provide a systematic and methodical understanding, as well as analysis, of one of the most critical political actors in the modern history of Cyprus, i.e. the (nationalist) right-wing movement. Analysis is focused on the ways that the (new and emerging) social structure interacts with (past and enduring) social practices (e.g. clientelism), ideology (nationalism and union with Greece as its political mandate), religion (the powerful Church of Cyprus), internal opposition (communism) and external influences (e.g. British authorities and the Greek government), in the development and consolidation of political life in Cyprus and particularly the nationalist Right camp.

The period under examination extends from the onset of the twentieth century to the year 1955, not without reason. This date is considered a landmark in nationalist, right-wing party politics since it was the year that the EOKA (National Organisation of Cypriot Fighters) armed struggle against Britain broke out. In 1943, prior to the EOKA, the right-wing camp had established, in response to the Left, the Cypriot National Party (KEK), which unified for the first time the hitherto scattered right-wing forces and formations on the island. In the 1940s, other structures of political representation of the Right were also established that proved durable: a trade union and an agrarian organisation. The history of right-wing party politics reveals a process of decomposition and regrouping, with an initial more protracted phase taking place in the 1900s and a latter more durable one beginning in the early 1940s and ending with the EOKA in 1955.

While this book is a Cyprus-based case study, it pertains to important areas of questioning that go beyond this specific focus. Its contemporary significance lies in the fact that an understanding of the above-mentioned period enables us to frame and contextualise Cyprus's current political history and politics. The issues and cleavages fashioned during these turbulent years significantly influenced the configuration of the party system in Cyprus (and particularly the Right political space) long afterwards; most important, however, is that these explain the continuous division and factionalism among the Greek Cypriot Right, as well as why a more tolerant and liberal tendency never acquired significant social backing until the late 1990s and early 2000s. An understanding of these divisions and factions can reveal the reasons underlying the subsequent formation of a variety of political parties on the Right of the political spectrum.

Knowledge of these divisions also enables us to understand the role that Greek Cypriot nationalism and its internal divisions played in the country's relationships with the British, the Turkish Cypriots and Turkey in the sensitive area of Eastern Mediterranean. Greek Cypriot nationalists of the early twentieth century challenged the colonial status of Cyprus and provided, in the years that followed, the basis for two of the most controversial organisations in Cypriot history: first, the EOKA organisation that carried out the armed struggle in 1955–1959 against Britain and

that led to the independence of Cyprus, although the purpose of the struggle was *enosis*, and, second, the extremist paramilitary organisation EOKA II in the early 1970s that led to the military coup of 1974 and the subsequent Turkish invasion. In addition, various nationalistic cliques formed a number of paramilitary organisations in the 1960s.

The research questions were examined using a combination of both primary and secondary sources. Specifically:

(a) Secondary literature for mapping out all the relevant information.
(b) Archive research in Cyprus, Greece and the National Archives in Britain.
(c) Indexing of relevant Greek Cypriot newspapers of the period.

Nicosia, Cyprus Yiannos Katsourides

References

Katsourides Y (2013) Nationalism, anti-colonialism and the crystallisation of Greek cypriot nationalist party politics. Commonwealth Comp Polit 51(4):503–523

Protopapas V (2012) The electoral history of Cyprus: politicians, parties and elections in Anglokratia 1878–1960. Themelio Publications, Athens (in Greek)

Attalides M (1986) The parties in cyprus (1878–1955). Lectures of the Popular University, No. 2. Municipality of Nicosia Publications, Nicosia, pp 123–153 (in Greek)

Ellinas A, Katsourides Y (2013) Organizational continuity and electoral endurance: the communist party of Cyprus. West Eur Polit 36(4):859–882

Katsourides Y (2012) Travelling against the tide: the cypriot communist left in the post-1990 Era. Perspect Eur Polit Soc 13(2):187–209

Christophorou C (2006a) Party change and development in Cyprus (1995–2005). South Eur Soc Polit 11(3–4):513–542

Acknowledgements

This book grew out of my PhD thesis, *The Early Party System of Cyprus, 1878–1931,* which I completed in 2009 for the Department of Political Sciences of the University of Cyprus. This particular theme opened the doors to the fascinating field of political parties, but also, and most crucially, it made me realise the links between history and politics. However, it is my late friend and colleague, the historian Rolandos Katsiaounis, who many years ago suggested writing a book on the Greek Cypriot Right when I was still unsure of what to focus my research on, who is most responsible for this book. Rolandos pointed out to me the lack of research on the party-political right-wing in Cyprus, despite the fact that they represent the dominant political actor on the island. Although I did not take his advice then, in time I realised the truth of his words and so began research on this book.

In the process of writing this book, so many people—including academics and practitioners—offered me their knowledge, feedback and constructive criticism: Caesar Mavratsas, Maria Hadjipavlou, Michalis Spourdalakis, Rolandos Katsiaounis, Petros Papapolyviou, Yiannakis Kolokasides, Andreas Panayiotou, Kostas Gouliamos and Michalis Michael. I particularly thank my former supervisor, Kyriakos Demetriou, who encouraged me to seriously research the issues and themes in this book.

In addition to the above-mentioned persons, many friends and colleagues have helped me with their advice and encouragement. Whether they are aware of this or not, they have all, and in various ways, helped to make this book a reality. I give them all my heartfelt thanks.

I am particularly indebted to two foundations that supported me financially: the Leventis Foundation and the British School at Athens. Their generosity allowed me to take the necessary time to review all the relevant archival material at the National Archives in London as well as secondary literature. This assistance was vital to my research.

The Institute of Commonwealth Studies of the University of London offered me a unique opportunity for furthering my research on the subject during my 5-year

fellowship there (June 2010–December 2015). In particular, I would like to express my appreciation to the Director of the Institute, Professor Philip Murphy, for giving me the chance to be a part of this vibrant academic community, and Professor Robert Holland, for his time, advice and feedback on my work.

I would also like to thank Johannes Glaeser, Marion Kreisel and their colleagues at the editorial and production departments at Springer for their invaluable help and superb work in publishing this book, as well as the anonymous reviewer whose comments allowed me to articulate a more coherent and meaningful argument. Once again, I thank Kathy Stephanides for her language editing of the manuscript.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude and love to my family: my wife Yiota, my two sons Nicos and Stelios, my brother Alexandros and my father Nicos. Although no longer with us, I know that my late mother Androula would be the happiest person on earth to see this book coming to life. Therefore, I want to dedicate this book to all the members of my family, those here and those who have left us.

Book Outline

Chapter 1 engages with the literature referring to nationalism and to the emergence of political parties in colonial contexts. Because there is a wealth of information on this subject, it was necessary to narrow the focus. Therefore, the emphasis lay with the formation of political parties in colonised countries and particularly those that represented Britain's most significant European possessions: Cyprus and Malta. This allows for a uniform benchmark since British colonies in other areas of the world (e.g. Africa or Asia) were entirely different from their European dominions. In this regard, the introduction focuses on some important aspects of this topic. First, it compares the British colonial rule of the two aforementioned countries, highlighting the most important characteristics of their respective experiences and the key factors in the rise of party politics. Second, it argues that internal political factors both between and within ideological camps were the main driving force for political positions. Nationalism, in this regard, was employed in an instrumental way in political competition. The Introduction therefore presents the analytical and historical context of the book within a frame that accounts for the emergence and development of right-wing politics in Cyprus, as well as its transformations and subsequent manifestations. The frame emphasises the particular cleavages in Cypriot society, the impact of British colonialism and the internal balance of power within the Greek community, which led to recurrent internal divisions.

Chapter 2 oversees the island's transition from Ottoman occupation to British administration, noting the British continuities with the Ottoman past including practices such as clientelism (especially their sources and ways of expression). In this way, the limits of Cypriot modernisation can be better understood. The transition facilitated and accelerated the rise of the bourgeoisie and from within this class the emergence of a new sociopolitical elite that soon claimed its stake in political life. In my coverage of this transition, I look into major developments and social mechanisms emphasising economic reforms that led to the emergence of a new class structure on the island and particularly the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, the new social and economic structures still allowed much room for past practices such as clientelism to perpetuate.

Chapter 3 looks at the political innovations introduced by the British (e.g. the establishment of electoral processes, the provisions for franchise and the Legislative Council). Together, the new political institutions and social terrain created a favourable context for the development of party politics on the island, and electoral politics, as well as the tensions of political life, are clearly evident in these institutions. The chapter also emphasises those social and institutional shortcomings that have distorted party politics in Cyprus since their inception. Some were inherited from the Ottoman era (e.g. usury and clientelism), whilst others were the result of British choices and decisions (e.g. ethnic division). Clientelistic relationships and ethnic divisions are vital to understanding party politics in Cyprus, then and now, as these led to a political system characterised by the incomplete political integration of the masses and based on oligarchic parliamentarism.

Chapter 4 analyses the powerful role of nationalism—which was translated into the political demand for union with Greece (*enosis*)—in the transformation of Cyprus's political landscape. I explicate the perpetrators of nationalism in Cyprus, the island's linkage with Greece, the peculiarities of the nationalist movement, its gradual massification through a variety of means (e.g. the press) and processes or events (e.g. the Balkan Wars). *Enosis* was a radical claim at the time since it advocated a break with the British Empire. It cohered as a political position particularly after 1901 and the first victory of the nationalists in the elections for the vacant post of the Archbishop of Cyprus, becoming a hegemonic ideology despite the efforts of the British colonial authorities to halt its rise and mitigate its influence among the Greek Cypriots. The dominance of *enosis* represented an important radicalisation of Greek Cypriot politics involving a decisive rupture with past traditions and a proof of the Right's popular capability.

Chapter 5 explains how a premodern institution, i.e. the Church of Cyprus, not only survived the (incomplete) process of modernisation but managed to maintain its hegemonic position within the Cypriot sociopolitical milieu. In addition to the historical justifications for the Church's powerful position, two processes are important here: (a) the immediate conflict with the British authorities that helped the religious institution portray itself as the 'protector' of the Greek population of the island and (b) the Church's espousal of the nationalist ideology. This latter factor produced an inordinate amount of power in the hands of the higher clergy while also relegitimising the Church within society. The Church of Cyprus deserves special merit in the analysis because it constituted the link that provided coherence, unity, organisation and leadership to the dispersed and opposing fractions of the nationalist right-wing camp. The Church of Cyprus was also the only local institution representing the Greek Cypriots in the affairs over which they had total control.

Chapter 6 examines the first major and mass conflict in Cyprus, which revolved around and inside the Church of Cyprus. This concerned election to the post of Archbishop of Cyprus, the most prestigious title among the Greek Cypriots at the time. The chapter scrutinises the causes of the conflict, the social forces representing the various camps, their political discourse and organisation and the

election's impact on citizen participation in civic elections. Essentially, the Archiepiscopal Question was the catalyst for the nationalisation and ideologisation of the masses in Cyprus, and through this conflict, we can see the way Greek Cypriot politics fundamentally transformed.

Chapter 7 focuses on the mobilisation and organisation of the anti-colonial cleavage within the Greek community of Cyprus, which largely accounts for the nature of Greek Cypriot right-wing politics in the early decades of British rule and beyond. During the first decades of the twentieth century, the nationalist organisations and pressure groups offered a field of political involvement for members/activists of the rising bourgeoisie who felt marginalised by the colonial administration and the lack of channels for personal advancement. In the absence of proper state/political institutions, these organisations became the domain for power struggles both between their members and with the colonial administration. Moreover, nationalist party politics were also influenced by external influences (i.e. developments in Greece and the stance of British authorities) and the internal political opposition, i.e. the Communists. Consequently, the nature of their interaction and opposition is also examined along with their organisational structuring.

Chapter 8 examines the period following the 1931 October riots that marked the abolishment of the Constitution and the termination of all political activities on the island for a decade until the late 1940s when the Constitutional Assembly was convoked; the latter constituted a turning point in Cyprus internal politics. I explore the reasons behind the right-wing's compromise with the British authorities for more than a decade and how they were caught unaware by the rise of the Communist Party of Cyprus (CPC) in the early 1940s. The realisation of their inability to confront the CPC, which was renamed AKEL in 1941, and the fear of losing their primacy within the Greek Cypriot political system spurred the hitherto unorganised and scattered right-wing forces to cohere and organise in the early 1940s. Both the British and the Church facilitated this development for different reasons, and thus were founded the first ever island-wide party of the nationalist right in Cyprus, the Cypriot Nationalist Party (KEK), and the various organisations associated with the Right: the trade union (SEK), the agrarian organisation (PEK) and the youth organisations.

Chapter 9 covers the period from the late 1940s until 1955 the year that the EOKA armed struggle began, emphasising patterns of confrontation between the two camps, a facilitating factor for entrenching the nationalist bloc. In this chapter, I emphasise the way nationalism and anti-communism were mobilised and the particular role of the Cypriot Church in unifying the right-wing political space and provide it with leadership. The chapter concludes with an overview and evaluation of the main reasons that drove the nationalist right to radicalise its struggle to such an extent as to form a clandestine organisation (EOKA) in order to undertake an armed struggle against the British.

In the final chapter, *Conclusions*, I reflect on the discussions of the previous chapters and bring the different threads of the argument together to identify the

main reasons for the emergence of the Greek Cypriot nationalist movement. There were particular preconditions, historical sequences and crucial junctures that prescribed the nationalist right's trajectory throughout the years; these can explain the contradictions as well as the development of the nationalist movement. The chapter draws some conclusions on the nature of right-wing party politics. The study of this historical period offers some important insights into nationalist, right-wing politics and its role in Cypriot politics and society today.

Contents

Chapter 1
Introduction: Nationalism and Political Representation in Colonised Countries

This introductory chapter engages with the literature referring to nationalism and to the emergence of political parties in colonial contexts emphasising the British colonial experience in the Mediterranean. The Introduction presents the analytical and historical context of the book within a frame that accounts for the emergence and development of right-wing politics in Cyprus, as well as its transformations and subsequent manifestations. The frame stresses the particular cleavages in Cypriot society, the impact of British colonialism and the internal balance of power within the Greek community, which led to recurrent internal divisions. In this chapter I argue that internal political factors both between and within ideological camps were the main driving force for political positions. Nationalism in this regard, was employed in an instrumental way in political competition.

Much of the literature on political party formation/performance has investigated the effects of institutions (particularly electoral institutions), which create an underlying structure that constrains the development of party systems (e.g., Harmel and Robertson 1985; Taagepera and Shugart 1989). And although, as Coppedge (1997, 184) argues, the institutional structure is a critical variable, it cannot on its own explain party formation. Political elites the world over are guilty of modifying institutional rules, rules that result from political struggles and compromises that, in turn, shape the future of political competition.

Party politics do not bow to strict institutional rules nor do they take place in a vacuum. And although the political sphere is quite autonomous of its social base, it is also—and unavoidably so—connected to and influenced by it. Therefore, party activity can only be fully understood if it is contextualised and situated within the social, institutional and economic structure (Meynaud 2002). I argue that political institutions and configurations of power within a political system help to determine the likelihood that political parties will form and become successful. The specific social structure of each country will relate not only to the structure of social and power relations but also to its past, i.e., its history. In Cyprus, the entire social and political milieu underwent profound changes during the transition from Ottoman to

Y. Katsourides, *The Greek Cypriot Nationalist Right in the Era of British Colonialism*, Contributions to Political Science,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55536-2_1

British occupation in 1878. This by no means suggests that the changes took place overnight. It was a much more complicated process, initiated in the second half of the nineteenth century by the Ottomans but accelerated by British colonialism (Katsiaounis 1996).

Tradition and modernity are concepts that are often used to explain the appearance of modern societies (Lekkas 1996, 197–227). However, as many scholars warn, any analysis using these concepts must not ignore the particular characteristics of the society under examination. A basic weakness of the theory of modernisation is that it tends to assume that there is only one path to social evolution (that followed by western societies). This theory posits that this one path functioned as a global model and prescription for all other societies, which through a sequential evolutionary process, arrived at the same endpoint. European historiography has tended to view this process as a movement towards parliamentary democracy, while the social sciences have translated it into modernisation theory and political development, where industrial societies advance naturally towards citizenship and political/societal participation (Smith 2010, 60–95). Where this official itinerary is not taken (e.g., Germany), modernist theory looks for the explanation in the survival of 'pre-industrial traditions' that blocked the traditional path (Eley 1978, 737–750). But this liberal-democratic teleology constructs a false polarity between authoritarian and parliamentary paths of development, as it assumes that the obstruction of one results in the success of its opposite. This position has been starkly criticised. In fact, the ideological consolidation of capitalist social relations is an unpredictable process—one that has no given or fixed destination (parliamentary democracy), but that, on the contrary, is both uneven and reversible, particularly in its early stages (Eley 1998, 164).

Emerson (1967, 238) points out that the problem with modernisation theory occurs because during the preceding centuries, some nations succeeded in achieving levels of wealth and power which allowed them to make greater advances than others, and this led to all other nations and societies following the model of western societies. Therefore, many researchers consider the opposing categories of traditional and modern societies as a crude and a-historical distinction because the many and varied historical paths of development are viewed as homogenous. 'History does not consist of a single step. Traditional societies are not static and unchanging, free of historical change and evolution nor is there some unified model of modernisation which defines their transformation' (Hobsbawm 2001, 208).

Hall and Gieben (2003, 27–28) argue that the transition from tradition to modernity occurred in most countries via similar (and various) mechanisms and multiple processes (see also James 1967, 78). Political, economic, social and cultural changes were the drivers of the transition. Yet despite their similarities, these processes and changes varied from country to country and resulted in different types of modernity. In colonised countries the definitive impulse towards modernisation came from the colonisation pursued by western countries. A brief discussion on colonialism here will clarify this position.

All colonised nations bear the marks of their colonisation, and the literature on the subject abounds with conflicting narratives and approaches to colonisation's societal influence (e.g., the 'Subaltern' school). An initial, and now highly

contested, narrative is that the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised was little more than simply borrowing from the 'apparently more 'developed' colonial powers (Cooper 1994, 1516). The lives of local people and the social and political agencies they produced were forgotten in narratives of mimicry. Those histories existed in the shadow of Europe not solely because of colonisation's powerful intrusion into other continents but because Europe's self-perceived movement toward state-building, capitalist development, and modernity marked—and still marks—a vision of historical progress against which African, Asian, or Latin American history appears as 'failure' (Chakrabarty 1992, 19).

This approach risks underestimating the possibility that local action might actually alter the boundaries of subordination within a seemingly powerful colonial regime. Recognition of the much greater power of the Europeans in the colonial encounter does not negate the importance of local (e.g., Cypriot) agency in determining the shape the encounter took. While the conquerors could concentrate military force to defeat colonised insurgents, 'pacify' villages, or slaughter rebels, the routinisation of power demanded alliances with local authority figures. The difficulty is to confront the power behind European expansion without assuming it was all-determining and to probe the clash of different forms of social organisation without treating them as self-contained and autonomous. The binaries of coloniser/colonised, western/non-western, and domination/resistance begin as useful devices for examination of power, but finally constrain a more precise understanding of power, e.g., how it is deployed, engaged, contested, deflected, and appropriated (Cooper 1994, 1517).

Similarly, a number of Greek Cypriot studies have situated Cyprus history and politics within the framework of nationalism and resistance to the foreign oppressor, particularly following the EOKA (National Organisation of Cypriot Fighters) armed struggle against the British (1955–1959). The burst of colonial liberation that followed—and even preceded—Cyprus independence, as well as some of the ruling elite's need to establish their stronghold over internal politics, led many 'organic scholars', journalists, media outlets and political actors to promote a narrative of nationalist resistance in order to build a moral case for right-wing, intra-community domination. This narrative was rooted in battles against foreign conquerors, filled with many small tales of resistance, individual acts of disobedience, and forms of religious and nationalist activism that eventually culminated in the political party system in the Cypriot state.

One major problem here is that the concept of resistance can be expanded so broadly as to reduce it to this one narrative (Cooper 1994, 1532), i.e., the dyad of resistor/oppressor. In this narrative all context is erased; the struggle unites the colonised population as one resistor, ignoring inequalities of class, age, gender. The complexity of multi-sided engagement with forces inside and outside the community is narrowed into a single framework (Ortner 1996). Significant as resistance might be, the overfocus on its role may compromise our understanding of Cyprus history rather than enhance it. There has been little questioning of this nationalist/resistance narrative in earlier research on Cyprus (see for example Papadopoulos 1964; Loizos 1975). These earlier tales of heroism tended to go unquestioned.

However, this exclusive and overstretched emphasis on this heroic narrative is now problematised as new questions arise and new perspectives are introduced.

With this in mind, I take an approach that argues that the interplay among several conflicting factors inherent in periods of transition produced a specific Cypriot context of modernisation within which nationalist politics unfolded. These factors included, inter alia: earlier (Ottoman) social structures; the new capitalist mode of production largely introduced by British colonisation; the emergence and consolidation of new social classes; new political structures; the emergence of political ideologies, etc. Nationalism, in particular, immediately became the most defining feature of Cypriot politics. Analysing nationalism in its various dimensions, i.e., intra-communal, inter-communal, and international would require a far more detailed and informed scope than I can cover in this book. My focus is the internal politics of the Greek community of Cyprus: the relationship between Greek nationalism and the internal structures and agencies of the Greek Cypriot community but also the way Greek politics intersected with Greece and Britain. This emphasis on Greek Cypriot nationalist politics means that the way in which the above factors interacted is crucial to an understanding of how nationalist politics emerged, evolved and eventually dominated.

The triumph of the nationalist movement in Cyprus—as well as in other countries—appears to be less a linear progression than a conjuncture, and its success less a question of a singular mobilisation in the name of the nation than one of coalition building, the forging of clientage networks, and party politics. The kind of politics that eventually took over colonial states was this nation-centered one, focused on the European-defined boundaries and institutions, and on notions of progress shaped by capitalism and European social thought. The reasoning whereby nationalists critiqued colonialism was intrinsically wed to capitalism and colonialism. In their reactions to the colonial powers, nationalists became caught up in the colonial regimes' categories; nationalism became a 'derivative discourse' (Chatterjee, cited in Cooper 1994, 1540–1541). The petty bourgeoisie in particular was absorbed in mimicking the culture of the coloniser.

There are two broad theoretical approaches to analysing the nationalist phenomenon (Smith 1994). First, is the 'national awakening' school, which views the nation as a physical class/category, anthropologically stable (Mavratsas 2003, 57). According to this school, the nation has always existed and therefore the real question is how the sleeping giant was awakened and not how it was mobilised/constructed. The second school views the nation as an artificial construct, an 'invented tradition' (e.g., Hobsbawm and Ranger [1983] 2015). The argument here is that the nation is a by-product of eighteenth-century Europe as an ideological project of the modern state. Consequently, nationalism is closely related to modern societies and the new social and economic forces. In this regard, it was nationalism that created nations and not the other way around.

Thus, although the various nationalist traditions perceive the concept of the nation in different ways, there were, according to Heywood (2006, 159–164), two opposing approaches that were particularly influential. The first (that largely corresponds to the 'national awakening' school) presents the nation mainly as a

cultural community, stressing the significance of ethnic ties, while the second supports a civic version. In Western Europe, nationalism was a political movement that aimed to limit government power and ensure political rights. In contrast, in Eastern Europe and the Balkans, regions where political ideas were less developed and the social structure was 'backward' in comparison to Western Europe, nationalism was a cultural movement first. It was 'the dream and the hope of poets and intellectuals', and the East's inferiority complex towards the West was mixed with an over-emphasis on the 'soul' of these peoples, on the survival of the glorious past and on their 'mission' in the world (Liakos 2005, 82). We must understand this dichotomy in context: in Western Europe, where the nations separated and became autonomous in the eighteenth century, unifying trends prevailed; in the East, it was separatism that predominated (Lekkas 1996, 91–93).

Nationalism, however, did not fall from the sky. Both the theoretical starting point and the empirical evidence show that nationalism in Europe was essentially a result of socio-economic changes and developments, which the nationalists subsequently influenced and helped to shape. Capitalism and its driving forces were a pre-condition for the realisation of the idea of nation (Beck 1996, 157). Industrialisation and the development of a commercial-industrial culture on the one hand, and the appearance of the nation on the other were a historical coincidence, which some scholars do not see as occurring by chance (Hobsbawm 1994, 28). The social classes that supported this process of ideological change were those most directly linked with the social progress of the era: commercial circles and some from the landowning class, as well as bankers, the educated middle class, industrialists and entrepreneurs (Hobsbawm 2002, 193). New petty bourgeois classes became the vehicles of national movements, with teachers, merchants, lawyers and doctors as the agents of the ideological preparation and initial mobilisation of the national movements (Liakos 2005, 22). Nationalism, in other words, was supported by social forces that sought to upgrade and legitimise their own social and political positions (Lekkas 1996, 69).

At the same time though, there are undeniable connections between nationalism and traditional structures and culture: e.g., language, religion, myths, etc. (Mavratsas 2003, 57). Moreover, there are theoretical and methodological problems with trying to explain the rise of nationalism solely as the direct expression of social interests, which in the case of Cyprus and because of colonialism, made these dividing lines were even more difficult to discern. Nationalism was thoroughly woven into the social and political fabric of Cyprus with people of all classes and professions being attached either to the old ruling class or the new one taking shape after British colonialism. Therefore, the answer may lie with politics and ideology as well as social structure. As Kitromilides remarks,

> Ethnic conflicts have been approached in scholarly literature as the outcomes of social mobilisation and political change that disrupt traditional equilibria in ethnically segmented societies while the role of ideological factors in this process has generally been overlooked. Yet systems of ideas play a decisive role in the emergence and escalation of confrontations by mediating the opposing groups' self-conception. (1979, 143)

What stands out about nationalism is its ability to join elements of tradition with modernising features. According to Hobsbawm (1994), nationalism created (invented according to his own terminology) a new tradition within which religion, as well as other pre-modern traditions and institutions, were incorporated. As a result of this fusion of past and present social forces and traditions, nationalism gradually became a hegemonic ideology throughout the western world, endorsed and promoted by the newly founded nation states and their ruling elites. It is in this context that nationalism has been described as an intrinsically integrative ideology: it stresses the common identity of all citizens by reference to language, history and shared traditions. Moreover, the fact that political practice has been shaped by the linguistic, institutional and territorial extent of the nation-state has been of incalculable importance, for it has held political imagination in a structure of limited possibilities and heavily constrained the expression of dissent (Eley 1998, 167).

1.1 Greek and Greek Cypriot Nationalism

A clear understanding of Greek nationalism is pivotal in any discussion of Greek Cypriot nationalism, its emergence and evolution. Although nationalism was initially a democratic movement, in Greece a concerted effort of established conservative social forces led by the Church soon altered its stance (Clogg 1973, 1–40). The conservative nature of Greek nationalism was epitomised by its acceptance of absolute monarchy after the nation-state was established, which reflected conservative interests in Greek society (Kitromilides 1979, 147). It was also a period of religious revival culminating in a surge of religious fundamentalism and millenarianism. Further, Greek scholars began to argue for the ethnological and cultural continuity of the Greek nation and Greek civilisation. The result was a type of organic nationalism that rejected the sort of social criticism inherent in the classicism in the Enlightenment; in Greece this critical perspective was replaced by ancestral worship.

These intellectual orientations were soon translated into a political programme (Kitromilides 1979, 152-157), i.e., the ideology of the *Megali Idea* (Great Idea). According to Lekkas (1996, 106), the main thrust of the Great Idea refers to the expansion of the national space (territorial, cultural and economic) into regions regarded as belonging 'by right' to the Greek nation. The Great Idea narrative blamed the decline of Greece's power on the rise of the Ottoman Turkish Empire; therefore, to reclaim their prior glory they had to replace the Ottoman Empire with a Greek state that would include the unredeemed Greeks of the periphery (e.g., Crete, Cyprus, etc.), who would be converted to the values of the Great Idea through education and the creation of a network of political and cultural ties with a free Greece. The irredentist Greek nationalism successfully consolidated the prevailing *status quo* in Greek society by focusing politics on external preoccupations, thus distracting attention from domestic problems and defusing social pressures from below. The ideology of the Great Idea denied legitimacy to domestic social

conflicts such that the conservative *status quo* remained in place. According to this line of thought, Greek nationalism remained irredentist and aggressive because of the economic and cultural underdevelopment of the Greek state and society.

Greek Cypriot nationalism is traditionally and rightfully analysed and contextualised within the parameters of Greek nationalism. Scholars argue that the type of Greek Cypriot nationalism (ethnic as opposed to civic), as well as other shortfalls in Cyprus's political development (e.g., clientelism) are due to the historical conditions of Cyprus political backwardness: that is, absolutist Ottoman structures on the one hand and authoritarian, anti-democratic structures and practices in state and society due to British colonisation on the other, as well as the absence of a sovereign state. As a result, many processes were fragmented and/or distorted by the primacy of pre-modern traditions in the political culture, which would have been erased through a 'healthier' process of liberal-democratic political modernisation (see for example, Mavratsas 2003; Attalides 1979; Markides 1977; Kyriakides 1968). Hence, in Cyprus, there was no bourgeois domination based in successful industrial capitalism; instead there was a deficit of citizenship, of bourgeois parliamentarism, and of firmly anchored liberal bourgeois political culture that opened the way for the type of nationalism (irredentist) that prevailed (Bozkurt and Trimikliniotis 2014).

Moreover, the spread of nationalism was facilitated, it is claimed, by the existence of a disoriented popular mass, which lacked the security of traditional communities. Thus, broad social strata responded to nationalist initiatives, including the petty-bourgeoisie of craftsmen and small businessmen, parts of the labour-force, of the rural strata and of the larger landowners. Here, nationalism is associated with the 'status anxiety' of traditional small producers and other elements hit by the growth of capitalism.

For the exponents of this approach the emergence of the nationalist movement is explained simply by the inherited cultural dispositions of a Greek bourgeoisie and the Church which had failed to produce a vigorous native liberalism. Rather than being investigated in its own right, nationalism is plotted along an ideological continuum between the emergence of the *enosis* movement in the late nineteenth century and that of the EOKA (1955–1959). The absence in Cyprus of a bourgeois revolution in the classic liberal-democratic mould is made to structure the entire history of the ensuing century. The failure of the Greek Cypriot bourgeoisie to generate a successful tradition of liberalism is made to determine, step by step, a disastrous accumulation of right-wing attitudes: extreme nationalism, but also violent anti-communism, hostility to parliamentary reform, anti-Turkishcism, and so on. In other words, instead of being interpreted in the determinate context of the particular conjuncture itself, notably between the end of the Archbishopric (1909) and the start of the EOKA armed struggle, (radical) nationalist ideology simply disappears into the linear continuity of 'pre-industrial' authoritarian traditions.

To be sure, such formulations have a certain descriptive value. But however illuminating when applied to particular policies or institutions, the functionalist view of nationalism substitutes a description of effects for analysis of the conditions