

**THE RISE OF ETHNO-NATIONALISM IN CYPRUS UNDER  
THE  
BRITISH RULE: 1878-1960**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OF  
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

**BY**

**PINAR KADIOĞLU**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

**AUGUST 2010**

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık  
Head of the Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Akçalı  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rebecca Bryant (METU NCC-PSIR) \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Akçalı (METU -PADM) \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Oktay Tanrısever (METU -IR) \_\_\_\_\_

**I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.**

**Pınar KADIOĞLU**

## **ABSTRACT**

### **THE RISE OF ETHNO-NATIONALISM IN CYPRUS UNDER THE BRITISH RULE: 1878-1960**

**KADIOĞLU, PINAR**

**Department of International Relations**

**Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pinar Akçalı**

**August 2010, 155 pages**

This thesis is an attempt to inquire the origins of the Cyprus conflict by analyzing the historical developments that laid the ground for the inter-communal dispute in the late 1950s, while focusing on the structural dimension of the rise of ethno-nationalisms in the island. The special emphasis is given to the British period 1878-1960 in the historical analysis since the ethno-religious identity consciousnesses of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities in the island started to turn into ethno-national ones and later into antagonistic nationalisms during this era. The study's underlying premise is that although different identity perceptions existed much earlier among the two communities of the island, the inconsistent policies of the British administration that shifted in accordance with its interests in the Mediterranean region enabled the emergence of a conducive environment for the politicization and manipulation of these diverse identity perceptions. The Greek and Turkish nationalisms gained strength in this era and gradually transformed into antagonistic nationalisms motivated by different political goals about the future of the island. These developments would be the main reason of the inter-communal violence in Cyprus that arose in late 1950s and also in the following years till the permanent territorial partition in 1974.

**Keywords:** Cyprus, Ethno-Nationalism, Greek Cypriot, Inter-Communal Conflict, Turkish Cypriot.

## ÖZ

### KIBRIS'TA ETNİK MİLLİYETÇİLİĞİN YÜKSELİŞİ VE İNGİLİZ DÖNEMİ: 1878-1960

**KADIOĞLU, PINAR**

**Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü**

**Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Pınar Akçalı**

**Ağustos 2010, 155 sayfa**

Bu tez, 1950'li yılların sonunda Kıbrıs'taki toplumlararası çatışmaya neden olan tarihsel gelişmeleri inceleyerek, Ada'daki etnik-milliyetçiliğin yükselişinin yapısal boyutlarını araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Tarihsel analizlerde, Kıbrıslı Yunan ve Kıbrıslı Türk toplumlarının önce etno-dinsel kimlik algılamalarının etno-milliyetçi algılamalara, sonrasın da ise düşman milliyetçiliklere dönüştüğü 1878-1960 İngiliz Döneminin üzerinde özellikle durulmuştur. Çalışmanın temel argümanı, Kıbrıs'ta yaşayan iki toplum arasındaki farklı kimlik algılamalarının tarih boyunca süregeldiği; ancak 1878 ile 1960 arasında İngiliz Yönetimi'nin Akdeniz'deki çıkarları doğrultusunda Ada'da uyguladığı sürekli değişkenlik gösteren politikaları sonucunda, bu farklı kimlik algılamalarının manipüle ve politize edilmelerini sağlayacak uygun ortamın hazırlandığıdır. Yunan ve Türk milliyetçilikleri bu dönemde Kıbrıs'ta güç kazanmış ve zaman içerisinde iki toplum arasında Ada'nın geleceği hakkında farklı siyasi hedefler ile şekillenmiş düşman milliyetçiliklerin oluşmasını sağlamıştır. Bu gelişmeler, hem 1950li yılların sonunda, hem de 1974'teki kalıcı toprak ayrımına kadar süregelen zamanda iki toplum arasındaki şiddetin temel nedeni olmuştur.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Etnik Milliyetçilik, Kıbrıs, Kıbrıslı Türk, Kıbrıslı Yunan, Toplumlararası Çatışma.

*To My Parents Hayrettin and Ayşe Kadiođlu,*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I want to sincerely thank my advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Akçalı for her auspicious guidance, constructive comments and encouragement throughout my research. I am also extremely grateful to her for being patient and offering me her inspiring supervision whenever I got lost in the details.

I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Oktay Tanrısever and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rebecca Bryant for honoring me by participating in the examining committee. I am also very grateful to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Oktay Tanrısever for encouraging and supporting me from the very beginning of my METU adventure. I also owe many thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rebecca Bryant, for her guidance during my research in Cyprus, as well as her useful comments and suggestion on the draft of my thesis.

I would like to offer my greatest appreciation and thanks to Assist. Prof. Dr. Murat Tüzünkan from Cyprus International University, and Mete Hatay from PRIO Cyprus Center for encouraging me during my field research in Cyprus and enabling me to access the literature that I have been longing for.

I would like to express my special thanks to Assist. Prof. Dr. Nicos Trimikliniotis from University of Nicosia: without the help that he offered me when I was desperate for accessing the British Colonial Documents in Southern Nicosia, I would not be able to finalize my research as I desired. Thank you Nicos!

I am deeply grateful to all special people in Cyprus who helped me in many ways during my field work, along with Assist. Prof. Dr. Umut Koldaş and Assist. Prof. Dr. Nur Köprülü from Cyprus International University, their continuous support and guidance for the last 6 years were crucial to me.

Moreover, I want to thank to dearest friends who had incredible faith in me and encouraged me during this process; Berkan Balcı, Burçak Arıkan, Başak Basa, Constantinos Syrimis, Ebru-Özgür Kaya, Emre Burak Yılmaz, Emre Yurt, Erhun Şahali, Jahanzaib Haque, Zain Shariq, Füsun Kaya, Adham Al Alami-Tammi Monaghan and Selçuk Şenol. I promise guys I will be less boring from now on!

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my mum, dad, and my lovely brother, whose love, support, encouragement, and above all trust in me were never lacking. They are the ones who in the first place made this work possible; hence to them this work is dedicated.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PLAGIARISM</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>ÖZ</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>DEDICATION</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	<b>x</b>
 <b>CHAPTER</b>	
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 The Cyprus Dispute .....	3
1.2 Historical Background .....	4
1.3 Theoretical Framework.....	16
1.4 Methodology and Outline .....	31
<b>2. DEVELOPMENT OF IDENTITY IN CYPRUS PRIOR TO THE BRITISH PERIOD</b> .....	<b>33</b>
2.1 From the Earliest Settlement in the Island till the Ottoman Conquest (2000 B.C.-1571) .....	36
2.2 From the Ottoman Conquest till British Arrival (1571-1878).....	51
<b>3. BRITISH RULE IN CYPRUS: FOUNDATION OF ETHNO-NATIONAL IDENTITIES</b> .....	<b>69</b>
3.1 British Attitude towards the Ottoman Empire and the Cyprus Convention.....	69
3.2 Early British Rule in Cyprus: 1878-1931 .....	76
<b>4. BRITISH RULE IN CYPRUS: CONSOLIDATION AND CLASH OF ETHNO-NATIONAL IDENTITIES</b> .....	<b>115</b>
4.1 British Rule in Cyprus: 1931-1960 .....	115
<b>5. CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>139</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>146</b>

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

### **FIGURES**

Figure 1 Historical Map of Cyprus.....	34
--	----

# **CHAPTER I**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This thesis is an attempt to inquire the origins of the Cyprus conflict, one of the most prominent inter-communal disputes of the 20<sup>th</sup> century that started in late-1950s between Turkish and Greek Cypriots and could not be solved since then. Cyprus case is no exception to some of the other well-known inter-communal conflicts of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, including the ones in Northern Ireland, Kosovo and the Middle East, in the sense that all of these conflicts involved antagonistic nationalist ideologies. However, the significance of the this specific conflict is that it consists of two ethnically and religiously diverse groups who had been living together for more than 400 years in the same geographical area and did not develop a sense of belonging to each other. Instead, their sense of belonging was to larger nation states of the region in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century, Greece and Turkey, whose national identities were shaped via otherization of one another.

Taking into account the fact that the divergence among these two communities always existed from the time that they started to live together, that is, 1571 onwards, even before the establishment of both Greece and Turkey. This, however, did not prevent the peaceful co-existence in the island till the process of transformation of national consciousnesses into antagonistic nationalisms was complete. As such, one can assume that the extreme inter-communal dispute in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century was part of a larger phenomenon than just pure diversity.

The main research issue that this thesis attempts to analyze about the Cyprus dispute is related to the historical developments that laid the ground for the inter-communal conflict in the island, since the ethno-religious identity consciousnesses of the communities in the island started to turn into ethno-national ones and later into antagonistic nationalisms during the British colonial rule. In the historical analysis of the present thesis, the ethno-symbolist approach on nationalism developed by Anthony D. Smith is used, while putting a special emphasis on the British colonial administration period in the island (1870-1960) in order to explore the structural dimension of the rise of ethno-nationalism in the island.

The thesis essentially argues that starting from the time in which the island's possession shifted from the Ottoman Empire to the British Empire, the British authorities started to implement constantly-changing internal policies in Cyprus from 1878 to 1960, according to their own interests in the Mediterranean region. This pattern of shifting policies of the British administration created a conducive environment in the island for the politicization and manipulation of the identity consciousnesses of these two groups, that later resulted in inter-communal dispute.

The significance of this study is three-fold. First, it serves as a resource for understanding the socio-cultural, demographical and administrative structure of the island starting from the early settlements till the British arrival, in order to make better sense of the mass reactions of Cypriots to British colonial administrative rule. Second, while providing a detailed historical account of the period between 1878 and 1960, it analyzes the political, economic and social structures in the island that are largely effected by the external actors in order to shed light into the causes of the inter-communal conflict. Third, it focuses on the specific case of Cyprus as an example of how ethno-national consciousness can be politicized and manipulated to be the main source of inter-communal conflict.

## **1.1 The Cyprus Dispute**

Cyprus is an Eastern Mediterranean island located at the crossroads of the three continents of Africa, Europe and Asia with an approximate area of 9,251 square kilometers. Throughout history, this small island has always been a source of interest for European and Asian civilizations, and faced various conquests due to its geographical location and rich mineral sources. Today, it still continues to be a major concern for many countries as well as a source of international dispute.

The most significant characteristic of the Cyprus dispute is about the Greek and Turkish Cypriot antagonistic nationalisms that entailed, first, violent inter-communal conflicts, and second, a permanent territorial division that resulted in the two communities living separately since 1974. Despite the several peace plans had been proposed by the international community for more than five decades, the two Cypriot communities still cannot manage to reach a mutual understanding to enable them to co-exist peacefully in the island.

Many outside powers had always been involved in the dispute between Greek and Turkish Cypriots, since the two communities had started to come into contact with each other in 1571. To begin with, the development of national consciousness among the two communities was deeply influenced by both Greece and Turkey, while the colonial policies of Britain manipulated this consciousness for its own national interests. The dispute, which first emerged as a clash of interests between the two Cypriot communities concerning the decolonization of the island, later turned into a territorial conflict between Greece and Turkey in which other external powers, such as Britain and later the United States of America, played a major role. The conflict has turned out to be even more complex, due to the attachment and loyalty the Cypriot communities feel towards Greece and Turkey.

## 1.2 Historical Background

As will be discussed in detail in Chapter 2 of the thesis, when we look at the history of Cyprus prior to the 1571 Ottoman conquest, we see the existence of religious perceptions of self and other among the Orthodox Christian inhabitants of the island. Yet, this religious consciousness took a new form and meaning when a group of Muslim settlers from Anatolia started to arrive on the island and a new administrative structure, the *millet* system,<sup>1</sup> was introduced under the Ottoman rule, which remained more or less the same during early years of British colonial rule.

With the impact of the French Revolution in 1789, national consciousness started to develop in the Ottoman territories that overshadowed religious attachments, and the Ottoman *millet* system had proven to be ineffective to keep the various communities of the empire together, including Cyprus. The 19<sup>th</sup> century witnessed the transformation of ethno-religious consciousness to ethno-national consciousness among the Orthodox Christian inhabitants in Cyprus, mostly as a result of Greek Enlightenment<sup>2</sup> and the establishment of Greece as an independent state. The Muslims on the other hand, had gone through this transformation nearly 100 years after their Christian cohabitants, with the influence of the establishment of Republic

---

<sup>1</sup>*Millet* system was the traditional Ottoman administrative method, which separated the diverse communities from each other based on their religious affiliations and administered them accordingly. For further information, see: Ortaylı, İ. (2006). *Son İmparatorluk Osmanlı*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.

<sup>2</sup>The Modern Greek Enlightenment (*Neo-Hellinikos Diafotismos*), was an 18<sup>th</sup> century ideological movement which had a strong commitment and a desire to emulate democratic ideals and anticlericalism, inspired by ancient Greece. For further information, see: Gazi, E. (2009). "Revisiting Religion and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Greece." In Beaton, R and Ricks, D. (Eds.) *The Making of Modern Greece: Nationalism, Romanticism, and the Uses of the Past (1797-1896)*. Burlington: Ashgate, pp. 95-108.

of Turkey in 1923 following the Young Turks Movement<sup>3</sup> in the Anatolia. Hence the peaceful co-existence of the two major communities of the island was first challenged by this transformation from religious to national consciousness; then, by the process of politicization and manipulation of the respective identities during the British rule.

As will be explained in detail in this thesis, following the Russo-Turkish War of 1878, the administration of the island was temporarily and conditionally shifted to Britain from the Ottoman Empire with the Cyprus Convention. Due to the temporal nature of the island's possession, the British authorities, in the early periods of their rule, adapted mostly loose administrative policies that were, in most cases, simply a continuation of the Ottoman policies. The British colonial administration was very much concerned about not offending the Ottomans by making significant changes in the administrative structure till the island became an official British colony. During this era, with the occupation of Egypt, Cyprus lost its significance as a strategical British possession in the Mediterranean region, and the required socio-economic and political reforms in the island were neglected. This neglect of the British authorities resulted in their failure to ameliorate problems caused by the rise of nationalism elsewhere in the region, including Greek nationalism followed by its Turkish counterpart.

Nevertheless, the British authorities, while not trying to offend the Ottomans, had to make slight changes to modernize the island in order to rule their new possession. This shift from the traditional Ottoman practices led to confusion among the islanders, because these modern measures were not fully adopted, and some of the

---

<sup>3</sup>Young Turk Movement represents the coalition of various groups under the Ottoman rule opposing the monarchy and demanding constitutional rule in late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. The movement was quite successful since it established constitutional monarchy in the Ottoman Empire in 1908 and enabled the spread of Turkish nationalism. For further information, see: Hanioglu, Ş. M. (1995). *The Young Turks in Opposition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ottoman traditional practices were still effective. When combined with the economic hardship in the island due to heavy British taxation, the space for the rise of nationalist tendencies was unintentionally enabled by Britain.

The introduction of a new justice and taxation system became a source of unrest in the island. These new regulations introduced legal equality among the residents of the island. Therefore, some of the important privileges granted to certain groups, such as the clergy and the government officers, under the previous *millet* system were abolished. This was regarded as disrespectful, even as an insult, to the religious authority of the clergy, especially in the Orthodox Christian community,<sup>4</sup> and led to the rise of hostility against the British rule, enabling the Church to be influenced by the Greek nationalist missionaries.

In the case of education, the British authorities attempted to introduce English as the medium of instruction in the island when they first arrived, however they were faced with strong resistance from both the Orthodox and Muslim clergy.<sup>5</sup> The system of education that had existed in the island before the arrival of the British was separate in line with the religious affiliations of the inhabitants, under the supervision of religious authorities. These schools were financed by the Orthodox Christian Church for the Greek Cypriots, or the religious bureaucracy of the Ottoman Empire. The fear of offending the Ottomans, the negative reaction of the locals, and the limited budget which was given for the island by the British Treasury did not allow the British administration in the island to make significant changes in the education system. The schools were financed only partially by the British authorities in the island via grants-in-aids. In the early era, the teachers in these separate schools

---

<sup>4</sup>Bryant, R. (2004). *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London: I. B. Tauris, pp. 27-28.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid, pp. 138-139.

continued to be the Cypriot Orthodox Christian priests and Cypriot *hodjas* (*Hoca*-Islamic clergy) who gave religious education.<sup>6</sup> However in the latter years, with the influence of nationalist ideology in both communities, the teachers and the schoolbooks started to be imported from Greece and Turkey, as a reflection of the process of nation building via education in these two countries. The British preference of not investing in the area of education and leaving the administration of the schools to local boards led to the creation of antagonistic nationalist understandings between the two groups. Since the local boards were in charge of the schools, the British authorities did not take any measures about the usage of Greek and Turkish flags in the respective community schools, which was a practice that showed the rise of two opposing nationalisms in the island. Therefore, it is not surprising that the *enosis* movement (unification of the island with Greece) was indeed created through education in this period among the Orthodox Christians,<sup>7</sup> while its political aspirations created unrest among the Muslim inhabitants in general.

In the year 1914, as a result of the alliance between the Ottoman Empire and Germany in World War I, British authorities unilaterally annulled the 1878 Convention. The decision of the Ottoman Empire to enter into an alliance with Germany was regarded as a state of war by the British Empire, and the island was annexed to the British Crown in the same year. However, the annexation did not mean that possession of the island became once more important for the British Empire; it was realized in order to support the British imperial policy in the region. Hence, in 1915, the British Prime Minister offered the island to Greece in exchange of Greek involvement in the war alongside Britain. The offer was declined by the

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid, p. 138.

<sup>7</sup>Markides, D. (2006). "Cyprus 1878-1925: Ambiguities and Uncertainties." In Faustmann, H. and Peristianis, N. (Eds.) *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism, 1878-2006*. Möhnesse: Bibliopolis, p. 27.

Greek authorities who preferred to stay neutral.<sup>8</sup> Yet even if the island stayed under the rule of Britain, this attempt of the British authorities enabled the idea of a future unification of Cyprus with Greece to be perceived as more of a possibility by the Orthodox Christians and fostered the nationalist tendencies among them. Muslim inhabitants of the island, on the other hand, felt threatened and a public unrest burst out which led to the massive migrations of Muslims to Anatolia.<sup>9</sup>

A year after Turkey recognized the annexation of the island with the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne, Britain declared Cyprus as a Crown Colony. Soon after this declaration, the British authorities due to the change in their interest in the region announced that the question of the union with Greece is not open to discussion anymore. In this period, the British administrators intended to implement modern measures, however the shift from ethno-religious identity consciousnesses of Cypriots to ethno-national identity consciousnesses was already completed by then. The Cypriots were now in favor of identifying themselves along with these lines. After 1925, some of the newly adapted British administrative policies, such as the legal identification of the inhabitants of the island and certain changes introduced in the areas of education, reflected this intention of the inhabitants. For instance, in 1927 when legal identification of the island's inhabitants in the legal papers was issued under the supervision of Governor Storrs, both communities insisted on the usage of 'Greek' and 'Turkish' Cypriot, rather than 'Orthodox Christians' and 'Muslims. British aim behind this practice was "to weaken the Helen nationalism among the Greek community in the island and create island patriotism"<sup>10</sup> since Turkish nationalism

---

<sup>8</sup>Borowiec, A. (2000). *Cyprus: A Troubled Island*. Westport: Praeger, p. 106.

<sup>9</sup>*Colonial Reports Annual, Cyprus Report for 1931*. (1932). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 5.

<sup>10</sup>Hasgüler, M. (2008). "Kıbrıslılık Kimliği: Kıbrıslı Türkler ve Kıbrıslı Rumlardaki Farklılaşma." In Hasgüler, M. (Ed.) *Kıbrıslılık*. İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı, p. 2. & An, A. (2005). *Forms of Cypriotism in the Turkish Cypriot Community: Obstacles and Necessary Conditions*. Paper presented at Seminar of the New Cyprus Association, Limassol, Republic of Cyprus.

was not seen as a threat back then for the colonial authorities. However, the practice of legally defining the groups in ethno-national terms led to the rapid politicization and institutionalization the different identity perceptions of the island's inhabitants that became a source for the radicalization of nationalist demands and aspirations promoted by the community elites.

The Orthodox Christian community of the island, who started openly expressing their desire for *enosis* by the time, did not welcome the declaration of Cyprus as a Crown Colony; however, the Muslim community was pleased. In October 1931 a massive uprising organized by the Greek Cypriots against British authorities took place, which resulted in the adaptation of repressive measures in the island. The new measures prevented the political participation of Cypriots in order to suppress the nationalist demands while establishing an autocratic British bureaucracy in the island.<sup>11</sup> However, instead of achieving this goal, this practice eventually rigidified nationalist claims of the Greek Cypriots.<sup>12</sup>

During the World War II, due to the changes in the international arena and British interests, British policy on Cyprus once again changed. The British authorities in the island relaxed the political measures which had been implemented from 1931 onwards and encouraged the establishment of close relations between the two communities of Cyprus with Greece and Turkey.<sup>13</sup> The reason behind this encouragement was to secure its own good relations with these two countries, since Greece was one of the Allied Powers and neutral Turkey was in the center of the British-controlled Middle East.

---

<sup>11</sup>Stefanidis, Y. D. (1999). *Isle of Discord: Nationalism, Imperialism and the Making of the Cyprus Problem*. London: C Hurst & Co Publishers, p. 1.

<sup>12</sup>Kızılyürek, N. (2002). *Milliyetçilik Kısılcacında Kıbrıs*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 81.

<sup>13</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi(1878-1960) Kolonyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika Vol. II*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, p. 9.

In 1940, when Greece was seized by Italy and decided to be an ally of Britain, the *enosis* claims of the Greek Cypriots disappeared for a while. The Orthodox Church of Cyprus, which was the champion of *enosis* ideology, also seemed to give up its previous demands. The Italians were defeated with the help of foreign armies, including the Greek Cypriot volunteers among the British forces. But when Greece could not manage to get the same result when Germans attacked the country in 1941, this failure led to the reemergence of the *enosis* idea as well as anti-colonial reaction in the island. This time the newly established Cypriot Marxist Party AKEL (*Anorthotikó Kómma Ergazómenou Laoú*-Progressive Party of Working People) was also effective alongside with the Greek Orthodox Church against Britain.

Turkish Cypriots on the other hand, were now defining themselves as Turks, and they were feeling much stronger attachments to Turkey. They were openly celebrating the national festivities of Turkey, such as the Republic Day of 29 October and national sovereignty day of 23 April. At the same time, they were sending loyalty messages to the Turkish Prime Minister and collecting money for the Turkish army.<sup>14</sup> The *enosis* plan was creating strong unrest among the Turkish Cypriots as they strongly rejected the idea of being a minority group in a Greek state. As a result, they started to be politically organized against this threat: the first attempt came in 1943, with the foundation of KATAK (*Kıbrıs Adası Türk Azınlığı Kurumu*-Association of the Turkish Minority of the Island of Cyprus); the second attempt came in 1944, with the foundation of the KMTHP (*Kıbrıs Millî Türk Halk Partisi*-Cypriot National Turkish People's Party).

During the 1950s the anti-colonial reaction among the Greek Cypriots increased. In 1951, Archbishop Makarios wrote a letter to the General-Secretary of the United

---

<sup>14</sup>Ibid, pp. 11-12.

Nations (UN) in which the results of the plebiscite conducted by the Church on 15 January 1950 was declared. In the letter, Makarios stated that 80 percent of the inhabitants of the island wanted unification with Greece. Next year, Makarios established the EOKA (*Ethniki Organosis Kypriou Agoniston*-National Organization of Cypriot Fighters) together with the Cyprus-born Greek Colonel Grivas.<sup>15</sup> This was a guerilla organization that aimed to attract attention to *enosis* on a global basis. Soon after its establishment, however, EOKA turned into a terrorist organization, attacking both the British forces and Greek Cypriots who were not supporting *enosis*.<sup>16</sup> Despite all attempts to put an end to the terrorist activities of EOKA by Britain, the violence in the island could not be prevented and turned into an inter-communal conflict during 1957 and 1958.

By the end of 1950s, the inter-communal conflict resulted in the foundation of the future partition of the island and the conflicting ideas between Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities about the future of the island rigidified. The Greek Cypriots insisted on *enosis* with the support of Greece, where Turkish Cypriots started to demand *taksim* (the partition of the island) with the support of Turkey. Eventually, as a result of a series of talks among Britain, Greece and Turkey in 1958 and 1959, it has been decided that the best solution would be the independence of the island.

However, when the independent Republic of Cyprus was established on 16 August 1960 under the guarantorship of Britain, Greece and Turkey, it was not welcomed by either of the communities. As put forward by one expert, “most Greek Cypriots [were] viewing an independent Republic as a frustrating delay on the road to *enosis*,

---

<sup>15</sup>Kızılyürek, N. (2002). *Milliyetçilik Kıskaçında Kıbrıs*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 101.

<sup>16</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Koloniyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika Vol. II*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, pp.104,

while Turkish Cypriots feared that the Greeks would look for any pretext to end Cypriot independence through union with Greece.”<sup>17</sup>

The constitution of the new republic framed by the Zurich and London Agreements of 1959, divided the communities of the island on the basis of their ethnic origin, just as the case in earlier times.<sup>18</sup> In addition to this, Britain, Turkey, and Greece were accepted as guarantor powers that were responsible from preventing any possible future claims of *enosis* and *taksim*. The first elections were held in the island in 1960 and the Republic of Cyprus became an independent member of the United Nations. In 1961, the new republic also became a member of the British Commonwealth.<sup>19</sup>

However, in 1963 when President Makarios proposed amendments for the constitution that aimed to reduce the political power of the Turkish Cypriots, the tensions between the two communities increased again. All of the Turkish Cypriot members of the parliament withdrew from the government. The negotiations held after these developments were inefficient, and violence among the two communities started once again. In 1964, United Nations with the Security Council Resolution of

---

<sup>17</sup>Morag, N. (2004). “Cyprus and the Clash of Greek and Turkish Nationalisms.” *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 10 (4), p. 600.

<sup>18</sup>The Turkish Cypriots were accepted as a minority group as they made up only 18 % of the population of the island. According to the constitution of the new republic, the president had to be a Greek Cypriot elected by the Greek Cypriots, and the vice president had to be a Turkish Cypriot elected by the Turkish Cypriots. The vice president was granted the right of a final veto on fundamental laws passed by the House of Representatives and on decisions of the Council of Ministers. In the House of Representatives, which had had no power to modify the constitution, the Turkish Cypriots were elected separately by their own community. For further information, see: Documents Regarding Cyprus Signed and Initialled at Lancaster House, London, February 19, 1959. Kypros-Net Official Website [online]. [Cited 20 April 2010]. Available at: <http://www.kypros.org/Constitution/treaty.htm#1>

<sup>19</sup>United Kingdom Commonwealth Secretariat, Official Website [online]. [Cited 20 April 2010]. Available at: <http://www.thecommonwealth.org/YearbookHomeInternal/138423/>

186<sup>20</sup> recognized the legitimacy of the administration of the Republic of Cyprus and decided to appoint peace keeping forces to the island.

Meanwhile, Turkey began to prepare for a military intervention to the island in order to ensure the security of Turkish Cypriots. However, the infamous “Johnson Letter”<sup>21</sup> from the USA to Turkey, postponed such an intervention.<sup>22</sup> In 1964, after a major inter-ethnic struggle in Nicosia, UN Peace Keeping Forces set up the ‘Green Line’ which divided the two communities in Nicosia and elsewhere.<sup>23</sup> However, between 1963 and 1967 inter-ethnic clash took place in Cyprus, and the Turkish Cypriots, as the weaker side, suffered greater losses.<sup>24</sup> They had to leave their homes and move to enclave areas under their own control in which they lived till 1974. In 1967, the Provisional Turkish Cypriot Administration was announced by the Turkish Cypriot leaders. In 1971 with the help of military junta colonels in

---

<sup>20</sup>United Nations Security Council Resolution 186 (1964). United Nations Security Council 1102<sup>th</sup> meeting, United Nations Official Website [online]. [Cited 07 April 2010]. Available at: <http://www.un.int/cyprus/scr186.htm>

<sup>21</sup>The Turkish Prime Minister at the time, İsmet İnönü, considering the fact that Turkish army was not capable of launching a full scale intervention, informed the US President Johnson about his plans. In his reply, Johnson stated that the plan should be delayed due to several reasons. First, a possible Turkish intervention in Cyprus would be seen as an act of partition of the island, since all of the other means had not been exhausted yet. Second, such an act would lead to a military conflict between Turkey and Greece, an unacceptable development as both states were NATO members. Third, such an act will defy the UN peace keeping efforts in the island and prevent the UN to realize a peaceful settlement of the problem. Fourth, such a move could result in the involvement of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) to the conflict, an undesirable outcome. For further information, see: “Telegram from the Department of State to the Embassy in Turkey Containing Message from President Lyndon B. Johnson with Instructions to Deliver It to President İsmet İnönü.” In Hakkı, M. M. (2007). *The Cyprus Issue: A Documentary History, 1878-2007*. London: I.B.Tauris, pp. 98-100. & Bölükbaşı, S. (2001). *Barışçıl Çözumsuzlük*. Ankara: İmge Yayınevi, pp. 121-127.

<sup>22</sup>Hakkı, M. M. (2004). *Kıbrıs'ta Statükonun Sonu*. İstanbul: Naos Yayıncılık, p. 27.

<sup>23</sup>Papadakis, Y. (2006). “Nicosia After 1960: A River, A Bridge and A Dead Zone.” *GMJ: Mediterranean Edition*, 1(1), p. 2.

<sup>24</sup>Papadakis, Y. (1998). “Greek Cypriot Narratives of History and Collective Identity: Nationalism as a Contested Process.” *American Ethnologist*, 25(2), p. 152.

Greece, EOKA-B<sup>25</sup> was formed. Also in the same year, EOKA-B activated a couple of plots against Archbishop Makarios, claiming that he changed his attitude towards *enosis*, and that he was no longer committed to the *enosis* ideal.<sup>26</sup> .

On July 15, 1974 the Greek regime sponsored a *coup d'etat* in Nicosia and Makarios was replaced by Nikos Sampson, and the inter-ethnic violence reached to extreme levels. Eventually, Turkey decided to use its guarantor rights, which was the right to military intervention with the purpose of restoring peace to the island, and sent troops to the island on 20 July 1974 in order to stop the violence. When the conflict still could not be solved, Turkey took control of the northern part of the island with a full-fledged military intervention on 14 August 1974. Turkey's intervention resulted in "heavy Greek Cypriot casualties and completely separated the two sides."<sup>27</sup> After the intervention, the UN declared a number of Security Council Resolutions<sup>28</sup> and demanded all foreign powers to withdraw from the island. However, Turkey did not comply with the resolutions. In 1975, Turkish Federated State of Cyprus was declared as a first step towards a future federated Cypriot state, but this attempt was rejected both by the UN and the Greek Cypriots. On 2 August 1975 with the Vienna Agreement,<sup>29</sup> signed after the third round of inter-communal

---

<sup>25</sup>EOKA-B was a fascist Greek Cypriot paramilitary organization formed in 1971 aiming to achieve *enosis* ultimately. For further information, see: Gantzel, K. J. and Schwinghammer, T. (2000) *Warfare Since the Second World War*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, p. 230-231.

<sup>26</sup>Bölükbaşı, S. (2001). *Barışçıl Çözumsuzlük*. Ankara: İmge Yayınevi, pp. 208-210.

<sup>27</sup>Papadakis, Y. (1998). "Greek Cypriot Narratives of History and Collective Identity: Nationalism as a Contested Process." *American Ethnologist*, 25(2), p. 152.

<sup>28</sup>United Nations Security Council Resolutions 353-354-355-356-357-358-359 (1974). United Nations Official Website [online]. [Cited 07 April 2010]. Available at: <http://www.un.int/cyprus/resolut.htm>

<sup>29</sup>The Third Vienna Agreement - August 1975. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cyprus Official Website [online]. [Cited 21 July 2010]. Available at: [http://www.mfa.gov.cy/mfa/mfa2006.nsf/All/0658E5B2F4D1A538C22571D30034D15D/\\$file/August%201975.pdf](http://www.mfa.gov.cy/mfa/mfa2006.nsf/All/0658E5B2F4D1A538C22571D30034D15D/$file/August%201975.pdf)

talks in Vienna, the Greek Cypriots in the north of the island and the Turkish Cypriots at in the south were allowed to move to the respective sides. The priority was given to the re-unification of families, which was also allowing the Greek Cypriots to move to north if they wished to do so. After the agreement, the Greek and Turkish populations of the island started to live separately.

A series of negotiations took place for eight years after 1974, between the two communities, with no common ground. After the failure of the negotiations, on 15 November 1983, under the leadership of Rauf Denktaş Turkish Cypriots declared their independence as well as their own state: Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Turkey was (and as of 2010 still is) the only country that recognized TRNC, where the southern part of the island, the Republic of Cyprus, is recognized as the only legal authority worldwide. Since then, many economic restrictions and embargoes were imposed on Turkish Cypriots. After 1983, several negotiations among the two communities took place and many UN peace proposals were made in order to solve the problem between the communities; however, they all failed. In 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2003, after the opening up of the green line, the communities were allowed to pass to the other side. The most promising UN plan, the Annan Plan<sup>30</sup> that proposed a loose federation composed of two component states was made. The plan was put into referenda on 24 April 2004. Although both the UN and Turkey spent tremendous efforts for the approval of the plan, it was rejected by the Greek Cypriots by a margin of about three to one, where Turkish Cypriots accepted the plan by a margin of almost two to one. Following the rejection of the Annan Plan, the negotiations were suspended until April 2008. In September 2008, full-fledged negotiations between the

---

<sup>30</sup>The Text of the Annan Plan. Hellenic Resources Network Official Website [online]. [Cited 07 April 2010]. Available at: [http://www.hri.org/docs/annan/Annan\\_Plan\\_Text.html](http://www.hri.org/docs/annan/Annan_Plan_Text.html)

communities started and they still continue, but as of 2010, no concrete result could be achieved.

### 1.3 Theoretical Framework

As was mentioned before, in this thesis, the ethno-symbolist approach of Anthony D. Smith will be utilized in order to analyze the historical developments both before and during the British colonial administration period in Cyprus. In this context, both the concepts of nation and nationalism, and the concept of ethnicity are relevant for the theoretical framework of the study.

The word ‘ethnie’ derives from the Greek word *ethnos* which means people, and refers to the historical human groupings in a given society. Hastings defines an ethnic group as “a group of people with a shared cultural identity and spoken language,”<sup>31</sup> whereas Weber states that ethnic groups are “those human groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent because of similarities of physical type or of customs or both, or because of memories of colonization or migration.”<sup>32</sup>

Whether these aspects are ‘given’<sup>33</sup> or ‘believed’ to be shared, all the members of ethnic groups carry a sense of belonging among themselves due to their common features such as “dress, language and culturally denoted physical features in

---

<sup>31</sup>Hastings, A. (1999). *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 3.

<sup>32</sup>Weber, M. (1922). “Economy and Society.” In Roth, G. and Wittich, C. (Eds.) (1978) *Ephraim Fischhof Vol. II*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, p. 389.

<sup>33</sup>Horowitz, D. L. (1985). *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press, p. 56.

addition to common nationality, race, religion, common ancestry, homeland, customs and traditions-culture.”<sup>34</sup>

Definition of the ethnic group and ethnic group consciousness carries a great similarity with the definition of nations along with these shared aspects, because both of the concepts carry a sense of belonging, or the ‘us’ feeling, which is strengthened by the perception of ‘other’ as well as and the will for defining the self within a particular group. Nations, as it is mentioned above, similar to ethnic groups are defined as the entities which constitute the common aspects of language, race, culture and sometimes religion.<sup>35</sup> However, it is not possible to suggest that ethnic groups and nations are the same, since nations carry “a wider ideological, discursive consciousness”<sup>36</sup> as compared to ethnies. In addition, the consciousness among the ethnies is much lower as compared to nations. But, it is fair to state that to a certain degree ethnic groups represent “a step in the process of nation-formation”<sup>37</sup> because usually ethnicity is a resource for the functioning of the nationalist projections.

Kohn explains the main difference between ethnic groups and nations, while stating that the sense of belonging to a group takes the form of organized action.<sup>38</sup> In addition the nationalist doctrine rather than including all shared aspects chooses one or more particular aspects to emphasize,<sup>39</sup> which will enable easier mobilization for

---

<sup>34</sup>Nash, M. (1996). “The Core Elements of Ethnic Thinking.” In Hutchinson, J. and Smith, A. D. (Eds.) *Ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 25.

<sup>35</sup>Kedourie, E. (1993). *Nationalism*. USA: Blackwell Publishing, p. 67.

<sup>36</sup>Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage Publications, p. 10.

<sup>37</sup>Connor, W. (1994). *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, p. 13.

<sup>38</sup>Kohn, H. (2005). *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origins and Background*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, p. 10.

<sup>39</sup>Kedourie, E. (1993). *Nationalism*. USA : Blackwell Publishing, p. 67.

the common belief that “a nation should have self-determination.”<sup>40</sup> That is to say, the process of politicization of the identity perception and creating the sense of belongingness in an organized political entity (in this case the nation-state) is the main difference between the concepts of ethnic group and nation, since “the presence of ethnicity is not in line with the idea of state all the time.”<sup>41</sup>

Nations are imagined political communities both inherently and sovereign,<sup>42</sup> so that they can actually be composed of one or more ethnic groups. Today many nations have their own nation-states and their most obvious difference from the ethnic groups is that they share a “common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members.”<sup>43</sup>

Although various studies have been conducted on the concepts of nations and nationalism since the 18<sup>th</sup> century, there is no consensus among the scholars on either the definition of nations and nationalisms, or when and how they emerged (that is whether nations and nationalisms are modern or pre-modern phenomena).<sup>44</sup> There are four major approaches about these concepts which are termed as primordialist, perennialist, modernist, and ethno-symbolist. Primordial and

---

<sup>40</sup>Glover, J. (1997). “Nations, Identity and Conflict.” In McKim, R. and McMahan, J. (Eds.) *The Morality of Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 12.

<sup>41</sup>Baumann, G. (2006). *Çokkültürlülük Bilmecesi: Ulusal, Etnik ve Dinsel Kimlikleri Yeniden Düşünmek.* (Demirakın, I. Trans). Ankara: Dost Yayınevi, (Original work published in 1996), p. 27.

<sup>42</sup>Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, p. 6.

<sup>43</sup>Smith, A. D. (1991). *National Identity*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, p. 14.

<sup>44</sup>The spread of nationalism with the influence of 1789 French Revolution carries a significant importance. The period before 1789 is named as the pre-modern era in which many ethnic groups lived together side by side under the multi-ethnic empires. As for the period after 1789, which is called as the modern era, we see the major empires starting to demolish and being replaced by several nation states.

perennialist approaches represent the pre-modern stand, where modernist and ethno-symbolists represent the modern stand.

The primordialist approach argues that the existence of the nations are as old as the existence of the human beings. They are parts of human nature, and they can be found anytime, anywhere.<sup>45</sup> As the concept of nation is perceived as a natural and universal phenomenon, any discussion on its emergence is accepted irrelevant. The concepts of nation and nationalism are basically inherent features of the collective human history. The sense of belonging to a nation and the idea of nationalism comes from sentiments due to the 'givens'<sup>46</sup> similar to such aspects as sex, physical characteristics, language and social practices as well as "kinship, religion and common ethnicity."<sup>47</sup> The 'given' aspects of identities are "rooted in the non-rational foundations of the personality"<sup>48</sup> and they form a strong attachment to the larger human groupings due to blood ties.<sup>49</sup> As it can be clearly understood from the assumptions of this approach, primordialists basically found their arguments on the natural and inevitable foundations of nations.

Perennialist approach, while not totally opposing the primordialist argument on nation as natural phenomena, argues that a nation is "the product of historical and

---

<sup>45</sup>Ichijo, A. and Uzelac, G. (2005). *When is the Nation? Towards an Understanding of Theories of Nationalism*. London: Routledge, p. 51.

<sup>46</sup>Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Free Press, p. 16.

<sup>47</sup>Shils, E. (1957). "Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties." *British Journal of Sociology*, 8, p. 135.

<sup>48</sup>Freeman, M. (1998). "Theories of Ethnicity, Tribalism and Nationalism." In Christie, K. *Ethnic Conflict, Tribal Politics: A Global Perspective*. Great Britain: Curzon Press, p. 19.

<sup>49</sup>Shils, E. (1957). "Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties." *British Journal of Sociology*, 8, p. 142.

social progresses.”<sup>50</sup> Nations, therefore, are continuous, immemorial and recurrent bodies, because humans always had a consciousness of being a member of a community throughout the history. As for nationalism, it is “simply the ideology and movement for an already existing nation.”<sup>51</sup>

Modernist approach, on the other hand argues that “neither nations nor states exist at all times and in all circumstances”<sup>52</sup> and that they are modern constructions that came into being due to the emergence of industrial society. The transformation of the communities and the system at large with industrialization led to the changes in the social structure and cultural systems, which enabled such conceptualizations to emerge. The technological innovations, especially in printing and spread of vernacular languages<sup>53</sup> as well as the struggle for survival by the smaller communities against the bigger ones<sup>54</sup> were the significant changes affecting. Along with the construction of national consciousness, nationalism started to exist in the modern era either as an ideology which aims to achieve nation-state, or as a “political movement seeking or exercising state power and justifying such actions with nationalist arguments.”<sup>55</sup>

According to modernist school of thought, nationalism emerged when the transformation from agrarian societies to industrial societies took place. It is a

---

<sup>50</sup>Guibernau i Berdún, M. M. (2007). *The Identity of Nations*. Cambridge: Polity, p. 14.

<sup>51</sup>Smith, A. D. (2000). “Theories of Nationalism: Alternative Models of Nation Formation.” In Leifer, M. (2000). *Asian Nationalism*. London: Routledge, p. 2.

<sup>52</sup>Gellner, E. (2006). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, p. 6.

<sup>53</sup>Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, p. 6.

<sup>54</sup>Hobsbawm, E. J. (2008). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>55</sup>Breuilly, J. (1994). *Nationalism and the State*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p. 6.

concept which came into being in the modern period since industrialization promoted a different kind of division of labor and the people felt the need of an ideology to redefine themselves in this new era.

Gellner explains the main difference between belonging to a community in the modern era, as being a member of a nation where this kind of consciousness cannot be seen in the pre-modern era. He divides the pre-modern political organizations into two categories as local self governing communities and the empires. On the one hand, there are city-states, tribal segments, and peasant communes; on the other hand there are large territories which are governed by empires<sup>56</sup> with various human groupings coming from different cultural, religious, and linguistic backgrounds.

According to Gellner, there are three main stages in history: the pre-agrarian, the agrarian, and the industrial. The pre-agrarian stage refers to the hunter-gatherer stage where there was no state or polity. He states that this stage did not face any kind of possibility on the emergence of nationalism, unlike the second phase in which there was such possibility. The second stage, the agrarian (or, as Gellner calls, the *agro-literate*), witnessed various types of societies with their own states in most cases. Gellner uses the term “agro-literate polity”<sup>57</sup> for defining this era along with the terms state of culture and sense of belonging in a human group. He states that the division of labor in this type of rule is basically the strict division between the ruler and the ruled in an empire. In such a structure, “a central dominant authority co-exists with semi-autonomous local units.”<sup>58</sup> Even if the ruling class

---

<sup>56</sup>Gellner, E. (2006). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, p. 13.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid, p. 14.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid.

forms a small minority as compared to the ruled, there is an intense level of social stratification where inequalities among the classes are absolute.<sup>59</sup>

According to Gellner, “The cultural differentiation is very marked”<sup>60</sup> in these systems, as the ruling groups belong to a higher class, holding various privileges, whereas the ruled does not. Due to this fact the homogenization of culture or any sense of creating a common belonging is not favored in these systems. Gellner further states that, it was not possible in such great territories to “impose universalized clerisy and a homogenized culture with centrally imposed norms” because “the resources were lacking”<sup>61</sup> for such an act. Third stage, the industrial stage- the modern era, was the main stage where establishment of the nation-states became inevitable and every society whether aspires to achieve their own state or already achieved.<sup>62</sup>

Gellner while focusing on the state of nature claims that “nations, like states, are a contingency, and not a universal necessity. Neither nations nor states exist at all times and in all circumstances.”<sup>63</sup> For him, “nationalism is primarily a political principle, which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent.”<sup>64</sup> He further states that due to the conditions created by the industrial revolution and the era following it, the presence of nationalism and nation-states became

---

<sup>59</sup>Ibid, p. 9.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid, p. 10.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid, p. 17.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid, p. 1.

inevitable.<sup>65</sup> He basically claims that ethnicity (or any other kind of human bond) is not a necessity for nationalism of any kind; the necessity is just the will for the application of the political project-formation of nation. Thus nations did not make either states or nationalism, however states and nationalisms created nations.<sup>66</sup> As such, they are not fixed and natural; rather they are subject to change.<sup>67</sup>

Although Gellner's perspective on nations and nationalism does not see any necessity of ethnic boundaries for the emergence of a nation, nationalism and the nation-state, other scholars like Anderson and Hobsbawm claim that ethnic consciousness in the emergence of nations and nationalisms is an important aspect.

Anderson argues that nations are "imagined political communities"<sup>68</sup> because "members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion."<sup>69</sup> In case of all human groupings, which also include ethnic groups, he states that "all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even these) are imagined."<sup>70</sup> He also states that nations are; (1) imagined as limited, because there is a belief of the borders of relatedness; (2) imagined as sovereign because nationalism emerged after Enlightenment and French Revolution so the support for traditional rules, divine or autocracies were demolished; (3) imagined as community, because this is the only way of keeping

---

<sup>65</sup>Ibid, p. 2.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid, p. 1.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid.

<sup>68</sup>Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, p. 6.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid.

large amounts of people with a sense of belongingness to each other even if they have no interaction among themselves together.<sup>71</sup>

However while stating that nations and nationalisms are human constructs, Anderson also suggests that these concepts should be understood “not with self-consciously held political ideologies, but with the large cultural systems that preceded it, out of which- as well as against which- came into being.”<sup>72</sup> The cultural systems that are mentioned by Anderson refer to the impact of print technology and converge of capitalism that created the possibility of constructing the sense of belonging to a nation through official print-languages.<sup>73</sup> That is to say, he opposes the necessity of previous group bonds in the emergence of nations and nationalisms while putting the emphasis on the process of creating a nation through several politically imposed cultural means.

Hobsbawm, on the other hand, uses the term “popular proto-nationalism”<sup>74</sup> in defining the common aspects of human groupings which contributed to the emergence of nations, such as language and culture etc, although not in all communities did these aspects help building a nation. History witnessed those aspects such as religion and language as well as myths about the past helped building the perception of a nation, as was the case in Polish and Irish nationalisms<sup>75</sup> and in Greek nationalism.<sup>76</sup> But while mentioning the importance of

---

<sup>71</sup>Ibid.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid, p. 46.

<sup>74</sup>Hobsbawm, E. J. (2008). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 77.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid, p. 67.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid, p. 77.

these factors, Hobsbawm clearly states that “the type of nationalism which emerged towards the end of nineteenth century has no fundamental similarity to state-patriotism [the modern understanding of nationalism], even it attached itself to it.”<sup>77</sup> According to him, the conception of nation and nation-state were the products of bourgeois liberal thought of 1830-1880. Formation of nations was the pure ideological human evolution from a smaller group to larger, from family to tribe, to region, and to nation in the end.<sup>78</sup> In this process, some people were destined to transform into full nations and some were not.<sup>79</sup>

Smith is the leading figure of the ethno-symbolist approach, who established a relation between ethnicity and emergence of nationalism. According to Smith, modernist approach to nationalism tells only the half of the story. Specific nations are also the product of older, often pre-modern ethnic ties and ethno-histories.<sup>80</sup>

Smith defines the nation as a “named human population sharing a historic territory, common myths and memories, a mass, public culture, a single economy and common rights and duties for all members.”<sup>81</sup> He states that it is important to distinguish concepts of the nation and state, since states are legal and political concepts whereas nations are social and cultural communities, with a territory, shared history and culture.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup>Ibid, p. 93.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid, p. 38.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid, p. 36.

<sup>80</sup>Smith, A. D. (1998). *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations*. London: Routledge, p. 195.

<sup>81</sup>Smith, A. D. (1999). *Myth and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 24.

<sup>82</sup>Smith, A. D. (1995). *Nations and Their Pasts*, in 24 October 1995 The Warwick Debates on Nations and Nationalism [online]. [Cited 15 February 2010]. Available at: <http://www.members.tripod.com/GellnerPage/Warwick.html>

Nationalism, on the other hand, is an ideological movement for the attainment and maintenance of autonomy, unity and identity of a human population, some of whose members conceive it to constitute an actual or potential nation. According to Smith, the concept of nationalism “appears so protean and seems so elusive”<sup>83</sup> that studies on nationalism require much more complex analyses composed of as many variables of nationalist movements and ideologies as possible. As such, Smith rejects the assumption that the emergence of nationalism is rooted only in the emergence of modernization.<sup>84</sup>

Smith further argues that modernist stand has several misleading problematic assumptions. According to him, nations can be both imagined and real<sup>85</sup> therefore they can both be fabricated and be the products of pre-existing traditions and heritages, which have coalesced over the generations. Nationalism can also emerge in all kinds of socio-economic settings, pre-industrial as well as industrial. Furthermore, the perception of modernist stand overlooks the persistence of ethnic ties and cultural sentiments in many parts of the world, and their continuing significance for large numbers of people in assuming that nations and nationalisms are mostly the products of modernization.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup>Smith, A. D. (1999) *Myth and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 29.

<sup>84</sup>Smith, A. D. (1995). *Nations and Their Pasts*, in 24 October 1995 The Warwick Debates on Nations and Nationalism [online]. [cited 15 February 2010]. Available at: <http://www.members.tripod.com/GellnerPage/Warwick.html>

<sup>85</sup>Smith, A. D. (2004). *The Antiquity of Nations*. Cambridge: Polity Press, p. 63.

<sup>86</sup>Smith, A. D. (1995). *Nations and Their Pasts*, in 24 October 1995 The Warwick Debates on Nations and Nationalism [online]. [Cited 15 February 2010]. Available at: <http://www.members.tripod.com/GellnerPage/Warwick.html>

Although Smith does not assert that every modern nation must be founded on some antecedent ethnic ties, he suggests that many nations have been and are based on these ties. With careful analysis, it can be seen that “who set out to forge modern nations is one of reconstructing the traditions, customs and institutions of ethnic communities which forms the basis of the nation, than of inventing new traditions.”<sup>87</sup> As such, the analysis based on the ethnic components of national communities is more likely to help to explain which populations’ nationalist movements would emerge under certain conditions as well as the general characteristics of their nationalism.

Smith further suggests that the exploration of earlier ethnic configurations will be helpful in explaining the major issues and concerns of a subsequent nationalism in a given population and provide clues about the likely growth of a nation and its nationalism.<sup>88</sup> Smith further argues that the history of great majority of communities in the world proves the existence of five specific stages in the formation of nations that are; the early coalescence, consolidation, development and division, reawakening and lastly the period of modern nation. The first stage is the period where the coalescence of clans and tribes, settlements and into a wider cultural and political networks. This stage is also associated with myths of ancestry, migration and liberation and, above all, foundation of myths. The second stage, the period of ethnic consolidation, is associated with spread of ethnic culture, the performance of military exploits and the existence of sages, saints and heroes, which is often recalled as ‘golden age’ by later generations. The third stage, development and division, refers to a decline, where the old order hardens around the upper classes,

---

<sup>87</sup>Smith, A. D. (2004). *The Antiquity of Nations*. Cambridge: Polity Press, p. 89.

<sup>88</sup>Smith, A. D. (1995). *Nations and Their Pasts*, in 24 October 1995 The Warwick Debates on Nations and Nationalism [online]. [Cited 15 February 2010]. Available at: <http://www.members.tripod.com/GellnerPage/Warwick.html>

the community's identity perceptions ossifies and decays due to pressure, sometimes conquest and exiles.

The fourth stage, reawakening or regenerating the community is the stage where nationalism appears via the nationalist revolutions. The nationalist movements reconstruct the past as that of a pre-existent nation and attempt to clean it from the alien disfigurements by using the myths for tying it to vision of the common future. During this process the manipulations in the perceptions are common via selective history teachings that single out the foundation myths and golden ages and omits unworthy episodes for the specific purpose of building a nation. In some cases, nationalists even invent episodes in the history. In the last stage, the period of the modern nation, the provision of a national constitution and the institution of a regular political system exists. In this stage, the development of a modern economy, establishing legal order and the emancipation and provision of social welfare for all classes and genders are given special emphasis.<sup>89</sup>

According to Smith the most significant process in the nation-formation is the type of ethnic community that the process is taking place since it determines the route. He identifies three kinds of ethnic groups, namely, the *lateral*, the *vertical*, and the *fragmentary*. The *fragmentary* ethnies are the immigrant communities, whose members have migrated from their community for economic, political or religious reasons in order to form a colony; and over the time form a nation. The *lateral* and *vertical* ethnies on the other hand, comparing to *fragmentary* ethnies are the vast majority in such cases.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup>Smith, A. D. (1995). "The Formation of National Identity." In Harris, H. (Ed.) *Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 141-143.

<sup>90</sup>Smith, A. D. (2000). *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Hanover: University Press of New England, pp. 71- 72.

Smith defines *lateral* ethnies, as aristocratic and extensive.<sup>91</sup> In this kind of ethnies, “the aristocratic groups have little social depth and they rarely resort cultural penetration of the people, even they may fail to recognize ‘the people’ as theirs.”<sup>92</sup> However, these ethnies carry the potential for self-perpetuation while preserving a sense of common descent and some din collective memories, via whether incorporation of aristocratic groups with other strata of the population, or surviving by changing character of masses accordingly with aristocratic culture.<sup>93</sup> The route to modern nationhood proceeds in these ethnies through the establishment of strong, centralized state dominantly by the aristocratic classes and through the bureaucratic incorporation of outlying regions and lower strata,<sup>94</sup> where in the process, intellectuals and professionals play a secondary role.<sup>95</sup>

According to Smith, nations and ethnies are closely aligned, and nations are based on and are being created out of “pre-existing ethnies.”<sup>96</sup> Therefore, nations are historical phenomena because they are rooted in shared memories and traditions of human groupings (collective pasts) whereas nationalism and modern nation-building processes are constructions. The central point which should be taken into consideration is the relation between shared memories and cultural identities since shared memories are essential to the survival of such collective identities.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup>Smith, A. D. (1999). *Myth and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 18.

<sup>92</sup>Smith, A. D. (2000). *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Hanover: University Press of New England, p. 72.

<sup>93</sup>Smith, A. D. (1989). “The Origins of Nations.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 12(3), p. 349.

<sup>94</sup>Smith, A. D. (2000). *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Hanover: University Press of New England, p. 72.

<sup>95</sup>Smith, A. D. (1989). “The Origins of Nations.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 12(3), p. 362.

<sup>96</sup>Smith, A. D. (1999) *Myth and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 10.

<sup>97</sup>Ibid, p. 10.

Therefore, the role of memories, values, myths and symbols are also significant, since nationalism very often involves the pursuit of symbolic goals. Consequently, ethno-symbolic approach can answer the question why masses respond to the intelligentsia's historical motivations on mass mobilization projects.

Another leading figure in ethno-symbolist approach, Connor, claims that there is no other kind of nationalism but ethnic nationalism. He finds it unnecessary to focus on the issue of the emergence of nations, rather he prefers to focus on the time in which a nation emerges and asks the question 'when is a nation?' He states that the main difference between ethnic groups and nations is that ethnic groups are composed of "people [who are] not yet cognizant of belonging to a larger element."<sup>98</sup> As such, nations are self-aware groups, whereas ethnic groups are not. He basically claims that the ethnic groups, while experiencing their traditional bond of belonging, are not aware of their uniqueness and only when they reach this awareness, they become nations.

Ethno-symbolist approach, while agreeing on the stand that nations and nationalisms are constructed entities, criticizes the modernist rejection of any primordial ties to this kind of consciousness. Their main argument is that history should not be disregarded in the studies of nation and nationalism, relevance and impact of previous sense of belongings and modern nation should be taken into consideration together.<sup>99</sup> Nation is a historical phenomenon which has an ethnic basis. The origins of nations should not be analyzed within the limits of a particular period of time in history, ignoring previous ethnic ties and sentiments. Since the historical ties of human groupings provide cultural background for the nation-

---

<sup>98</sup>Connor, W. (1994). *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, p. 102.

<sup>99</sup>Smith, A. D. (1999). *Myth and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 181.

formation processes, they are significant for the construction of national consciousness and nationalism.

#### **1.4 Methodology and Outline**

As was mentioned above, in this thesis, Anthony D. Smith's ethno-symbolist approach on nationalism will be utilized, since the impact of the historical developments, especially the ones in the British era, that laid the ground for the inter-communal dispute in Cyprus can be explained with this analysis.

The thesis is divided into five chapters. After the Introduction, in the second chapter, the historical background on the development of identity in Cyprus prior to the British period is given under two headings: 1) 'From the Earliest Settlement in the Island till Ottoman Conquest (2000 B.C.-1571)' and 2) 'From the Ottoman Conquest till British Arrival (1571-1878).' In addition to providing historical background information on Cyprus, the second chapter also attempts to provide an insight about the complex multi-religious and multi-national structure of the island.

In the third chapter, first, the early British attitude towards the Ottoman Empire concerning the "Eastern Question" and the reasons behind the occupation of the island are analyzed. Later, in order to explore the motives behind the foundation of the ethno-national consciousnesses among the communities during the early British era, the historical developments from 1878 till 1931 are examined by specifically examining the British imperial foreign policies in the region.

In the fourth chapter, the period between 1931 and the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus in 1960 is analyzed in order to explore the reasons behind the

consolidation of the separate nationalist tendencies that eventually resulted in the emergence of inter-communal conflict in the island.

In the Conclusion, the creation of nationalist identity perceptions of both communities in Cyprus and the effect of British administrative policies on the rise of such consciousness as well as their transformation into antagonistic national identities are discussed by using the ethno-symbolist approach of Anthony D. Smith on nationalism.

In order to analyze the developments in this specific historical period, in this thesis, in addition to the relevant books, theses and journal articles written on the topic in English and Turkish, some official archival sources that are available in the education, justice, population and administration sections of the Cyprus Annual Colonial Reports from 1886 to 1959 are also used. Furthermore, the issues of the Cyprus Gazette from 1914 to 1958, and the books and reports about the developments in the island from the British point of view (published between 1878 and 1924) are examined. These sources are mainly obtained from the Republic of Cyprus State Archives in Southern Nicosia, National Archives and Research Department of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus in Kyrenia and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus' Republic Assembly- Şehit Cengiz Ratip Library in Northern Nicosia.



south of Turkey, 105 km from the west of Syria, 380 km from the north of Egypt and 380 km from the east of Greece (Rhodes Island).

As was mentioned in the Introduction, Cyprus has been divided into two parts since 1974 and administrated separately by the *de jure* Republic of Cyprus in the southern part and *de facto* Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus in the north. According to the 2008 figures,<sup>100</sup> the population of the south is 796.900 composed of Greek Cypriots, Armenians, Maronites and Latins, as well as settlers and temporary workers from other countries. The population of the north is 265.100 according to the 2007 figures<sup>101</sup>, composed of Turkish Cypriots, temporary workers from other countries and a small number of Maronites.

The religious composition of the island, similar to its multi-national structure, is quite complex. Most of the Greek Cypriots are Greek Orthodox Christians, and Turkish Cypriots are Sunni Muslims. The Maronites and Latins are practicing the faith of Catholic Christianity and belong to Roman Catholic Church, where Armenians belong to Armenian Apostolic Church. Apart from these, there are also smaller religious groups such as Baha'is, Hindus, Jews and Protestant Christians who are mostly the immigrants who settled there and temporary workers.

---

<sup>100</sup>Demographical Report 2008 [online]. *Statistical Service of the Republic of Cyprus*, [cited 24.02.2010]. Available at: <http://www.mof.gov.cy/mof/cystat/statistics.nsf/All/CBAA25D58105CAF3C225767B00381C70?OpenDocument&sub=1&e=>

<sup>101</sup>KKTC Genel Nüfus ve Konut Sayımı Toplu Sonuçlar, 10 Eylül 2007 [online]. *KKTC Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Örgütü*, [cited 24.02.2010]. Available at: <http://nufussayimi.devplan.org/Nufus-nitelikleri-index.html>

Throughout history, due to its geographical location, Cyprus “has always been at the center of strategic trade routes”<sup>102</sup> and experienced “multiple faces of exploitation.”<sup>103</sup> As one expert suggests, “Most nations from Europe who wanted to conquer Africa or Asia stepped over Cyprus, and most Asian nations who wanted to conquer European countries, again, stepped over Cyprus.”<sup>104</sup> Many civilizations replaced one another from 700 B.C till the independence of the island in 1960 including Mycenaens, Egyptians, Hittites, Phoenicians, Assyrians, Romans, Plotemian, Byzantines, Abbasid-Umayyad Caliphates, English, Franks, Lusignans, Venetians, Ottomans and lastly the British.<sup>105</sup>

Therefore the contemporary multi-religious and multi-national characteristic of Cyprus is basically a historical outcome. Throughout its history, all the conquerors, while using the island as a tool for accumulating wealth and/or power, also influenced its socio-cultural structure. Continuous population exchanges and imposition of different religious systems of rule resulted in a complex demographical and socio-cultural structure of this small Mediterranean island.

---

<sup>102</sup>Camp, G. D. (1980). “Greek-Turkish Conflict over Cyprus.” *Political Science Quarterly*. 95(1), Spring, p. 43.

<sup>103</sup>Hasgüler, M. (2007). *Kıbrıs'ta Enosis ve Taksim Politikalarının Sonu*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayıncılık, p. 25.

<sup>104</sup>Clerides, G. (2000). Impediments to the Solution of the Cyprus Problem. *Seton Hall Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, Summer/Fall, p. 15.

<sup>105</sup>Chrysafi, A. C. (2003). *Who Shall Govern Cyprus - Brussels or Nicosia?* London: Evandia Publishing, pp. 10-26. For further information, see: Cobham, C. D. (1908). *Excerpta Cypria: Materials for a History of Cyprus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Atun, A. (2005). *Milat Öncesinden Günümüze Kıbrıs Tarihi Üzerine Belgeler*, Lefkoşa: Samtay Vakfı Yayınları & Purcell, H. D. (1969). *Cyprus*. New York: Praeger.

In this chapter, in order to explore the historical experiences that led to the establishment and development of the complex socio-cultural setting of Cyprus, an introduction to the island's history prior to the British arrival is given. This period is examined under two historical eras: from the earliest settlements in the island till the Ottoman conquest (2000 B.C.-1571); and from the Ottoman conquest till British arrival (1453-1878). Both of these periods had significant impact on the later developments in the island, especially in terms of the emergence of demographic complexity and ethnic tensions.

## **2.1 From the Earliest Settlement in the Island till the Ottoman Conquest (2000 B.C.-1571)**

The earliest conquests of the island began in the Bronze Age “when copper production transformed Cyprus into a center of commercial importance in the eastern Mediterranean.”<sup>106</sup> The earliest people who conquered the island were Mycenaens, an early Greek civilization. They first settled in Asia Minor and the Aegean islands, and then, in 2000 B.C. they colonized Cyprus. This development brought early Greek culture as well as Greek political ideas and manner of administration to the island.<sup>107</sup>

During this era, Cyprus was divided into city-kingdoms in line with the general Mycenaean administrative practice. Introduction of this administrative practice carries great significance, as it lasted nearly 1700 years, even if the rulers of the island kept changing. Under the rule of Mycenaens, Cyprus became a commercial and cultural center where many people interacted with each other. While the island

---

<sup>106</sup>Camp, G. D. (1980). Greek-Turkish Conflict over Cyprus. *Political Science Quarterly*. 95(1), Spring, p. 43.

<sup>107</sup>Chrysafi, A. C. (2003). *Who Shall Govern Cyprus-Brussels or Nicosia?* London: Evandia Publishing, p. 9.

itself was getting influenced by various outside cultures, it was also influencing them.<sup>108</sup>

The Mycenaean rule ended after 500 years, when the Egyptian Pharaoh III Thutmose's armies conquered Cyprus in 1500 B.C. Egyptians were using the island as a source of copper production. In their 300 years of rule, they had to face numerous raids to the island from the Hittite Empire. This struggle ended up with the Hittite conquest of the island in 1320 B.C. Hittites, just like Egyptians, used the rich copper resources of the island, but in addition they also used the island "as a penal colony."<sup>109</sup> When the Hittite Empire demolished in 1200 B.C., Cyprus was once again conquered by Egyptians who controlled the island for the next 200 years. Later, from 1000 B.C. to 709 B.C., Phoenician<sup>110</sup> and Assyrian civilizations ruled Cyprus till the Persian King Cambyses captured the island in 525 B.C.<sup>111</sup> In his era; Cyprus became one of the five administrative divisions of this empire.<sup>112</sup>

The Persians did not change the administrative system of the island which was established during the Mycenaean rule, and just like the previous Egyptian, Hittite,

---

<sup>108</sup>Mycenaens were deeply influenced by the eastern cultures in terms of poetry, art and material culture. The myths and the local deities of Mycenaean civilization were also introduced from the Near East via Cyprus, mostly by Sumerian and Akkadian Empires and from today's Anatolia, Syria and Palestine. For further information, see: West, M. L. (1999). *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 586-600 & Jones, P. and Pennick, N. (1997). *A History of Pagan Europe*. London: Routledge, p. 11.

<sup>109</sup>Purcell, H. D. (1969). *Cyprus*. New York: Praeger, p. 78.

<sup>110</sup>Phoenicia (2300 B.C.-65 B.C.) was an ancient civilization composed of Greek city-kingdoms and covered the territories of today's Lebanon, Syria and Israel.

<sup>111</sup>Briant, P. (2002). *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. USA: Eisenbrauns Publications, p. 51.

<sup>112</sup>Persian Empire (550 B.C.-330 B.C.) possessed the territories of today's Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, as well as parts of Central Asia, Anatolia, Thrace and Macedonia, Black Sea coastal regions, Iraq, northern Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Palestine, Israel, Lebanon, Syria, western Libya and some parts of Egypt.

Phoenician and Assyrian rulers, they gave an autonomous status to the local kings of the city-kingdoms in exchange of annual tributes that would be given incessantly. As such, they did not intervene in the internal affairs of the island.<sup>113</sup> This system of administration, while giving the autonomous status to the Cypriot city-kingdoms was also enabling them to preserve the Greek culture, which first came to the island in 2000 B.C. and was still quite influential due to the existence of the ancient Greek kingdoms in the region.

The possession of Cyprus was essential to Persia's expansionist Mediterranean policy due to the geographic proximity of the island to the Asian Mediterranean coasts. It was considered that the island is capable of furnishing a considerable fleet and serving as an outpost in the Asian war.<sup>114</sup> In addition, the Island had ancient ties with the Phoenicia, and the fact that most of the Cypriot kings' were of Phoenician origin, using Phoenician language was considered as an advantage in terms of easy communication with the Phoenician city-states.<sup>115</sup> The Persians were expecting loyalty and military support as well as tributes from the Cypriot kings in wars. However, after the Battle of Issus between the Persian Empire and the Kingdom of Macedonia<sup>116</sup> in 333 B.C. that ended with the Macedonian victory, the Cypriot kings shifted their loyalty from the Persians to the Macedonians. After the Battle of Issus, Alexander the Great, the King of Macedonia, wanted to capture Tyre in 332 B.C. During the siege of the city, the Cypriot kings supported

---

<sup>113</sup>Spyridakis, C. (1964). *A Brief history of Cyprus*. Nicosia: Greek Communal Chamber Publications Department, p. 100.

<sup>114</sup>Briant, P. (2002). *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. Daniels, USA: Einsenbrauns Publications, p. 489.

<sup>115</sup>Ibid, pp. 488-489.

<sup>116</sup>Ancient Kingdom of Macedonia (early 7th century B.C.-150 B.C.) was an ancient Greek kingdom which became the most powerful kingdom in the world under the rule of Alexander the Great. It possessed the territories stretching from today's Greece, Macedonia, Thrace, most of the Anatolia, to India, including Iran, Pakistan, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Egypt.

Alexander the Great. The reason behind their support was their awareness of the fact that Phoenicia was already under Alexander's influence.<sup>117</sup> At the end of the war, as a response to their voluntary help, Alexander the Great gave independence to Cyprus.

However after the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C., one of the generals of the Kingdom of Macedonia, Ptolemy I Soter, who was also the ruler of Egypt, conquered the island. The main motivation of Ptolemy I Soter in the conquest of the island was to be able to control the neighboring areas of Egypt, thus further securing his rule over this country. The island was not only important in terms of its geography, but also in terms of its rich mineral resources and agricultural wealth.<sup>118</sup> Soon after this development, another general of Kingdom of Macedonia, Antigonus I Monophthalmus and his son Demetrius started to challenge Ptolemy I Soter. In a campaign against Ptolemy I Soter, Demetrius I conquered the island in 306 B.C.<sup>119</sup> However, the island was re-conquered by Ptolemy in 294 B.C. and remained thereafter as a possession of the Ptolemaic dynasty till its annexation by the Roman Republic<sup>120</sup> in 58 B.C.<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup>Briant, P. (2002). *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. USA: EISBN Publications, p. 828.

<sup>118</sup>Austin, M. M. (2006). *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 497.

<sup>119</sup>Braund, D. (2003). "After Alexander: the Emerge of the Hellenistic World." In Erskine, A. *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 28-29.

<sup>120</sup>The Roman Republic-Roma (509 B.C.-27 B.C.) was the continuation of ancient Roman civilization with a republican form of government. The Roman Republic possessed the territories of today's central Italy, North Africa, Iberian Peninsula, Greece and southern France.

<sup>121</sup>Austin, M. M. (2006). *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 497.

After the annexation of Cyprus by the Romans, however it was given as a gift to Cleopatra VII Philopator and her brother, who were the last members of the ruling Ptolemy Dynasty in Egypt, by the Roman King Gaius Julius Caesar in 47 B.C. After the Battle of Actium<sup>122</sup> between Egypt and Roman Republic that resulted in the emergence of Roman Empire<sup>123</sup>, Cyprus was taken back by the Romans in 27 B.C.<sup>124</sup> Under the Roman Empire, Cyprus was first administered as part of the province of Cilicia, later it was divided into four districts and administered by a proconsul.<sup>125</sup>

The most significant effect of the Roman rule in the island's socio-cultural setting was the introduction of a new religion, Orthodox Christianity. In 46 when Apostles Paul and Barnabas travelled to Cyprus with a missionary goal, they could succeed to convert the Roman proconsul to Orthodox Christianity.<sup>126</sup> Cyprus therefore became the "the first country which is ruled by

---

<sup>122</sup>When Roman General Mark Antony and Cleopatra VII Philopator, the sole ruler of Egypt, decided to establish an eastern empire, it was regarded as a betrayal by the Senate of the Roman Republic, that ended in the declaration of war on Cleopatra VII Philopator. The war which ended with Roman Republic's victory was named as Battle of Actium. After the war, the general who fought against the Cleopatra and Anthony, Octavian were given the name of Gaius Julius Caesar in 27 B.C. by the Roman Senate and became the leader of Romans. He while bringing peace to the Roman state, transformed the oligarchic and democratic Roman Republic into the autocratic Roman Empire.

<sup>123</sup>The Roman Empire (27 B.C.- 476/1453) was the continuation of the Roman Republic, which possessed the territories in most of today's Europe as well as north Africa, all Anatolia, the Caucasus and all eastern coast of Mediterranean. Roman Empire was divided into Western and Eastern Roman Empires in 395. The Western Roman Empire was demolished in 476, where Eastern Roman Empire demolished in 1453.

<sup>124</sup>Saville, A. R. (1878). *Cyprus*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 9.

<sup>125</sup>Eilers, C. (2006). "A Roman East: Ptolemy's Settlement to the Death of Augustus." In Erskine, A. *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, p. 91.

<sup>126</sup>Holland, R. (1998). *Britain and the Revolt in Cyprus, 1954-1959*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 6.

Christianity.”<sup>127</sup> After the establishment of Orthodox Church, Christianity rapidly spread in the island and there would not be any major change in the island until 395, when the Roman Empire was divided into two as Western Roman Empire and Eastern Roman Empire/Byzantine Empire.

After this division, Cyprus, together with the neighboring countries, became part of the Eastern or Byzantine Empire.<sup>128</sup> Under the Byzantine rule, the Church of Cyprus was used as a central apparatus of the state, further increasing the importance of the Church on the socio-cultural structure of the island. Thus, when Byzantine Emperor Zenon gave the *autocephalous* (independence) status to the Church of Cyprus in 488,<sup>129</sup> this would become another major turning point. The *autocephalous* status given to the Church of Cyprus, introduced certain symbolic and administrative privileges to the clergy. The archbishop was given the privilege of signing his name by a special ink made with vermilion and cinnabar, wearing purple instead of black robes and to hold an imperial scepter, all of which gave him an important status within the empire. In addition, the Church was given the rights of “electing and consecrating its own bishops and archbishops and ranking equally with the churches of Antioch, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Constantinople.”<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup>Saville, A. R. (1878). *Cyprus*. London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, p. 9.

<sup>128</sup>Ibid, p. 10.

<sup>129</sup> Holland, R. (1998). *Britain and the Revolt in Cyprus, 1954-1959*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 6.

<sup>130</sup>The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, The Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch and All the East, The Greek Orthodox Church of Jerusalem and The Greek Orthodox of Alexandria are the four ancient patriarchates of wider Greek Orthodox Churches. They all are very influential and regarded as the Byzantine Empire heritage. For further information, see: Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 13.

Another important change that took place under the Byzantine rule was the acceptance of the Greek language as the legal language of the island. Most of the inhabitants were peasants called *coloni*. All of the administrative policies adopted at this era were “rigid and codified in law.”<sup>131</sup> The craftsmen and tradesmen in the towns were obliged to work under the trade organizations and were not allowed to change neither their status nor their proficiencies.<sup>132</sup> In addition, “under the law issued by [Byzantine Emperor] Constantine, tenant farmers were made serfs and forbidden to leave the land on which they were born.”<sup>133</sup> This legal practice led to the rapid internalization of the cultural aspects among the inhabitants and rigidified the presence of the Greek culture in the island, since interaction with the other civilizations was prohibited.

When Muawiyah I, who was the first Caliph of the Umayyad Dynasty<sup>134</sup> conquered the island in 647, the inhabitants of Cyprus came into contact with another group of people, the Arabs. However, the Arabs did not settle in the island and they signed a three year agreement with the Byzantine authorities, which required annual taxes. When the Byzantine governors would later reject paying these taxes, the island was re-conquered by the Arabs in 653.<sup>135</sup> During this time

---

<sup>131</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 13.

<sup>132</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz’de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 31.

<sup>133</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 13.

<sup>134</sup>The Umayyad Caliphate (661-750) was the second of four Islamic caliphates, which possessed territories of the today's Spain, the eastern part of Anatolia including all Caucasus as well as all North Africa, Iberian Peninsula and the Central Asia till India.

<sup>135</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz’de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, pp. 33-34.

period, many Muslims from Syria settled in Cyprus.<sup>136</sup> In 688, another peace treaty was signed between the Arabs and the Byzantine authorities, this time with a higher annual tax; however this treaty did not settle problems between the two sides.<sup>137</sup>

The Abbasid dynasty, the successor of the Umayyad, also could not solve the problems with the Byzantine authorities, although they made twenty four more sieges to the island until 964.<sup>138</sup> However, with the decline in the power of the Abbasid Caliphate,<sup>139</sup> the Byzantine Emperor Nikephoros II Phokas seized the island back in 964, and Cyprus remained as a Byzantine island till late 12<sup>th</sup> century. In 1185, the Byzantine governor of Cyprus commander Manuel I Komnenos seized the island,<sup>140</sup> and “set [himself] up as an independent ruler in Cyprus.”<sup>141</sup> He started to “govern the island with the title of emperor”<sup>142</sup> although his reign lasted only seven years.

---

<sup>136</sup>Hill, G. H. (1952). *A History of Cyprus, Vol.I: To The Conquest by Richard Lion Heart*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 284.

<sup>137</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz’de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 34.

<sup>138</sup>Özkuş, A. E. (2005). *Kıbrıs’ın Sosyo-Ekonomik Tarihi: 1726-1750*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 31. & Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz’de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 34.

<sup>139</sup>The Abbasid Caliphate (750-1258) was the third of four Islamic caliphates, which possessed territories of the today’s eastern part of Anatolia including all Caucasus as well as all North Africa except Tunisia, Iberian Peninsula and the Central Asia till India.

<sup>140</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz’de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 34.

<sup>141</sup>Mango, C. A. (2002). *The Oxford History of Byzantium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 194.

<sup>142</sup>Finley, G. *The History of Greece: From Its Conquest by the Crusaders to Its Conquest by the Turks and of the Empire of Trebizond 1204-1461*. London; William Blackwood and Sons, p. 89.

King Richard I of England captured the island in 1191 on his way to Jerusalem during the Third Crusade<sup>143</sup> in the battle known as the War of Tremetusia.<sup>144</sup> Most historical documents give the reasons behind the conquest as a robbery “perpetrated upon some shipwrecked English soldiers, and an insult offered to [Richard’s] sister and [Cypriot wife] Berengaria”<sup>145</sup>, however the major motive of the conquest was King Richard’s suspicion about a pact between Emperor Manuel I Komnenos and Ayyubid Sultan of Egypt and Syria, Saladin,<sup>146</sup> whom he was fighting against. After the war, King Richard I “appointed officials to administer Cyprus, left a small garrison to enforce his rule, and sailed on to the Holy Land [Jerusalem].”<sup>147</sup> With this conquest, a new era began in the Cyprus, as the 800 years of Byzantium rule ended and the islanders met with their a new ‘other’, Catholic Christians.

---

<sup>143</sup>Crusades were the religious expeditionary military expeditions made by Western Christians in order to take back the holy places from Muslims and spread Catholic Christianity. There were a total of eight crusades which lasted between 1096 and 1571. The First Crusade was made between 1096 and 1099 and it aimed to take back Jerusalem from Muslims. The Second Crusade was made to Greek islands between 1147 and 1149. The Third Crusade took place between 1189 and 1192 and it enabled the Christians an access to Jerusalem and other holy places. The Fourth Crusade of 1202-1204 was through Constantinople, whereas the Fifth Crusade of 1218-1221 was through Egypt. The Sixth Crusade between 1228 and 1229 enabled the control of several holy sites including Jerusalem. The Seventh Crusade was held between 1248 and 1254. Finally, the Eighth Crusade in 1270 was against Egypt and Tunisia, both of which were unsuccessful. For further information, see: Mastnak, T. (2002). *Crusading Peace: Christendom, the Muslim World, and Western Political Order*. California: University of California Press & Nicolle, D.(2001). *The Crusades*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing.

<sup>144</sup>Hill, G. H. (1952). *A History of Cyprus, Vol. I: To The Conquest by Richard Lion Heart*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 316-318. & Saville, A. R. (1878). *Cyprus*. London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, p. 10.

<sup>145</sup>Fisher, F. H. (1878). *Cyprus: Our New Colony and What We Know About It*. London: Georger Routledge and Sons, p. 92.

<sup>146</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 46.

<sup>147</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 14.

Soon after King Richard I left the island, the inhabitants of the island declared a local priest as their ruler after an insurrection. Immediately after this incident, King Richard I sold the island to Knights Templar,<sup>148</sup> in order to finance the money for the crusade.<sup>149</sup> From the British point of view, keeping this far-away island as a property of England was not profitable at the time. The establishment of the Latin Church of Cyprus in 1191 was an important development realized by the *Knights Templar*<sup>150</sup> whose rule was extremely repressive. This led to several uprisings on the part of the inhabitants.<sup>151</sup> So only a year after they took possession of the island, the *Knights Templar* wanted to sell it back to King Richard I.

In 1192, King Richard, being unable to repay the money to the *Knights Templar*,<sup>152</sup> “conferred it as sovereignty upon Guy de Lusignan,<sup>153</sup> the expelled king of Jerusalem.”<sup>154</sup> The Lusignan dynasty would be the next rulers of the island for nearly 300 years during which Cyprus acted as a base for crusades.

---

<sup>148</sup>*Knights Templar* were the officially endorsed Christian military orders of the Roman Catholic Church fighting in the Crusades,

<sup>149</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz’de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 38.

<sup>150</sup>Setton, K. M. (1984). *The Papacy and the Levant, 1204-1571: The Sixteenth Century Vol. IV*. Pennsylvania: Amer Philosophical Society Press, p. 756.

<sup>151</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz’de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 38.

<sup>152</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 47.

<sup>153</sup>Guy de Lusignan was a French knight, who became the king of the Jerusalem between 1186 and 1192 and Cyprus between 1192 and 1194.

<sup>154</sup>William, R. (1842). *The History of Modern Europe: With an Account of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire; and a view of the Progress of Society, From the Rise of the Modern Kingdoms to the Peace of Paris 1763, in a series of letters from a Nobleman to His Son. Vol. I*. London: Longman, Brown &Co., p. 238.

The Lusignan rule started another suppressive era in the island, both in political and socio-cultural terms (which also continued during the following Venetian rule till the 1571 Ottoman conquest). Cyprus experienced a significant change in its socio-cultural and political structure during this era, mostly due to the establishment of a western style feudal system, and a massive population influx from Palestine to Cyprus. These migrants from Palestine were used mostly as soldiers. Under the Lusignans, “the Cypriots who fled to other countries due to the wars were [also] invited back”<sup>155</sup>, and upon their return, they were granted lands.

In this era, the Cypriots were divided into three classes: *paraioki*, *perperyaroi* and *electheroi*. The *paraiokis* were the serfs, who had to work for free, give one third of the harvests to their Lusignan masters and had to pay a tax for staying alive. The *perperyaroi*s were subjected to same conditions, but they were free. As for the *electherois*, they could get some basic rights in exchange of payments to the Lusignan King, and they were able to possess lands, although they had to give one fifth of their harvest to the governors.<sup>156</sup> Other than these three classes, there were a small number of inhabitants who belonged to the bourgeois class working as tradesmen or soldiery.

Most of the Cypriots were serfs working under their Lusignan masters.<sup>157</sup> Despite this, however, the Lusignan rulers “habitually employed Orthodox Christians to staff their government and during their rule the personnel of the civil services was

---

<sup>155</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz’de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 39.

<sup>156</sup>Ibid, p. 39.

<sup>157</sup>Hill, G. H. (1952). *A History of Cyprus, Vol. II: The Frankish Period, 1192-1432*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 6-7.

dominated by them.”<sup>158</sup> This practice might be explained due to the differences in the language between the inhabitants, the new settlers and the rulers, as the Lusignan rulers could not speak Greek.

Under the Lusignan rule, “the Orthodox Church was deprived of all its privileges and there was an intense effort to impose Roman Catholicism.”<sup>159</sup> They aimed to establish the Catholic Church as the main religious authority, thus eradicating the influence of the Orthodox Christianity in the island. In 1197, Lusignan King Amalric I of Cyprus applied to Pope Celestine III and asked for help for the spread of Catholicism in Cyprus. Soon after, a Latin Archbishopric in Nicosia and bishoprics in other towns were established. In 1260, Pope Alexander IV, in an official document named *Bulla Cypria*, declared the Latin Archbishop as the one and only religious leader of the island.<sup>160</sup>

The inhabitants, especially the ones in higher positions, however, were “defensive of their Orthodoxy”<sup>161</sup> although they continued to serve to their Lusignan rulers. The lower classes also resisted religious repression and followed “the lead of their own clergy” in refusing “to accept the imposition of their Western rulers' form of Christianity.”<sup>162</sup> Hence “the Latin Church has never taken easy root in Cyprus”<sup>163</sup>

---

<sup>158</sup>Riley-Smith, J. (2002). *The Oxford History of the Crusades*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 319.

<sup>159</sup>Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis, M. C. (1987). *Identity Conflict Resolution in Divided Societies: The Case of Cyprus*. PhD Thesis, University Professors Programme, Boston University, p. 102.

<sup>160</sup>Purcell, H. D. (1969). *Cyprus*. New York: Praeger, pp. 152-154.

<sup>161</sup>Riley-Smith, J. (2002). *The Oxford History of the Crusades*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 319.

<sup>162</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 16.

<sup>163</sup>Setton, K. M. (1984). *The Papacy and the Levant, 1204-1571: The Sixteenth Century, Vol. IV*. Pennsylvania: Amer Philosophical Society Press, p. 756.

but the mingling of Orthodox Christians and Catholics from Palestine created confusion in religious terms, a factor that would be influential for many generations to come.<sup>164</sup>

In the late 14<sup>th</sup> and early 15<sup>th</sup> centuries the competition among the Genoese, Venetians and Mamluks on the control of the Mediterranean trade routes, started to challenge the Lusignan power in the island. The raids to the island by the Republic of Genoa<sup>165</sup> and the Mamluk Sultanate<sup>166</sup> substantially weakened the Lusignans. The Republic of Genoa gained the control of Famagusta between 1372 and 1464, and the Mamluk Sultanate conquered the island in 1426. The Mamluks, however, did not settle in Cyprus, instead, they “withdrew in exchange of an annual tax”<sup>167</sup> to be given incessantly by the Lusignan King and his heirs.

The Lusignan rule in Cyprus would eventually come to an end when the Lusignan King James II married the daughter of a noble Venetian family who had strong commercial interests in Cyprus in 1468. After the death of King James II in 1473 and his son same year, his wife Catherine became the sole

---

<sup>164</sup>Ibid, p. 756.

<sup>165</sup>The Most Serene Republic of Genoa (1005-1815) was an independent republic which possessed the territories of the northwestern coast of Italy, islands of Lesbos and Chios, Crimea as well as some cities in Asia Minor.

<sup>166</sup>The Mamluk Sultanate (1250-1517) was a sultanate which possessed the territories of today's Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Jordan, and southern coast of Iberian Peninsula. Mamluks were also carrying the title of Caliphate.

<sup>167</sup>Özkul, A. E. (2005). *Kıbrıs'ın Sosyo-Ekonomik Tarihi: 1726-1750*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 33.

ruler of Cyprus.<sup>168</sup> Her reign continued until 1489 when “Venice formally annexed Cyprus and ended the 300 year Lusignan epoch.”<sup>169</sup>

Under the Venetians, the administration of the island was given to a governor who was sent from Venice. During this time period, the administrative, social, legal and economic structure of the island did not change, as the Venetians were basically interested in using the island as a colony to serve their military and commercial needs.<sup>170</sup> There was also no significant change in the demographic characteristics of the island too, as the Lusignans were not asked to leave the island; instead they continued to stay there as land and farm owner.<sup>171</sup> The previous taxation system under which the Orthodox inhabitants had suffered, were also kept, this time, with even higher rates.<sup>172</sup>

As the Venetians were willing to establish good relations with the Mamluk Sultanate, they continued to pay tribute to the Mamluks.<sup>173</sup> The main intention behind the will for establishing good relations with Mamluk Sultanate was the Venetian interest in the Mediterranean trade. In addition, the rise of Ottoman

---

<sup>168</sup>Larsen, A. R., Robin, D. M. and Levin, C. (2007). *Encyclopedia of Women in the Renaissance: Italy, France, and England*. California: ABC-Clío, p. 99.

<sup>169</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 16.

<sup>170</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz’de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 42.

<sup>171</sup>Purcell, H. D. (1969). *Cyprus*. New York: Praeger, p. 69.

<sup>172</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz’de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 43.

<sup>173</sup>Imber, C. (2005). *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies, Vol. II*. London: I.B. Tauris, p. 27.

power in the region in the mid-15<sup>th</sup> century was threatening the territories of both the Mamluk Sultanate and Venetia.<sup>174</sup>

When the Ottomans conquered Egypt and ended the Mamluk Sultanate in 1517, the Sublime Porte<sup>175</sup> accepted the Venetian demand for conciliation; now the tribute paid to the Mamluks would be made to the Ottomans. The offer was also advantageous for the Ottomans, because the conquest of the island would bring unnecessary political and economic burden to the empire.<sup>176</sup> As for the Venetians, however, paying the tribute to the Ottomans was necessary since the island had “a major role” for them in terms of the “safety of maritime trade routes.”<sup>177</sup>

The Ottomans became a major naval power after the possession of the former Mamluk naval forces.<sup>178</sup> The struggle for Mediterranean dominance between the Ottoman Empire on one hand and Genoa, Venice and Austria on the other would continue during the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The Ottomans, however, became the major power in the region after they landed to Sardinia, Spain, Corsica, Gozo, Liguria, Mahdiya, Tunisia, and Djerba in 1550. During this time period, due to their increased interest in Cyprus, the Ottoman envoys demanded the island from the

---

<sup>174</sup>Carboni, S. (2007). *Venice and the Islamic World: 828-1797*. French Metropolitan Museum of Art: Yale University Press, p. 79.

<sup>175</sup>Sublime Porte (*Bab-ı Ali*) was the high governmental body of Ottoman Empire. It was serving as the modern day Foreign Ministeries.

<sup>176</sup>Goffman, D. (2006). *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe: New Approaches to European History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 155.

<sup>177</sup>Carboni, S. (2007). *Venice and the Islamic World: 828-1797*. French Metropolitan Museum of Art: Yale University Press, p. 79.

<sup>178</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz'de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 50.

Venetians in 1570.<sup>179</sup> After the rejection of the demand, the Ottoman navy invaded Cyprus in 1571. The Ottoman-Venetian war ended in 7 March 1573, and Cyprus became an Ottoman province.

## **2.2 From the Ottoman Conquest till British Arrival (1571-1878)**

The Ottoman conquest of Cyprus had three specific motives: first, Cyprus had strategic importance for the Ottomans. After the conquest of Egypt in 1517 and Rhodes in 1522, the island became even more important especially because of its geographical proximity to the Ottoman lands. It could be used as a military base in a war, and in order to safeguard the Ottoman sovereignty, it became indispensable.<sup>180</sup> Second motive was economic: the Ottoman ships carrying loots for the Sultan were robbed by the Venetian pirates<sup>181</sup> and the Venetian administration was not in any attempt to stop such events. Therefore, the possession of the island for securing the Ottoman trade routes became a necessity.<sup>182</sup> Third motive was religion. The position of the caliphate had passed from the Mamluk Sultanate to the Ottoman Empire and the Ottoman Sultan had become the new leader of the Islamic world. Since at the time of this shift, the

---

<sup>179</sup>Carboni, S. (2007). *Venice and the Islamic World: 828-1797*. French Metropolitan Museum of Art: Yale University Press, p. 45. & Özkul, A. E. (2005). *Kıbrıs'ın Sosyo-Ekonomik Tarihi: 1726-1750*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 37.

<sup>180</sup>Özkul, A. E. (2005). *Kıbrıs'ın Sosyo-Ekonomik Tarihi: 1726-1750*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 35.

<sup>181</sup>Ibid, p. 36.

<sup>182</sup>Setton, K. M. (1984). *The Papacy and the Levant, 1204-1571: The Sixteenth Century, Vol. IV*. Pennsylvania: Amer Philosophical Society Press, p. 200.

island was under the protection of the Mamluk Sultanate, the possession of the island was claimed together with all the religious rights of the Sultan.<sup>183</sup>

The very first task that the Ottomans completed after the conquest was to harmonize the island's administrative structure to the empire's traditional administration via *millet* system. The most significant aspect of this system was that it primarily categorized the Ottoman subjects according to their religious affiliations. The division among the subjects was made by depending on whether they were Muslims or *zimmi*s (non-Muslim). Muslims were recognized as the members of a superior group, and hence given the right to rule; whereas the *zimmi*s were seen as a group in need of protection under the Islamic law. Responsibilities, status and rights of all individuals were determined by these divisions. The *zimmi*s were divided into four main *millets*, namely Armenians, Catholic Christians, Jewish Community, and Orthodox Christians. These *millets* were entitled to pay taxes in exchange of protection for their lives and properties as well as the right to practice their own religions.<sup>184</sup>

The Ottomans accepted diversity as an inevitable fact and via *millet* system they allowed the co-existence of semi-autonomous units living under the rule of a central authority. These semi-autonomous groups were allowed to preserve their own cultural and religious characteristics. The local religious leaders of *zimmi*s were given various privileges and were recognized as the authority figures responsible from the affairs of their own communities. As such, they also functioned as intermediary figures between their own community and the Ottoman

---

<sup>183</sup>Özkuş, A. E. (2005). *Kıbrıs'ın Sosyo-Ekonomik Tarihi: 1726-1750*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 36.

<sup>184</sup>Jennings, R. C. (1993). *Christians and Muslims in Ottoman Cyprus and the Mediterranean World, 1571-1640*. New York: New York University Press, p. 132.

government, responsible from matters of collection and imposition of taxes as well as maintenance of law and order within their respective communities.<sup>185</sup>

In addition to the changes that took place in order to harmonize the island's administrative structure with that of the Ottoman *millet* system, some demographic and economic adjustments that led to fundamental changes in the existing socio-cultural and political structure of the island were also made. These changes did not just influence the island during the Ottoman rule, but also in the following era of British rule. As will be analyzed in the next chapter, under the British administration, there was no substantial change in the socio-cultural and political structure of the island, and most of the changes would be based on the already existing Ottoman system.

The Ottoman economy mostly depended on war tributes and loots as well as the collection of the taxes from the subjects of the empire. In 1572, a year after the conquest, Ottoman authorities conducted a census in the island and found out that 76 villages were now empty, due to the rapid out-migrations from the island to Venetian territories<sup>186</sup> during the war and after the conquest. This particular situation was not welcomed by the Ottoman authorities, since it meant insufficient labor power for the collection of expected taxes from this newly conquered territory.

---

<sup>185</sup>Caldarola, C. (1982). *Religions and Societies, Asia and the Middle East*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, p. 175.

<sup>186</sup>Hackett J., B. D. (1901). *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus: From the Coming of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas to the Commencement of the British Occupation (A.D. 45- A.D. 1878) Together with Some Account of the Latin and Other Churches Existing in the Island*. London: Methuen & Co. p. 191.

The Ottomans employed their traditional settling policy<sup>187</sup> in Cyprus that aimed both to increase the population and to establish a powerful Turkish and Islamic influence.<sup>188</sup> In line with this policy, the Ottoman sultan declared that there was a need for 20,000 of his subjects to be settled in the depopulated districts<sup>189</sup> in Cyprus, in addition to the 30,000 soldiers<sup>190</sup> who already had been there after the conquest. The exile *fermans* (declaration of the Sultan)<sup>191</sup> were sent to the governors of villages all over Anatolia.<sup>192</sup> In September 1572, 1,689 families were sent to Cyprus from the Anatolian cities of Sivas, Tokat, Amasya, Aksaray and Niğde.<sup>193</sup> However this population transfer did not satisfy the need for labor and taxes. There were only 85.000 subjects, men from of all occupational groups, ages ranging from 14 to 50, including the native inhabitants.<sup>194</sup> Therefore 12,000 more

---

<sup>187</sup>This method involved compulsory exile where subjects from other parts of the empire were sent to the newly conquered territories.

<sup>188</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz'de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 75.

<sup>189</sup>Hackett J., B. D. (1901). *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus: From the Coming of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas to the Commencement of the British Occupation (A.D. 45- A.D. 1878) Together with Some Account of the Latin and Other Churches Existing in the Island*. London: Methuen & Co., p. 192.

<sup>190</sup>Encouraging the Ottoman soldiers whom fought in the war of a certain conquest to stay in the conquered land was an Ottoman tradition.

<sup>191</sup>According to these *fermans*, people who would migrate to Cyprus would be selected among the physically healthy wage earners and would mainly be occupied as carpenters, farmers, tailors, blacksmiths, locksmiths, cooks, and iron and rock workers. As a further motivation, it was also declared that people who would migrate would not pay taxes for two years and that they would be given territory in the island. For further information, see: Özkul, A. E. (2005). *Kıbrıs'ın Sosyo-Ekonomik Tarihi: 1726-1750*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 41. & Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz'de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 86.

<sup>192</sup>Gazioğlu, A. C. (1994). *Kıbrıs'ta Türkler, 1570-1878: 308 Yıllık Türk Dönemine Yeni Bir Bakış*. Lefkoşa: CYREP, p. 100.

<sup>193</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz'de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 76.

<sup>194</sup>Hackett J., B. D. (1901). *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus: From the Coming of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas to the Commencement of the British Occupation (A.D. 45- A.D.*

families had to be transferred to the island from Anatolia; eventually however, only 8,000 families could be brought.<sup>195</sup> Nevertheless, eventually 20 percent of the island's population became Muslim, and "nearly all areas on the island came to have mixed Greco-Turkish populations."<sup>196</sup>

This economy oriented demographic change naturally had its socio-cultural impact on the island: with the placements of people from Anatolia "a new substantial ethnic group"<sup>197</sup> was introduced to the island, now the Orthodox Christian inhabitants met with their new 'other', Muslims from Anatolia.

In the first few years of their rule, the Ottoman authorities did not make excessive demands from their new subjects. At the time, the properties of the former conquerors (Venetians and Lusignans) were distributed to the local subjects, in order to ease any potential obstacle towards tax collection.<sup>198</sup> Since agricultural

---

1878) *Together with Some Account of the Latin and Other Churches Existing in the Island*. London: Methuen & Co., p. 192.

<sup>195</sup>The failure in the settlement plans was mostly due to the reluctance among the families in Anatolia to migrate to Cyprus, as there was the danger of a possible Crusade attack to Cyprus. As such, many families rejected compulsory migration despite the fact that they had to pay tribute to the government or face heavy penalties because of their rejection. For further information, see: Halaçoğlu, Y. (2001). "Osmanlı Döneminde Kıbrıs'ta İskan Politikası." In Ahmetbeyoğlu, A. ; Afyoncu, E. *Dünden Bugüne Kıbrıs Meselesi*. İstanbul: Tarih ve Tabiat Vakfı Yayınları, p. 44. & Gazioğlu, A. C. (1994). *Kıbrıs'ta Türkler, 1570-1878 : 308 Yıllık Türk Dönemine Yeni Bir Bakış*. Lefkoşa: CYREP, pp. 166-167.

<sup>196</sup>Morag, N. (2004). "Cyprus and the Clash of Greek and Turkish Nationalisms." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 10 (4), p. 598.

<sup>197</sup>Nevzat, A. (2005). *Nationalism Amongst the Turks of Cyprus: The First Wave*, PhD. Thesis, Oulu: Oulu University Press, p. 46.

<sup>198</sup>Hackett J., B. D. (1901). *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus: From the Coming of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas to the Commencement of the British Occupation* (A.D. 45- A.D. 1878) *Together with Some Account of the Latin and Other Churches Existing in the Island*. London: Methuen & Co., p. 191.

production was the main economic activity of the island, the distribution of land to the locals was seen as important in this sense.

Furthermore, the Orthodox Christian inhabitants of the island were granted new rights in accordance with the *millet* system, which they did not possess under the Catholic rule for hundreds of years. As the Orthodox Christians were recognized as a *millet*, they were now seen as an “autocephalous and isotimous entity” with the right of electing its own leader.<sup>199</sup> As for the Orthodox Christian Church of Cyprus, it was recognized as the head of its own *millet* and Orthodox Christian Archbishop was granted generous privileges<sup>200</sup> for securing his flock’s fiscal, social and religious interests, in exchange of supporting the Ottoman authority.

The rights which were given to the Orthodox Christian subjects of Cyprus were the following: (1) the freedom of religious worship in their own churches; (2) the right to collect taxes from the Catholic monasteries seized by the Ottomans; (3) the right to get permission to acquire houses, estates, and other kinds of property, as well as the right to transfer them to their heirs. As suggested by one expert, these rights could be seen as an indication of recognition on the part of the Ottoman of “the supremacy of the Orthodox community over all other Christian denominations in the island.”<sup>201</sup> As for the Catholic Christians, they were not allowed to possess any property and their churches were converted into mosques or warehouses.<sup>202</sup> This differentiation in the property rights were made in order to

---

<sup>199</sup>Luke, H. C. (1921). *Cyprus under the Turks: 1571-1878*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 15.

<sup>200</sup>Katsiaounis, R. (1996). *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus: During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Cyprus Research Center: Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus XXIV, p. 11.

<sup>201</sup>Luke, H. C. (1921). *Cyprus under the Turks: 1571-1878*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 15.

weaken the Catholic Church and make the Orthodox Christian Church more powerful as the one and only recognized religious entity of the *zimmis*.

Immediately after the conquest of Cyprus in 1571, the island was declared as a *beylerbeyliği* (Ottoman province) and a *paşa* (pasha-Ottoman general or governor) was appointed from Istanbul. In a few months a few *mullahs* (Islamic clergy) and *kadis* (Sharia judges) were also sent there.<sup>203</sup> The appointed *paşas* were responsible for the administrative affairs of the island, whereas the *mullahs* were responsible for the religious and financial affairs in general. The Orthodox Christian authorities had direct connection with these appointed Ottoman authorities in the issues regarding their flock. In judicial issues, the Orthodox Christian authorities were mainly responsible from their flock's issues, while the *kadis* were responsible for judicial matters of Muslims.

Nevertheless, the division between the two groups in judicial matters was not too rigid.<sup>204</sup> In most cases, all people in Cyprus -not just Muslims- used the Islamic courts. Although, the Greek Orthodox Christians were granted the right to establish their own courts, these courts did not survive and instead they, too, started to use the Muslim courts, even for cases involving only themselves.<sup>205</sup> The *kadis* had to make sure that the legal rights of *zimmis*, as well as Muslims, had to be protected in their courts. In this context, they encouraged all Cypriot subjects to

---

<sup>202</sup>Hackett J., B. D. (1901). *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus: From the Coming of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas to the Commencement of the British Occupation* (A.D. 45- A.D. 1878) *Together with Some Account of the Latin and Other Churches Existing in the Island*. London: Methuen & Co., pp. 194-195.

<sup>203</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz'de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 76.

<sup>204</sup>Jennings, R. C. (1993). *Christians and Muslims in Ottoman Cyprus and the Mediterranean World, 1571-1640*. New York: New York University Press, p. 132.

<sup>205</sup>Ibid, p. 69

make their complaints directly to their courts so that the disputes could be settled immediately.<sup>206</sup>

This relative equality in judicial affairs, however, did not exist in the economic field, in which there was an obvious discrimination; the taxes imposed on the Ottoman subjects of Cyprus were denominational, weighted according to the religious affiliations of its subjects. In this context, the *zimmis* were required to pay higher taxes than Muslims. They also were required to pay a certain amount of money for the Ottoman troops that Muslims were not obliged to. However, for the *zimmis*, military service was not compulsory.<sup>207</sup>

The Ottomans also imposed certain social restrictions, which kept the two major communities of the island, Orthodox Christians and the Muslims, apart from each other. For example, inter-communal marriages were prohibited, despite the fact that Muslims and Orthodox Christians were living in mixed villages (in 1832 approximately 200 such villages existed).<sup>208</sup>

As for conversion from other religions to Islam, the Ottomans were more flexible; although this was not prohibited, it was not encouraged either, due to the consideration of possible losses of tax revenues. The Ottomans were mostly “interested in securing a flow of forced recruits for their various wars and, above all, in collecting taxes.”<sup>209</sup> To that end, conversions were strictly followed and recorded to official documents. Also once a subject was converted to Islam, it was

---

<sup>206</sup>Ibid, pp. 103-104.

<sup>207</sup>Ibid, p. 103.

<sup>208</sup>Dietzel, I. and Makrides, V. N. (2009). “Ethno-Religious Coexistence and Plurality in Cyprus under British Rule (1878-1960).” *Social Compass*, 56 (1), p. 74.

<sup>209</sup>Borowiec, A. (2000). *Cyprus: A Troubled Island*. Wesport: Praeger, p. 16.

strictly forbidden for him/her to reverse from Islam to his/her former religion. After the Ottoman conquest, many Christian Cypriots converted to Islam with their families.<sup>210</sup> However, it should be mentioned that these conversions were not just opportunistic behaviors to avoid the military service or paying high taxes, there were also certain people<sup>211</sup> who were practicing both religions. This was due to the intense social interaction between the groups living together, and historical familiarity with each other for sharing this Eastern Mediterranean island. Likewise, the fundamental religious beliefs of the peasants were also influenced from both Christianity and Islam in the island.<sup>212</sup>

Along with the exclusive *millet* system, there were inequalities between the rulers and the ruled. The religious administrative authorities, along with tax collectors, *paşas*, and notables from both of the groups, were regarded as the higher class. These people had many similarities among themselves as compared to the peasants from both communities. Both the Christian clergy and the Muslim *ulema* (religious elites) were tax-exempt, and enjoyed similar levels of monetary wealth. They both had the right to own or rent land, and to engage in trade and commerce.<sup>213</sup> So, in the specific case of the respective higher classes from both communities, the only

---

<sup>210</sup>Jennings, R. C. (1993). *Christians and Muslims in Ottoman Cyprus and the Mediterranean World, 1571-1640*. New York: New York University Press, pp. 137-143.

<sup>211</sup>These people were known as *linobambakoi* (linen-cottons) *community*. They were the Muslim Christian sect of Cyprus which continued to exist well into the 1960s. For further information, see: Constantinou, C. M. (2007). "Aporias of Identity: Bicomunalism, Hybridity and the 'Cyprus Problem'." *Cooperation and Conflict: Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association*, 42(3), pp. 247-270.

<sup>212</sup>Beckingham, C. F. (1957). "The Turks of Cyprus." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 87(2), p. 173.

<sup>213</sup>Jennings, R. C. (1993). *Christians and Muslims in Ottoman Cyprus and the Mediterranean World, 1571-1640*. New York: New York University Press, p. 150.

obstacle in full inter-mingling in socio-cultural terms was the prohibition of intermarriage.<sup>214</sup>

The peasants of the two communities were facing similar levels of poverty and hardships under the agrarian Ottoman economy.<sup>215</sup> This socio-economic similarity between the two social classes from time to time led to alliances within each class, especially at times of political and economic crisis.<sup>216</sup> While the Muslim and Orthodox Christian peasants were uniting against their common oppressors, the higher classes, the Muslim and Christian higher classes were uniting against the peasants.<sup>217</sup> The 18<sup>th</sup> century witnessed the first signs of social unrest among the Muslim and Christian inhabitants of Cyprus, as both *paşas* and Christian clergy abused their authorities in tax collection. There were many peasant riots during this time. In addition to that, epidemic diseases, famine and earthquakes in this century resulted in mass migrations to Anatolia and Syria.<sup>218</sup>

---

<sup>214</sup>Katsiaounis, R. (1996). *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus: During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Cyprus Research Center: Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus XXIV, p. 17.

<sup>215</sup>Kızılyürek, N. (2005). *Milliyetçilik Kıskaçında Kıbrıs*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 209.

<sup>216</sup>Katsiaounis, R. (1996). *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus: During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Cyprus Research Center: Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus XXIV, pp.15-17.

<sup>217</sup>The *Çil Osman Ağa Riot* is a perfect example in this sense, where both Muslims and Christians struggled against Osman Ağa, a Muslim governor who decided to double the tax rates. The peasants from both communities reacted together and their common complaints were taken to Sublime Porte. Osman Ağa was not demoted and he attempted to take revenge from his complainers. However, he was attacked and killed by both Muslim and Christians. For further information, see: Gazioğlu, A. C. (1994). *Kıbrıs'ta Türkler, 1570-1878: 308 Yıllık Türk Dönemine Yeni Bir Bakış*. Lefkoşa: CYREP, p. 331.

<sup>218</sup>Hill, G. H. (1952). *A History of Cyprus, Vol. IV: The Ottoman Province*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 80.

In 1754, the Sublime Porte granted “head of the *millet*” title to the Archbishop of the Cyprus Christian Orthodox community. He was also given the right to have direct communication with the Porte together with three bishops. Especially the right of having direct communication with the Porte without the intervention of the local Ottoman governor in the island created unrest among the Muslim community, as it would make the Orthodox Community leaders more influential and powerful.<sup>219</sup> In time, these special rights became more beneficial for the Orthodox clergy, especially during the reign of two Ottoman Sultans in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, Selim III (1789-1807) and Mustafa IV (1807-1808). As for the Muslim elites, they first regarded these rights to be positive, as a kind of a guarantee against despotism of Ottoman governors. However their perception changed when the powers of the Orthodox clergy started to over-shadow that of the Ottoman local governors.<sup>220</sup> Especially after 1785 when Ottoman governors of the island started to become more and more influenced by the archbishops, due to their monetary power and direct influence on the Porte, public unrest, and eventual riots among the Muslims were seen.

By the end of 18<sup>th</sup> century, the Orthodox Christian Church became very influential, practically governing the island on its own. The Muslims inhabitants were disturbed from the fact that the *paşas* and other governors became secondary authorities in the island’s administration; many Orthodox Christian’s fled to Anatolia because they could not bear the pressure which was imposed by the

---

<sup>219</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz’de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 112.

<sup>220</sup>Hackett J., B.D. (1901). *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus: From the Coming of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas to the Commencement of the British Occupation (A.D. 45- A.D. 1878) Together with Some Account of the Latin and Other Churches Existing in the Island*. London: Methuen & Co., pp. 197-198. One such member of the clergy was Archbishop Kyprianos was the head of the Cypriot Orthodox Church between 1810 and 1821, who was hanged by the Ottoman Governor Küçük Mehmet on 9<sup>th</sup> July 1821 for providing support to the Greek War of Independence.

Church.<sup>221</sup> The Church was demanding additional taxes from the Christians, claiming that they were protecting them from the Ottoman legal punishments given for riots.<sup>222</sup>

In 1804, the Muslims rebelled against the Orthodox Church, which was by then controlling most of the capital in the island, upon rumors that there would be a famine and that the food stocks in the island were insufficient.<sup>223</sup> The rebellion was suppressed when two *paşas* from Anatolia arrived at the island after a call for help from the Archbishop to the Sublime Porte with their troops and intervened in the conflict.<sup>224</sup> After the incident, the governor of the island, Küçük Mehmet, adopted repressive measures that ended the authority of the Christian Orthodox clergy.<sup>225</sup>

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, nationalist ideas started to spread in the Orthodox Christian community in Cyprus. The foreign embassies in the island were the main institutions spreading these nationalist ideas. As it is mentioned by one expert, “the first stirrings of radical ideas, inimical to the Ottoman status quo, appeared in the island” by the Orthodox Christian elites of Larnaca, the city where most of the

---

<sup>221</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz’de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, pp. 118-122.

<sup>222</sup>Ibid, pp. 118-123.

<sup>223</sup> Luke, H. C. (1921). *Cyprus Under the Turks: 1571-1878*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 128.

<sup>224</sup>Ibid, p. 127.

<sup>225</sup>Luke, H. C. (1921). *Cyprus Under the Turks: 1571-1878*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 130 & Hackett J., B.D. (1901). *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus: From the Coming of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas to the Commencement of the British Occupation (A.D. 45- A.D. 1878) Together with Some Account of the Latin and Other Churches Existing in the Island*. London: Methuen & Co., p. 198.

embassies were located.<sup>226</sup> At first, the nationalist ideas and “manifestation amongst Greeks of Masonic activity was fiercely denounced by the Church of Cyprus”,<sup>227</sup> due to the negative stand of the Eastern Orthodox patriarchs towards the ideas of enlightenment that had been promoted since the French Revolution.<sup>228</sup> Nationalism was regarded as a threat to the influence of religion on people and an ideology which would lead to the removal of religious authority.

Nevertheless, when the *Filiki Eteria* (Friendly Community) was established as a Greek Orthodox nationalist organization in Anatolia aiming to establish an independent Greece in 1814, the members of the group demanded support from the Orthodox Christian Church of Cyprus. In 1818, Archbishop Kyprianos was registered as a member to this organization by Demetrius Hypatros, a member of *Filiki Eteria*, responsible for Egypt and Cyprus. Archbishop Kyprianos promised only “spiritual support” to him.<sup>229</sup> When the Greek War of Independence/the Greek Revolt started against the Ottomans in Ionian Islands and Morea<sup>230</sup> in 1821, the Ottoman governor Küçük Mehmet convinced the Ottoman Sultan that similar attempts were likely in the island, as there was support to the uprising in the island among the Greek Cypriots. His claim was based on several propaganda brochures about the Greek nationalist movement that he found in the island.<sup>231</sup>

---

<sup>226</sup>Katsiaounis, R. (1996). *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus: During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Cyprus Research Center: Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus XXIV, p. 18.

<sup>227</sup>Ibid.

<sup>228</sup>Ibid, pp. 18-19.

<sup>229</sup>Gazioğlu, A. C. (1994). *Kıbrıs'ta Türkler, 1570-1878: 308 Yıllık Türk Dönemine Yeni Bir Bakış*. Lefkoşa: CYREP, p. 134.

<sup>230</sup>*Morea*, refers to the Peloponnese peninsula in today's southern Greece.

<sup>231</sup>Purcell, H. D. (1969). *Cyprus*. New York: Praeger, p. 93.

After this incident, the Ottoman government sanctioned the Orthodox Christians of the island in every measure.<sup>232</sup> Archbishop Kyprianos, along with his fellow clergy were found guilty and hanged by the Ottoman authorities. These executions and other punishments continued to be carried out for six months including even “the notables, the priests and Greeks of means, who had escaped the janissaries<sup>233</sup>, become refugees at Larnaca, under the protection of the European Consuls.”<sup>234</sup>

The role as well as the political stand of the Orthodox Church against nationalism started to change after the incidents of 1821 in the island. Now that some of the top members of the Church hierarchy were prosecuted by the Ottoman officials, they were “portrayed as having been the eternal champion of Greek nation in Cyprus”, giving them an “opportunity to claim authority in directing the nationalist clause.”<sup>235</sup> The Church’s influence as the leader of its community was once again, this time even stronger, was restored.

The struggle between the Greeks and the Ottomans ended after six years and Greece became independent in 1827 with the help of Britain, France and Russia. The independent Greece of 1827, however, was just the “half the size of the country we now know, and comprised 700,000 out of 3 million Greeks.”<sup>236</sup> The

---

<sup>232</sup>Luke, H. C. (1921). *Cyprus Under the Turks: 1571-1878*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 131.

<sup>233</sup>The Janissaries were Ottoman troops comprised of infantry units.

<sup>234</sup>Luke, H. C. (1921). *Cyprus Under the Turks: 1571-1878*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 132.

<sup>235</sup>Nevzat, A. (2005). *Nationalism amongst the Turks of Cyprus: The First Wave*, PhD. Thesis, Oulu: Oulu University Press, p. 64-65.

<sup>236</sup>Stavridines, Z. (1999). *The Cyprus Conflict: National Identity and Statehood*. Lefkoşa: CYREP, p. 10.

main goal of this newly independent state was unification with the rest of the Greeks who were still living under the Ottoman rule and gaining back Constantinople, in other words, the *Megali Idea*.

This external development, as well as the domestic incidents had significant impact on the Orthodox Christians of Cyprus and led to the rise of nationalism. One other very basic reason of this impact was related to a particular practice of the Ottoman system itself, which allowed its subjects to travel in the large territories of the empire, basically for trade purposes. The two major communities of Cyprus also enjoyed this right, and when they were away from their homeland, they basically identified themselves with their religious and national identities.<sup>237</sup> These travels also enabled them to have close relations with their respective co-religionists from other parts of the empire. In time, these interactions would lead to the development of a sense of belonging to a wider society both for Muslims and Christians of Cyprus. Consequently, instead of developing a territorial-cultural identity, they developed an ethno-religious identity, and when ethnic incidents emerged, the hostility between the groups became unavoidable.

While the importance of the Orthodox Church on its flock was increased after the incidents of 1821, with the 1839 *Tanzimat* Reforms, the influence of the Church was reduced in the administrative structure of Cyprus. The reforms were basically designed for encouraging “Ottomanism” among the different ethnic groups of the empire and to prevent nationalist movements in order to secure territorial integrity of the empire. According to the new regulations, all Ottoman subjects, whatever religion or sect they may belong to would be subject to the new laws without any exception. According to these new laws: (1) perfect security would be granted to

---

<sup>237</sup>Bryant, R. (2004). *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London: I. B. Tauris, p. 22.

the inhabitants of the empire, with regard to their life, their honor, and their fortune; (2) Ottoman subjects would be taxed in a ratio to their fortune and ability, and that nothing further should be demanded from them; (3) every person would enjoy the possession of his property of every nature, and dispose of it with the most perfect liberty, without anyone being able to impede him; (4) An equally regular method of recruiting, levying the Ottoman army will be imposed and the duration of service will be fixed for all Ottoman subjects.<sup>238</sup> Along with all *millet*s, these rights were also granted to Orthodox Christian community in the island.

However neither the *Tanzimat* reforms, nor the idea of Ottomanism worked as desired, and during the Crimean War of 1853-1856, “the spectre of radical nationalism was resurrected by the minute” among the Orthodox Christian intellectuals<sup>239</sup> in Cyprus. After the war, *Tanzimat* reforms were restructured and the 1856 *Hatt-i Humayun* reforms were announced. These reforms also aimed to restructure the *millet* system, while promising “Ottoman non-Muslims equal rights and, among other things, employment in responsible positions within developing Ottoman bureaucracy.”<sup>240</sup>

In 1861, the island was placed under the responsibility of the Çanakkale province of the empire. Due to the distance between Çanakkale and Cyprus, however, there emerged some administrative difficulties. *İhtiyar Heyeti* (Assembly of Elders) was established as an administrative unit in towns and villages, composed of both

---

<sup>238</sup>Creasy, E. D. (1961). *History of Ottoman Turks; From the Beginning of Their Empire to the Present Time*. London: Bentley, pp. 452-455.

<sup>239</sup>Katsiaounis, R. (1996). *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus: During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Cyprus Research Center: Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus XXIV, p. 20.

<sup>240</sup>Adanır, F. and Faroqhi, S. (2002). *The Ottomans and the Balkans: a Discussion of Historiography*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, p. 34.

Muslim and non-Muslim members. The ratio between the members in these assemblies was based on the population of the village or town. Another institution, *Kavanin Meclisi* (Legislative Assembly), entitled to make and enforce laws, was also established. This body was composed of four appointed members chosen by the Ottoman administrator, *kaymakam*, and elected members from both of the Muslim and Orthodox Christian communities, the ratio of being 3/5 Orthodox Christian and 2/5 Muslim.<sup>241</sup>

However, none of these reforms would please the inhabitants of the island. The Muslim elites of Cyprus, who had a strong sense of loyalty to Islam and the Sultan,<sup>242</sup> was disturbed from the separatist nationalist movements in the empire and did not welcome Ottomanism as an ideology. Orthodox Christian elites, on the other hand, were more under the influence of independence of Greece and *the Megali Idea*.

During this time, Muslim and Orthodox Christian elites developed some hostility toward each other, mostly due to their sense of belongingness to their respective co-religionists, despite the fact that there was some level of identifiable interaction between them in linguistic, cultural and even religious domains since 1571.<sup>243</sup> This hostility had become much more intense when Greece started to develop its own national identity building process with the establishment of Greek history curricula

---

<sup>241</sup>Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz'de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık, p. 135

<sup>242</sup>Nevzat, A. (2005). *Nationalism Amongst the Turks of Cyprus: The First Wave*, PhD. Thesis, Oulu: Oulu University Press, p. 61.

<sup>243</sup>Nevzat, A. (2005). *Nationalism amongst the Turks of Cyprus: The First Wave*, PhD. Thesis, Oulu: Oulu University Press, p. 77. & Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 153.

which was “a cultural orientation towards Greek antiquity,”<sup>244</sup> giving a particular history education towards building a Greek nation. The Orthodox Christian elites of Cyprus, while establishing close relations with the newly established independent Greece, were also building an ethno-religious consciousness in line with Greek nationalist doctrine. In the latter years of the Ottoman rule, the will for *enosis*<sup>245</sup> became out and open among the elites and the sense of hostile ‘other’ started to develop, mostly due to the influential rhetoric of mainland Greek nationalism interpreting history of Greek-Turkish relations as “400 years of enslavement and suffering under the Ottomans” leading to “Greek emancipation.” As for the Ottoman elites, the Greek independence movement was a “betrayal” on the part of the Greek subjects.

---

<sup>244</sup>Stavridines, Z. (1999). *The Cyprus Conflict: National Identity and Statehood*. Lefkoşa: CYREP, p. 10.

<sup>245</sup>*Enosis* means unification in Greek language and refers to the movement of Greek-Cypriot community to unite with Greece.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **BRITISH RULE IN CYPRUS: FOUNDATION OF ETHNO-NATIONAL IDENTITIES**

In the previous chapter, the socio-cultural, demographic and administrative structure of Cyprus in the pre-British era was analyzed in detail. Following this background information, this chapter will first discuss the British attitude towards the Ottoman Empire and the main motivation behind the occupation of the island in order to explore the British perception on both the island and its inhabitants. Second, the chapter will give the historical developments between the 1878 and 1960, while examining the period by focusing on the constantly-changing internal policies of British administration in the island and its effects on the creation of antagonistic nationalisms among the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities.

#### **3.1 From British Attitude towards the Ottoman Empire and the Cyprus Convention**

After the Russo-Turkish War, which ended in 1774 with the defeat of the Ottoman Empire, the European powers that had strong interests in the region became more and more concerned about the issue of stability in the Eastern Mediterranean region. The Ottoman Empire was on decline and expected to dissolve, while Imperial Russia was on the rise and becoming a powerful threat for the European countries that wanted to secure their position in the region.

This problematic situation and the instability in the region between 1774 till the final demise of the Ottoman Empire after the World War I, was generally referred

as the “Eastern Question” by the European powers. The primary concern of the European powers was mainly to protect and/or expand their position in the Middle East, which led them to make plans on the partition of the Ottoman territories. Along with this aim, these powers were supporting and encouraging the formation of new states by creating ethno-national consciousness within the borders of the Ottoman Empire, just like Greece and Romania, as well as the creation of “desired nation-states” such as Armenia and Israel.<sup>246</sup>

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, both the British and Russian powers expanded in Asia, resulting in the emergence of clash of interests between these two countries in the region. Britain was trying to keep the Russians as far away as possible from India, whereas the main Russian concern was to prevent the British entrance to Central Asia.<sup>247</sup> Britain was also concerned about the Russian and French plans on the possible future partition of the post-Ottoman legacy, since this kind of an arrangement would be a threat to secure its political and economic ties with India.

When the Ottoman Empire started to lose its previous power and influence in mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, there emerged the widely believed notion among the European powers that the Ottoman Empire was “rotten to its core” and “it had to be transformed into something more wholesome.”<sup>248</sup> However, unlike other European powers, Britain was in favor of stability rather than disintegration in the region in order to secure its interests. Therefore, instead of making expansionist plans,

---

<sup>246</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 20.

<sup>247</sup>Marshall, P. J. (1996). *The Cambridge Illustrated History of the British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 29.

<sup>248</sup>Kedourie, E. (1987). *England and the Middle East: The Destruction of the Ottoman Empire 1914-1921*. London: Mansell Publishing, p. 15.

Britain preferred to assist the Ottoman Empire in order to prevent its demolition during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

The reason of the Ottoman regression was seen as lack of democracy in the empire by Britain. The domination of Islamic rule in state organization along with unequal rights granted to its Muslim and non-Muslim subjects in many areas of life were considered as the main reasons of decline of the Ottoman power. British authorities proposed a European model of central government to the Ottoman Sultan, which required various administrative reforms in order to create a system of governance under rule of law, in which all subjects of the empire would be treated equally and interaction between the government and its subjects would be provided. Therefore, Britain was suggesting an urgent transformation because according to them, if the Ottoman Empire would not improve on these lines, it was better for it to disappear.<sup>249</sup>

The most significant British interest in the region was to secure the Mediterranean trade routes; as such, the British had no desire for acquiring the Ottoman territories. In line with this policy, Britain declined the Ottoman offers of lending the island of Cyprus to them three times in 1833, 1841, and 1845.<sup>250</sup> The island was not considered valuable as they had already been controlling the entrance of the Mediterranean through Gibraltar since 1784<sup>251</sup> and through Malta since 1800.<sup>252</sup> In addition, when Britain purchased the majority of the shares of the Suez

---

<sup>249</sup>Kedourie, E. (1987). *England and the Middle East: The Destruction of the Ottoman Empire 1914-1921*. London: Mansell Publishing, pp. 9-15.

<sup>250</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 20.

<sup>251</sup>Martin, R. M. (1837). *History of the Possessions of the Honorable East India Company*. London: Whittaker & Co. Ave Maria Lane, pp. 31-32.

<sup>252</sup>*Ibid*, p. 266.

Canal Company in 1875, its position in the region was even more enhanced in terms of safe trade routes. The Suez Canal, due to its strategic position, was a useful asset for the transportation of labor power and storage to India.<sup>253</sup> However in 1878, in the aftermath of the Russo-Turkish War, Britain decided to re-evaluate the Ottoman offer of lending the island, since Russian expansionist policies started to threaten British interests in the region.

In 1878, the Ottoman authorities, in exchange for military support against possible Russian attack and the continuation of Russian occupation of the eastern cities of Ardahan, Kars and Batumi, offered “Cyprus, Peninsula of Gallipoli with the territory on the Asiatic side between the Gulf of Edremid and the Sea of Marmora, Mytilene, Lemnos, Stampalia, Crete, Scanderoon, Accree, Haifa or Alexandria”<sup>254</sup> to the British. The British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli sent British Ambassador Colonel Home to the Ottoman Empire same year for assessing the conditions that the Ottoman Empire was in as well as the plausibility of the Ottoman offer. The Confidential Memorandum that Colonel Home sent to the British government on 8 June 1878 evaluated the Ottoman offers and stated that the island of Cyprus was the most advantageous among all of the other offered places in political, military, naval and commercial terms.

The memorandum highlighted the fact that Britain’s interests were not in Asiatic Turkey as long as the Dardanelles and Bosphorus were under the Ottoman control and where only Ottoman state's allies would be allowed to sail war vessels through the straits with the permission by the Sultan. The memorandum also suggested that

---

<sup>253</sup>Mahajan, S. (2002). *British Foreign Policy 1874-1914: The Role of India*. New York: Routledge, p. 29.

<sup>254</sup>Lee, D. E. (1931). “A Memorandum Concerning Cyprus, 1878.” *The Journal of Modern History*, 3(2), p. 238.

Britain should obtain territorial advantage in the Levant<sup>255</sup> in order to secure British position in the East. It was further stated that the British Empire was in need of a *place d'armes*,<sup>256</sup> where it could establish a large army in a secure base in order to be prepared for any hostile act from the Caucasus, Tigris, Euphrates, Persian Gulf or Suez Canal. In addition, this *place d'armes* should satisfy the soldiers' needs in terms of obtaining mules, oxen and horses as well as encamping large bodies of troops of all arms.<sup>257</sup>

Along these lines, Cyprus was found quite sufficient to serve British interests. Furthermore, since it was an island with no clear territorial borders with any country, its defense would be relatively easier. The only negative aspect of the island, however, was its deficient harbors. To that end, it was stated several times in the memorandum that if Britain would build a harbor in the island, it would possibly be superior to any other harbor in the Levant. Moreover, due to the geographical location of the island, it would be easy for Britain to realize surveillance over the lines of communication with India passing through the Suez Canal.<sup>258</sup>

The memorandum also emphasized the possible advantages of the island in commercial terms, referring to the fact that Britain needed a place that can be used as a depot for English goods and as a place striking the attention of the commercial ships that were travelling in the region. The geographical location of the island

---

<sup>255</sup>*Levant* refers to the eastern Mediterranean region composed of territories of today's Palestine, Israel, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Sinai Peninsula.

<sup>256</sup>*Place d'armes* is a term to refer to an army stronghold that contains bodies of troops and military means.

<sup>257</sup>Lee, D. E. (1931). "A Memorandum Concerning Cyprus, 1878." *The Journal of Modern History*, 3(2), p. 238.

<sup>258</sup>*Ibid.*

would possibly serve as a safe space for the ships of British manufacturers who were using the Mediterranean for transporting goods from India to the West via the Suez Canal. Moreover, due to the geographical proximity of Cyprus to Syria and Asia Minor, the island would facilitate the commercial activities of British manufacturers in the area. Finally, since it was an island, there would be no difficulty in terms of custom regulations in Cyprus.<sup>259</sup>

In addition to these factors, the memorandum also mentioned about the possible political advantages that the possession of the island would bring. The complex demographical structure of Cyprus was seen as a chance for Britain to try its own solution to the Eastern question. By showing to the Eastern nations the benefits of a good, civilized government that respected the rights of different ethnic groups, its prestige would be wide in Levant and its influence in the region would therefore expand.<sup>260</sup>

Under the influence of the memorandum, Prime Minister Disraeli and Foreign Minister Lord Salisbury agreed that due to its proximity to the Suez Canal, Cyprus carried strategic importance for securing the Indian trade routes and that it was beneficial for Britain to accept the offer made by the Ottoman Empire. However, when Disraeli suggested in the British Parliament in April 1878 to seize Cyprus,<sup>261</sup> he was faced with severe oppositions by some of the members of the parliament, who explicitly stated that it would be a great mistake of the part of the government to occupy Cyprus, as there was no adequate information on the

---

<sup>259</sup>Ibid.

<sup>260</sup>Ibid, p. 241.

<sup>261</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 1.

island.<sup>262</sup> However despite such opposition, Britain and the Ottoman Empire signed the Cyprus Convention on 4 July 1878, which transferred the administration of the island to Britain.

According to the Cyprus Convention, the Ottoman Empire would maintain its sovereignty over the island, while Britain was granted the right to administer the island in exchange of annual tributes. The terms of the convention were as follows: (1) England shall join the Sultan in defending his remaining Asiatic territories by force of arms against Russia;<sup>263</sup> (2) The Sultan should introduce certain necessary reforms that would be agreed later between the two powers.<sup>264</sup> The specific measures regarding the administration of Cyprus would be taken only after a more careful inquiry and deliberation;<sup>265</sup> (3) England should pay the excess of revenue<sup>266</sup> over expenditure to Porte;<sup>267</sup> (4) Sublime Porte could freely sell and lease lands and other property in Cyprus belonging to the Ottoman Crown and State;<sup>268</sup> (5) the English government, through their competent authorities, could purchase at a fair price the land required for public improvements, or for other public purposes, as well as land which was not cultivated;<sup>269</sup> (6) the Muslim

---

<sup>262</sup>Archibald, F. (1878). "The Fiasco of Cyprus." *Nineteenth Century: A Monthly Review*, 4(20), p. 609.

<sup>263</sup>Bowles, T. G. (1896). "The Cyprus Convention." *Fortnightly Review*, 60(359), p. 627.

<sup>264</sup>Ibid, p. 627.

<sup>265</sup>Ibid, p. 628.

<sup>266</sup>An annual tribute of 92,000 pounds. For further information, see: Mahajan, S. (2002). *British Foreign Policy 1874-1914: The Role of India*. New York: Routledge, p. 48.

<sup>267</sup>Bowles, T. G. (1896) The Cyprus Convention. *Fortnightly Review*, 60(359), p. 628.

<sup>268</sup>Hakkı, M. M. (2007). *The Cyprus Issue: A Documentary History, 1878-2007*. London: I.B.Tauris, p. 4.

<sup>269</sup>Ibid.

tribunals in the island should continue to exist, responsible only from the exclusive religious matters of the Muslim population of the island; (7) an appointed Muslim resident of the island would be given the title of Board of Pious Foundations (*Evkaf*) and along with an appointed delegate by British authorities, this person would administer the property, funds, and lands belonging to mosques, cemeteries, Muslim schools, and other religious establishments in Cyprus;<sup>270</sup> (8) In case Russia would attempt to re-conquer Kars and Armenia, the Island of Cyprus will be evacuated by Britain, and the Convention would be cancelled.<sup>271</sup>

### 3.2 Early British Rule in Cyprus: 1878-1931

The decision to possess the island was a reflection of both British romanticism and pragmatism. While the strategic importance of the island was pragmatically emphasized in the British Parliament, the justification of the island's possession was made by using romantic ideals to the British public. According to these ideals, the possession of an island, which had a Greek history, would attract the philhellenic<sup>272</sup> tendencies in the British community since Greece had always been considered as the place of "origin of western political and intellectual identity."<sup>273</sup> Also, Cyprus had once been conquered by King Richard I of England, and had served as a safe base during the Crusades; therefore, the possession of the island was presented as a historical right of Britain.<sup>274</sup>

---

<sup>270</sup>Ibid.

<sup>271</sup>Ibid, p. 5.

<sup>272</sup>*Philhellenism* was an intellectual stand that emerged at the end of 19th century, which was a reflection of admiration of Ancient Greek culture.

<sup>273</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 60.

<sup>274</sup>Ibid.

In the early British publications, the island was presented to the British public as a prize won by British diplomacy<sup>275</sup> and heroic interpretations of the medieval conquest of the island by the ancestors were made,<sup>276</sup> resulting in high expectations regarding the possession of the island. However, soon after the British army and British officers landed to the island, it became clear that neither the physical conditions nor the social structure of the island had much resemblance to the imagined picture of Cyprus.

On 12 June 1878, nearly a month after the signing of the Cyprus Convention, Britain sent Lord John Hay, the Admiral Commanding the Channel Fleet, to take over the island in the name of the Queen. On 22 July 1878, General Garnet Wolseley arrived to Cyprus with the title of high-commissioner along with British troops. He was a respected general in the British army who had earlier served in Canada and India. Wolseley was welcomed by Lord Hay, the local elites and the archbishop of Kition.<sup>277</sup>

In contradiction to the claims of several studies suggesting that the Orthodox Christian religious leaders welcomed the British authorities and requested from them handing Cyprus over to Greece,<sup>278</sup> the Orthodox Christian clergy had only

---

<sup>275</sup>Markides, D. (2006). "Cyprus 1878-1925: Ambiguities and Uncertainties." In Faustmann, H. and Peristianis, N. (Eds.) *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism, 1878-2006*. Möhnesse: Bibliopolis, p. 22.

<sup>276</sup>For further information, see: Lake, J.J. (1878). *Ceded Cyprus: Its History, Condition, Products and Prospects*. London: Effingham Wilson, Royal Exchange, p. 22. & Saville, A.R. (1878). *Cyprus*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 25.

<sup>277</sup>Cavendish, A. (Ed.) (1991). *Cyprus 1878: The Journal of Sir Garnet Wolseley*. Nicosia: Cultural Center of the Cyprus Popular Bank, p. 9.

<sup>278</sup>Mallison, W. (2005). *A Modern History of Cyprus*, I. B. Tauris, p. 10. & Gazioğlu, A. (1997) *Kıbrıs Tarihi İngiliz Dönemi (1878-1960)*. Lefkoşa: Kıbrıs Araştırma ve Yayın Merkezi, p. 15 .

half religious and half commercial expectations from Britain.<sup>279</sup> At the time, they did not mention *enosis*<sup>280</sup> since Greek nationalism in the island was not yet very powerful, the lower classes on the other hand, had other expectations such as permanent relief from ethnic and social subjugation.<sup>281</sup> The shift in rule was primarily considered as a chance for acquiring new freedoms by the Orthodox Christian community of the island.<sup>282</sup> Among the Muslim community of the island, however, there was the widespread belief that Ottoman Turkish rule would, at least prospectively, be restored one day.<sup>283</sup> However, since their rights and privileges were now under protection with the Cyprus Convention,<sup>284</sup> the Muslim community peacefully approved the shift of administration from the Ottoman Empire to the British Empire.

After his arrival, General Wolseley was disappointed due to the inadequate physical conditions of the island, and he considered this as an outcome of misadministration under the Ottoman rulers. He interpreted the cheerful welcoming ceremony of the inhabitants to the British troops as a reflection of

---

<sup>279</sup>Hogarth, W. D. (1889). "The Present Discontent in Cyprus." *Fortnightly Review*, 46(272), p. 245.

<sup>280</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 158.

<sup>281</sup>Katsiaounis, R. (1996). *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus: During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Cyprus Research Center: Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus XXIV, p. 67.

<sup>282</sup>Bryant, R. (2004). *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London: I. B. Tauris, p. 2.

<sup>283</sup>Nevzat, A. (2005). *Nationalism amongst the Turks of Cyprus: The First Wave*, PhD. Thesis, Oulu: Oulu University Press, p. 104

<sup>284</sup>Evre, B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi , p. 30.

relief from the Ottoman oppression.<sup>285</sup> His negative ideas about the Ottomans and their way of governance can be seen from a passage from his journal written in 24 July 1878:

It said that wherever the horse of the Turk treads nothing will ever grow afterwards, he can pull down and destroy but he is not only incapable of creating but he cannot even succeed in keeping alive the creations of others.<sup>286</sup>

General Wolseley's negative perceptions were not only limited to the Ottoman administrators; he had similar ideas about the inhabitants of the island as well. He was expressing his opinion about all the inhabitants of the island as being shabby and ignorant,<sup>287</sup> while using insulting words such as villain<sup>288</sup> for Muslims in particular. In addition, although the Orthodox Christian elites had declared their loyalty to Britain, and therefore they were perceived as a peaceful and faithful community,<sup>289</sup> Wolseley had negative thoughts about the Orthodox Christians inhabitants and clergy as well. Words such as ragged, dirty, greasy and filthy<sup>290</sup> were used frequently to describe the Orthodox Christian clergy in the journal of Wolseley. After hoisting the British flag on 18 August 1878, he was expressing his opinion as follows:

---

<sup>285</sup>Cavendish, A. (Ed.) (1991). *Cyprus 1878: The Journal of Sir Garnet Wolseley*. Nicosia: Cultural Center of the Cyprus Popular Bank, p. 10.

<sup>286</sup>Ibid.

<sup>287</sup>Ibid, p. 117.

<sup>288</sup>Ibid, p. 151.

<sup>289</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 157.

<sup>290</sup>Cavendish, A. (Ed.) (1991). *Cyprus 1878: The Journal of Sir Garnet Wolseley*. Nicosia: Cultural Center of the Cyprus Popular Bank, pp. 51-52, 134, 146.

Such a mockery of everything sacred, dirty greasy priests attempting to intone some dreary dirges that were utterly devoid of music or melody... The priests never cut their hair and whilst mass was going on all wore it hanging down their backs... All part their hair down the center, which when this hair is as long as a woman's gives a nasty effeminate look to them which is not agreeable.<sup>291</sup>

In addition to the underdeveloped physical conditions, hot climate was the other major problem about the island that Wolseley and other British staff were complaining about. The first British officials who were sent to the island were military officials, who were keen on transforming the island into *place d'armes* as soon as possible. Consequently, shortly after the British arrival, these soldiers were "immediately set to work in the penetrating July sun to build a pier in the harbor of Larnaca."<sup>292</sup> However, due to their inexperience in working in the hot weather, most of the soldiers got fever and had sun-stroke. As all British troops, one after the other, started to suffer severely from working in the hot climate, the preparation of the island as a strategic base was no longer possible for a considerable amount of time.

Thus, the value of the island for Britain started to be questioned in the very same year as the condition of the British troops became a major concern in the country. Prime Minister Disraeli had to face many criticisms in the British Parliament that eventually led to the postponement of converting the island into a *place d'armes*.<sup>293</sup> There was a widespread belief that Britain was misled by the Intelligence Department considering the island and its condition.<sup>294</sup> Furthermore,

---

<sup>291</sup>Ibid, p. 51.

<sup>292</sup>Bryant, R. (2004). *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London: I. B. Tauris, p. 24.

<sup>293</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 100.

<sup>294</sup>Cavendish, A. (Ed.) (1991). *Cyprus 1878: The Journal of Sir Garnet Wolseley*. Nicosia: Cultural Center of the Cyprus Popular Bank, p. 126.

by the end of 1878, General Wolseley was stating that Cyprus was not “answer[ing] the purpose for which it was acquired.”<sup>295</sup> Soon, the island was seen only as a place with “agricultural possibilities and resources,”<sup>296</sup> rather than a *place d’armes* in the British Parliament.

The British authorities, while introducing the island as a new jewel in the crown to their own public, were also spending considerable effort to present the island “as an area clearly under the Turkish [Ottoman] suzerainty, simply occupied and governed temporarily by them”<sup>297</sup> to the Ottomans. According to the Cyprus Convention, the possession of the island was temporary and the British were highly concerned about not offending the Ottomans by making significant changes in the administrative structure of the island. The following passage from General Wolseley’s journal, dated 20 August 1878, about the British Foreign Minister Lord Salisbury’s injunctions on the administration of the island, clearly shows the British attitude towards the island:

The object of the home Government is evidently to govern Cyprus upon the Turkish lines as far as possible and to make the Sultan and his pashas feel that in conceding to us the privilege of governing of any of the Asia Minor provinces no violent disturbance of Turkish law and customs would be attempted.<sup>298</sup>

General Wolseley was also agreeing that it was much more logical to make as little new laws as possible in the island. He was stating clearly that he is not in favor of

---

<sup>295</sup>Ibid.

<sup>296</sup>*British Empire Series Vol. V: General.* (1902). London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Ltd, p. 103.

<sup>297</sup>Markides, D. (2006). “Cyprus 1878-1925: Ambiguities and Uncertainties.” In Faustmann, H. and Peristianis, N. (Eds.) *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism, 1878-2006*. Möhnesse: Bibliopolis, p. 22.

<sup>298</sup>Cavendish, A. (Ed.) (1991). *Cyprus 1878: The Journal of Sir Garnet Wolseley*. Nicosia: Cultural Center of the Cyprus Popular Bank, p. 55.

establishing a representative assembly in Cyprus, since “the establishment of the parliament led to the bane of all good government” in the Ionian Islands and it was quite likely that the similar events might happen in Cyprus in the future.<sup>299</sup> However, the Disraeli government, while avoiding to make significant changes in Cyprus regarding the Ottoman laws and customs,<sup>300</sup> nevertheless, wanted to transform the island into a model government in Levant so that its prestige would be wide in the region.

This contradictory stand of the Disraeli government was creating domestic discontent in Britain and the decision to possess the island by the Cyprus Convention was deeply criticized. The critics were stating that Britain, as the greatest power in Western Europe, had put itself into a very weak position in this island by accepting the missionary role of civilizing Cyprus, a land that had been ruled by “the vassals, the tributaries of a battered and broken barbarian power,” that is the Ottomans.<sup>301</sup> The Disraeli government rejected the criticisms and continued to defend the possession of the island as a good political move.

The plans on transforming the island into a model government were somehow ambiguous since Cyprus was very different as compared to the non-Western British colonies and protectorates. The island was perceived as European due to its Greek past and Christian inhabitants, and that was creating confusion in the matter of its administration. It was assumed that the primary need for establishing a

---

<sup>299</sup>Ibid, p. 15.

<sup>300</sup>Markides, D. (2006). “Cyprus 1878-1925: Ambiguities and Uncertainties.” In Faustmann, H. and Peristianis, N. (Eds.) *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism, 1878-2006*. Möhnesse: Bibliopolis, p. 26.

<sup>301</sup>Archibald, F. (1878). “The Fiasco of Cyprus.” *Nineteenth Century: A Monthly Review*, 4(20), p. 611.

modern government in the island was separating the church and the state from each other and establishing civil structures that legally identified the inhabitants.<sup>302</sup>

Therefore, as a moderate attempt that disregarded General Wolseley's discontent, the British authorities enacted the Cypriot Constitution by an Order of Council on 14 September 1878.<sup>303</sup> According to the new constitution, a Legislative Council that would be headed by the British High Commissioner and would have no less than 4 and no more than 8 legislative members from the all communities of the island would be created. Half of the members of the council would be chosen among the civil servants, the other half from other professions.<sup>304</sup> The main responsibility of the Legislative Council would be to regulate the major legal issues peculiar to Cyprus.<sup>305</sup> It was originally composed of four British officers and three Cypriot representatives appointed by the British High Commissioner.<sup>306</sup>

Another constitution was enacted in 1882, which envisaged a new structure to the Legislative Council. According to this new regulation, the Legislative Assembly would now be composed of twelve elected members and six officers working under the British High Commissioner. The proportion of the elected members was three Muslim and nine Christian members. The aim of this ratio was to prevent the Christian members, who were the majority, of the council to pass any laws that

---

<sup>302</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 158.

<sup>303</sup>Cavendish, A. (Ed.) (1991). *Cyprus 1878: The Journal of Sir Garnet Wolseley*. Nicosia: Cultural Center of the Cyprus Popular Bank, p. 15.

<sup>304</sup>Evre, B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, p. 31.

<sup>305</sup>Bryant, R. (2004). *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London: I. B. Tauris, p. 28.

<sup>306</sup>*Osmanlı İdaresinde Kıbrıs: Nüfusu, Arazi Dağılımı ve Türk Vakıflar*. (2000). Ankara: Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, p. 28.

they deemed acceptable: when combined with the votes of British officials, the Muslims members could have the chance of creating a more balanced decision-making procedure. In any case, the last decision was depending on the High Commissioner's vote.<sup>307</sup>

The new Cyprus Constitution further enabled the British officers to replace the Ottoman governors who were in charge of the six administrative provincial districts of the island.<sup>308</sup> The constitution also established separate village administrative councils that were responsible from handling community affairs separately together with the specially formed Joint Councils for the adjudication purposes common to both Orthodox Christians and Muslims.<sup>309</sup> This administrative practice aimed to preserve the continuation of the *millet system*. In addition to these administrative councils, separate courts for the religiously divided inhabitants of the island were created. The Supreme Court in Nicosia and the District Courts continued to apply the Ottoman law under the supervision of the commissioners. Gradually, however, the English law, with its emphasis on equitable legal practices and procedures, superseded the Ottoman laws, resulting in the curtailment of some of the traditional practices of corruption, bribery and special treatments to some groups.<sup>310</sup>

---

<sup>307</sup>Ibid, p. 27.

<sup>308</sup>Ibid.

<sup>309</sup>Calotychos, V. (1998). "Interdisciplinary Perspectives: Difference at the Heart of the Cyprus Identity and Its Study." In Calotychos, V. (Ed.) *Cyprus and Its People*. Colorado: Westview Press, pp. 5-6.

<sup>310</sup>Katsiaounis, R. (1996). *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus: During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Cyprus Research Center: Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus XXIV, p. 65.

As was mentioned before, the British preference of introducing some modern measures in Cyprus while preserving the Ottoman administrative structures, created complexity in the island's administration. Efforts towards forming a secular colonial bureaucracy alongside the *millet* system created confusion among the inhabitants as well. The new equitable practices were not compatible with the traditional Ottoman system of governance where the religious clergy of both communities were influential in administration as the representatives of their own flocks. Thus, the clergy fell into confusion regarding the change in their authority and role within the state.

The religious elites in the island were abhorrent about these new equitable practices. Especially the Orthodox Christian Church of Cyprus was disturbed as the Muslim clergy. Archbishop Sophorinos was demanding the continuation of the Ottoman political, social, and economic structures that provided authority in the socio-political level to the Church as well as immunity from all taxation.<sup>311</sup> Amongst the Orthodox Christians who belonged to lower classes, however, the new regulations were raising great expectations. They were now hoping not to be faced with subjugations like they faced under the Ottoman rule,<sup>312</sup> while believing that they would not have to pay taxes to tax farmers anymore.<sup>313</sup>

Archbishop Sophorinos was also terrified by the idea that the Orthodox Christian Church might lose its influence on its flock under the new order of things. His fear

---

<sup>311</sup>Cavendish, A. (Ed.) (1991) *Cyprus 1878: The Journal of Sir Garnet Wolseley*. Nicosia: Cultural Center of the Cyprus Popular Bank, p. 152.

<sup>312</sup>Katsiaounis, R. (1996). *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus: During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Cyprus Research Center: Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus XXIV, p. 67.

<sup>313</sup>Cavendish, A. (Ed.) (1991). *Cyprus 1878: The Journal of Sir Garnet Wolseley*. Nicosia: Cultural Center of the Cyprus Popular Bank, p. 40.

was proven to be right as early as August 1878, when Orthodox Christian inhabitants disinclined to pay the usual stipends for the Church. Consequently, on 14 August 1878, Archbishop Sophorinos paid a visit to the British High Commissioner and asked for state assistance to collect his usual stipend. The reason behind his demand was again the continuation of the traditional Ottoman system, since the state assistance provided via soldiers in the collection of these stipends was an Ottoman practice. However, the demand made by Archbishop Sophorinos was not welcomed by the High Commissioner Wolseley, who explicitly stated that from the following year on Sophorinos should “look to his flock for assistance without any pressure being brought to bear upon them by the British authorities.”<sup>314</sup>

This demand of the Archbishop was perceived by Wolseley as a natural reflection of the traditional habit of the Orthodox clergy acquired during the Ottoman rule, in which they used the advantages of the Ottoman governing system, which gave privileges to religious authorities to consolidate power over Orthodox Christian people.<sup>315</sup> Same year, the privileges granted to the clergy and the government officers, both in cases of penal actions and taxation under the previous *millet* system, were abolished.

This imposition of social equality from above led to a rise of hostility towards British rule by the Church; it was regarded as a disrespectful act, even as an insult, to the religious authority of the clergy.<sup>316</sup> Yet, the Orthodox Christian Church,

---

<sup>314</sup>Ibid, p. 44.

<sup>315</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 158.

<sup>316</sup>Bryant, R. (2004). *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London: I. B. Tauris, pp. 53-57.

along with the traditional elites, was still willing to cooperate with the ruling regime.<sup>317</sup> In 1879, Archbishop Sophorinos, and metropolitans of Paphos, Kyrenia and Kitium sent a memorial to Wolseley “asking him to preserve church rights; to exempt church land from tax, to protect indebted priests from prison and forced labor; to include clergy in governing councils; and for a church-state concordat to define relations.”<sup>318</sup> Their demands were once again ignored, which caused Archbishop Sophorinos to lose his authority over his flock, since he no longer had the authority of the state behind him.<sup>319</sup>

During the Ottoman rule the cooperation of the Ottoman government with the Orthodox Christian Church used to bring mutual advantages to both parties. The Ottomans were guaranteeing their rule by granting monetary and legal privileges to the Church. The Church on the other hand, was adjusting itself to the existing plurality of the *millet* system in which the cooperation across religious divisions was quite common.<sup>320</sup> As the partner of the Ottoman government, the Church in order to maintain this structure was adopting certain suppressive measures on its own flock in cases of disturbances, and helping the Ottoman administration to prevent the spread of nationalist sentiments in the island. However, with the effect of the change in the traditional structures of authority the Church “while

---

<sup>317</sup>Katsiaounis, R. (1996). *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus: During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Cyprus Research Center: Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus XXIV, p. 182.

<sup>318</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 158.

<sup>319</sup>Ibid.

<sup>320</sup>Dietzel, I. and Makrides, V. N. (2009). “Ethno-Religious Coexistence and Plurality in Cyprus under British Rule (1878-1960).” *Social Compass* ,56 (1), p. 80.

attempting to retain the political influence and power it had enjoyed under the Ottomans, ... started to increase its support of Greek nationalism.”<sup>321</sup>

The rise of *the Greek Brotherhood of the Cypriots of Egypt* influence in Cyprus is exemplary in this framework. *The Greek Brotherhood of the Cypriots of Egypt* was formed in January 1873 when island was still under the Ottoman rule, in order to create Hellenic consciousness in the island as a missionary organization.<sup>322</sup> It could not be effective back then due to the Church’s opposing stand. However, when the Church started to lose its influence on its flock during the British era, the *Greek Brotherhood of the Cypriots of Egypt’s* influence became significant in the island.

The other major area in which the British administration aimed to imply modern measures in Cyprus was education. Under the Ottoman system, the schools were only giving religious education under the supervision of the religious institutions of the island in Cypriot dialect. The Orthodox Christian Cypriot dialect, *Kypriaka*, was highly different from the one that was used in mainland Greece. As for the Turkish Cypriot dialect, it was also very different from the Ottoman Turkish, despite the fact that it had some similarities with some of the dialects in Anatolia.<sup>323</sup> The mainland Greek and Turkish languages were not spoken or understood at that time by the Cypriots; the dominant language was *Kypriaka*,

---

<sup>321</sup>Ibid.

<sup>322</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 163.

<sup>323</sup>Bryant, R. (2004). *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*, London: I. B. Tauris, pp. 32-35. & Pollis, A. (1973). “Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus.” *Comparative Politics*, 5(4), pp. 585-586.

even in various mixed villages “Muslims, outnumbered by their Greek-speaking neighbors, spoke Cypriot Greek, rather than Turkish, as their first language.”<sup>324</sup>

The aim of the British administration was first and foremost to increase the literacy rate in the island, teaching the Cypriot children to read and write the languages that they spoke, and secondly depending on the success of the students, to encourage them to get modern education either in their native languages in the separate Greek and Turkish secondary schools, or in English language in the British secondary as well as the technical schools.<sup>325</sup>

The language issue became significant in the process of reforming the education in the island. The earlier British efforts were basically educating the Cypriot youth to become functional English speaking colonial subjects; however due to the resistance that they faced from both Muslim and Orthodox Christian communities, they had to agree on the means that communities insisted, which was to continue separate education, and later the adaptation of Greek and Ottoman (Turkish) educational systems to the schools of the island.

The schools attended by the Orthodox Christian and Muslim Cypriots continued to be divergent, the teachers being religious authorities, priests and *hodjas*, just like under the Ottoman era.<sup>326</sup> In the early years of the British rule, people who had religious education in Athens, Trieste and Alexandria started to become teachers in Orthodox Christian Cypriot schools. Especially, the teachers who were sent by the

---

<sup>324</sup>Bryant, R. (2004). *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*, London: I. B. Tauris, p. 34.

<sup>325</sup>Ibid, p. 139.

<sup>326</sup>Nevzat, A. (2005). *Nationalism amongst the Turks of Cyprus: The First Wave*, PhD. Thesis, Oulu: Oulu University Press, p. 108.

*Greek Brotherhood of the Cypriots of Egypt* had great impact in the development of Hellenic consciousness,<sup>327</sup> since their aim was to introduce Hellenic ideals to their students. The *Greek Brotherhood of the Cypriots of Egypt* became more organized, as the influence of the Church dwindled and the nationalist tendencies among the Orthodox Christian clergy started to appear. In the last months of 1878, the Greek Vice-Consul in Cyprus reported that the basic elements of national identity began detectable in the island, mostly because of the newly adopted educational policies.<sup>328</sup> As early as 1893, The *Greek Brotherhood of the Cypriots of Egypt* started to finance particular schools in the island that teach the curricula of Greece.<sup>329</sup>

The religious and linguistic diversity among both communities was presented as the main reason of the system of education in the island; however the most important factor behind the British acceptance of the demands of local communities was economic restrictions. Implementing the necessary reforms meant the increase on the on the island's expenditure; therefore, while providing a limited grant to the primary schools (since the most important goal was increasing the literacy) starting from 1881, British colonial administration did not intend to pay the entire expenses of the schools and discourage the private contributions by the locals.<sup>330</sup> The only measure taken in order to enable some kind of control on

---

<sup>327</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 164.

<sup>328</sup>Katsiaounis, R. (1996). *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus: During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Cyprus Research Center: Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus XXIV, p. 51.

<sup>329</sup>Bryant, R. (2004). *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*, London: I. B. Tauris, p. 21.

<sup>330</sup>Persianis, P. (1996). "The British Colonial Education 'Lending' Policy in Cyprus (1878-1960): An Intriguing Example of An Elusive 'Adapted Education' Policy." *Comparative Education*, 32 (1), p. 49.

these schools was appointing inspectors, who were only responsible from reporting.

The language issue was also effective in the legal administration of the island. Despite this distinctive linguistic characteristic of the island, the British administrators first recognized English as the main language in the island, which created unrest among the local elites. Later, as a response to local demands for *katharevousa*<sup>331</sup> for Orthodox Christian Cypriots, and Ottoman Turkish for Muslim Cypriots was recognized as the main languages of the island in addition to English, This regulation basically encouraged the inhabitants to learn and use these languages in order to participate in the political life of the island. However, the educated elites of both communities were still mostly using these languages, and they gradually started to dominate the public arena as well as administrative practices. As for *Kypriaka* and Cypriot Turkish, they slowly became the languages which are only used among the villagers.<sup>332</sup>

In this era, the print media also started to publish only in *katharevousa* and Ottoman Turkish, despite the fact that most of the population in the island from both communities was not able to read in these languages. The publishers of these media resources were the community elites who were already influential in the Legislative Council, hence deeply involved in politics. The articles, news and poetry, mostly about the history of Greek and Turkish nations, written in these sources were disseminated orally in the cafes via the elites, and until the 1950s this practice played an important role in the spread of nationalist sentiments,<sup>333</sup>

---

<sup>331</sup>*Katharevousa* is a form of the Greek language conceived in the early 19th century aiming to purify the Greek dialects from influences of other languages.

<sup>332</sup>Bryant, R. (2004). *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*, London: I. B. Tauris, p. 35.

<sup>333</sup>*Ibid.*

especially among the Christian Orthodox inhabitants of the island. The use of *katharevousa* enabled the Christian Orthodox inhabitants to feel deeper attachments to their co-religionists in Greece and created Hellenic consciousness, while distancing them further away from other cultural attachments related to island.

Even if the British administrators in the island were well-aware of the nationalist sentiments among the Orthodox Christian Cypriot elites, they could not foresee the possible future outcomes. The idea of sharing the same intellectual past with Greeks was rooted among the British authorities; also London's uncertain position about the future possession of the island was causing a considerable complacency towards this growing awareness. As such, the ordinance against the Hellenist communities,<sup>334</sup> which was passed in February 1879, included no sanctions. By 1880, there were about six hundred Greek nationals in Cyprus who settled in Larnaca and Limassol, trying to spread the idea of becoming the "dream nation" among the Orthodox Christian inhabitants.<sup>335</sup>

In 1882 when Britain invaded Egypt, only six years after its possession the idea of transforming the island into a *place d'armes* withered away. British General Staff did not find building a military base in Cyprus necessary any more, since Alexandria was now capable of satisfying all of the British needs in the region as a port. It was decided that the only necessity for the island was to prevent its occupation by other states that could be potentially powerful in the Eastern

---

<sup>334</sup>Hill, G. H. (1952). *A History of Cyprus, Vol. IV: The Ottoman Province. The British Colony, 1571-1948*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 497.

<sup>335</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 163.

Mediterranean.<sup>336</sup> Yet, the possession of Cyprus, along with Gibraltar and Malta, was still considered useful, as it would assure the flow of coal supplies for the British vessels during a possible war.<sup>337</sup> This development later became the main cause of the island's economic neglect, since the British Treasury did not find it efficient to invest in the island anymore, and wanted to keep the island's expenditure in minimum.<sup>338</sup>

Along with London's unwillingness for increasing Cyprus's financial burden via establishing required infrastructures, Britain also started to collect high taxes. According to the Cyprus Convention, Britain was obliged to pay an annual tax to the Ottoman Empire; however Britain refused to pay these taxes, due to the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in 1856 Crimean War by Russia, in which Britain and France had financed the Ottomans. When the war ended with the victory of Russia, the Ottomans were indebted to these two European powers. Taking into account the inability on the part of the Ottomans to pay their debt, the British authorities preferred to collect taxes from the Cypriots.

The major source of tax revenue for the British was the compulsory locust-tax that was one pound per head, an extremely high rate for poor Cypriots farmers. Furthermore, as the British government wanted to keep the expenses of the island as low as possible, no investment in Cyprus made for public works. The lack of investment in the island made it really difficult for the Cypriots to give the imposed taxes. Both Muslims and Christians of the island were deeply disturbed

---

<sup>336</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Koloniyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika Vol. II*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, p. 22.

<sup>337</sup>Vamberly, A. (1886). "Russia and England; Batoum and Cyprus." *Fortnightly Review*, 40(237), pp. 372-373.

<sup>338</sup>Crawshaw, N. (1978). *The Cyprus Revolt: An Account of the Struggle for Union with Greece*. London: George Allen & Unwin, p. 20.

from the taxes, since they “found themselves not only paying the tribute, but also covering the expenses incurred by the British colonial administration, creating a steady drain on an already poor economy.”<sup>339</sup> Soon this regulation became the symbol of British injustice in the island and resulted in a burst of public unrest in 1889.<sup>340</sup>

To sum up, British administration was faced with various challenges during this era, since the newly introduced modern institutions of the island clashed with the existing socio-political culture of Cyprus. These institutions were not functioning as they were expected, as they could not be internalized by the inhabitants of the island, for whom the main problem became economic hardships. The Legislative Council, which was composed of nine Orthodox Christians, three Muslims and six English officials turned out to be useless in carrying the plans of British authorities, especially when the Muslims started to vote together with Orthodox Christians, especially about monetary issues. The freedom of press was also abused by the inhabitants of the island, as many radical-nationalist publications that the British authorities could not control were being published. There was a similar problem for the system of imprisonment. The prisons were no deterrent to the inhabitants since they were considered comfortable by them.<sup>341</sup>

The mass unrest in the island and the disappointment of the Cypriot communities led to the creation of a conducive environment in this period for the rise of Greek nationalism. The clergy started to be divided into two poles: one group started to

---

<sup>339</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 9.

<sup>340</sup>Hogarth, W. D. (1889). “The Present Discontent in Cyprus.” *Fortnightly Review*, 46 (272), p. 249.

<sup>341</sup>Hogarth, W. D. (1889). “The Present Discontent in Cyprus.” *Fortnightly Review*, 46 (272), p. 253.

be influenced more and more by the missionaries and to sympathize the *Megali Idea*, and the other group, which was more traditional, favored cooperation with the rulers. The nationalist ideas gradually started to be out-spoken by the clergy while complaining about the situation of the island. However, British ignorance on the Greek nationalism stood still. In 1889 a British journalist was reporting the existing signs of *enotist* agitation in the island as a mere newspaper cry that should not be taken as a serious threat.<sup>342</sup> According to this report, Orthodox Christian peasants hardly knew that there was a city called Athens, so they were in no position to contribute to any attempt for union with Greece. In addition to that, it was stating that the clergy and the intellectuals believed that the island's position would be much worse under the Greek rule. The impositions of a possible Hellenic Kingdom, such as compulsory military service and heavier taxes, were not desired at all. As such, at the time, nationalism in the island was very low among the Orthodox Christians. It was also noted that one-third of the island (that is non-Greek Cypriots) did not have any attachment to the Greeks, so there was no risk for the *enosis* movement to become a threat to the British rule in the island.<sup>343</sup>

While the British authorities were far away from realizing the rise of Greek nationalism, Muslims elites of the island were highly disturbed from the activities of the Orthodox Christian Cypriot elites. In 1890, the first Muslim political organization of the island, *Kıraathane-i Osmaniye* (Ottoman Club of Nicosia) was formed. Its members were loyal supporters of the Ottoman Empire who had close relations with Porte and the organization was functioning as a safe-ground for the Muslim Cypriots for exchanging their views about the island's future.<sup>344</sup>

---

<sup>342</sup>*Enotist* (unionist) is a term that refers to Greek Cypriots who favor *enosis*, the idea of unification of the island with Greece.

<sup>343</sup>Hogarth, W. D. (1889). "The Present Discontent in Cyprus." *Fortnightly Review*, 46 (272), pp. 246.

<sup>344</sup>Evre, B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, p. 46.

In 1893, Ali Rifki, who became the *mufti*<sup>345</sup> of Cyprus in 1890, during a visit that he paid to the British High Commissioner Walter Sendall, demanded the introduction of the Ottoman press law in order to prevent the publication of racial and provocative material in several Orthodox Christian newspapers.<sup>346</sup> These newspapers (*Cyprus*, *Neon Kition*, *Alitha*, *Stasinós*, *Salpiiks*, *Enosis* and *Foni tis Kipru*) were influential sources of the Greek nationalist ideology, which started to be published between 1878 and 1887. However, Ali Rifki's demand was rejected by the British authorities. Even though they seemed to be aware the *enotist* agitation among the Greek Orthodox inhabitants of the island as a potentially destabilizing factor,<sup>347</sup> they did not take any measures for preventing the further expansion of the ideology.

This negligent attitude of the British officials continued throughout the 1890s, resulting with the reactionary development of Turkish national consciousness among the Muslim Cypriot elite. By the time, the Muslim Cypriot elites who were previously supporting Ottomanism, started to be influenced by the Young Turk movement in the Ottoman Empire. By the late 1890s, the new publications of *Kıraathane-i Osmaniye* such as *Kokonuz*, *Feryat*, *Mirat-ı Zaman* were publishing pro-Young Turk articles, although the first publication of the organization, *Zaman*, used to publish articles that aimed to foster Ottomanism in the island.<sup>348</sup>

---

<sup>345</sup>Mufti (*Müftü*) is the Islamic religious leader who is responsible from interpreting religious laws and issuing appropriate Islamic advisory opinions.

<sup>346</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 177.

<sup>347</sup>Markides, D. (2006). "Cyprus 1878-1925: Ambiguities and Uncertainties." In Faustmann, H. and Peristianis, N. (Eds.) *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism, 1878-2006*. Möhnesse: Bibliopolis, p. 26.

<sup>348</sup>Evre, B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, pp. 47-48.

The geographical proximity of Cyprus to Anatolia also helped the rapid spread of Young Turkist ideology in the island. The restriction on the publication of Young Turk journals in other territories administered by the Ottoman Empire during the 1890s,<sup>349</sup> turned the island into a safe space for these publications, resulting in some of the Young Turks from Anatolia fled to Cyprus, specifically for this reason.<sup>350</sup> Their ideology started to spread in the island, mainly through the branches of the *İttihak ve Terakki Cemiyeti* (Committee of Union and Progress) which was established by these Young Turks who had migrated from Anatolia and now residing in Nicosia and Larnaca.<sup>351</sup> The conservative Muslims along with *mufti* Ali Rıfıkı, however, were still feeling strong loyalty to the Ottoman Sultan, and favoring the preservation of local structures and multiculturalism in Cyprus. Therefore, they were against the newly emerging Young Turk movement, even *mufti* Ali Rıfıkı was giving public speeches in order to prevent the influence of this new movement on Muslims of the island.<sup>352</sup>

In April 1897, due to the outbreak of the war between Greece and the Ottoman Empire, High Commissioner Sendall issued a proclamation in the Cyprus Gazette forbidding “meetings, assemblies and processions” that would disturb public peace.<sup>353</sup> This was the first attempt on the part of the British authorities in the island to prevent a possible nationalist clash among the inhabitants of the island.

---

<sup>349</sup>Nevzat, A. (2005). *Nationalism amongst the Turks of Cyprus: The First Wave*, PhD. Thesis, Oulu: Oulu University Press, p. 75.

<sup>350</sup>Kızılyürek, N. (2002). *Milliyetçilik Kıskaçında Kıbrıs*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 215.

<sup>351</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 182.

<sup>352</sup>Evre, B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, p. 48.

<sup>353</sup>Cougland, R. and Mallison, W. (2005). “Enosis, Socio-Cultural Imperialism and Strategy Difficult Bedfellows.” *Middle Eastern Studies*. 41, p. 575. & Evre, B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, p. 43.

The British authorities were now aware of the development of Turkish nationalism among the Muslims of the island, due to the Young Turkish influence in every stage of the daily life, especially through education. In the Muslim schools, the teachers were “preaching to the public on the virtues of the Turkish nation,”<sup>354</sup> and basically constructing the Turkish nationalism.

When Archbishop Sophorinos died in May 1900, the Orthodox Christian clergy further split into two groups: where one was openly supporting the Hellenic ideals, the other was still favoring good relations with the British authorities and claiming that Orthodoxy was the only identity that their people needed and cooperation with Britain authorities would improve the living conditions of the Orthodox Christian inhabitants and satisfy the spiritual needs of church leaders.<sup>355</sup> However the conservative stand was not as powerful as the Hellenic stand, and three years after the death of Sophorinos, the local Orthodox Christian politicians “invent[ed] the of *enosis* declaration.”<sup>356</sup>

The Orthodox Christian members of the Legislative Council who were supporting the Hellenic ideals, managed to pass a law in 1903 in favor of the unification of the island with Greece with the majority vote. The law was easily passed because one Muslim member was missing in that session. This event created unrest among the Muslim community that was already anxious about the future of the island. As a respond, the Muslim members of the Legislative Council, with the help of the appointed British members, passed another law stating that the Muslims of the

---

<sup>354</sup>Nevzat, A. (2005). *Nationalism amongst the Turks of Cyprus: The First Wave*, PhD. Thesis, Oulu: Oulu University Press, p. 109.

<sup>355</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 179-180.

<sup>356</sup>Ibid, p. 157.

island were disturbed from the *enosis* claims and they believed that if there would be a change in the status of Cyprus, the island should be returned back to the Ottoman Empire.<sup>357</sup>

At the time, as the threat of *enosis* had began to be felt profoundly, the success of the Young Turk movement to started the second constitutional era in the Ottoman Empire (*İkinci Meşrutiyet*)<sup>358</sup> which was welcomed by the island's Muslims elites. The establishment of new political and social organizations in the Ottoman mainland influenced the Muslim elites in the island, who were incited by the *enotist* arguments of the Orthodox Christian community. As a result, in 1908 the first Cypriot Muslim association was founded under the name of *Türk Teavün Cemiyeti* (Turkish Welfare Association).<sup>359</sup> The usage of the word "Turk" in the name of the organization was reflecting the ongoing transformation of the religious identity to national identity within the Muslim community of the island.

On 9 October 1907, British Undersecretary of State for the Colonies, Winston Churchill visited Cyprus on his way to East Africa. During his four day visit, he travelled in various parts of the island and made observations on its current political status. As a result of his observations, Churchill stated that the Greek nationalist movement in the island was identical to Cretan aspirations, which was undesirable, as Britain did not favor the decline of Ottoman sovereignty. Hence Churchill dismissed the local demands for both *enosis* and returning Cyprus to

---

<sup>357</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Kolonyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika Vol II*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, pp. 47- 48. & Evre, B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, p. 43.

<sup>358</sup>The second constitutional era in Ottoman Empire (*İkinci Meşrutiyet*) resulted in the adaptation of constitutional monarchy in the Ottoman Empire. Between 1908 and 1920 many political groups were established and were represented in the Ottoman Parliament.

<sup>359</sup>Evre, B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, pp. 47-48.

Ottoman rule. He also rejected the relatively moderate demand of Greek Cypriots for changing the constitution which would give them more power, as he believed that such an increased power could have shut out both the British and the Muslims from the island. According to him, *enosis* was a reaction to the social and economic dissatisfaction that the Greek Cypriots had under the British rule. So, for Churchill, the solution was implementing better policies, a proposal rejected by the British Colonial Office and the Treasury.<sup>360</sup>

In the following two years, with the impact of the rise of the *enosis* movement among the Greek Cypriots, as well as the success of the Young Turks in the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish Cypriot nationalist aspirations became consolidated.<sup>361</sup> In 1909, two pan-Turkish associations were established in the island, *Terraki Kulübü* (Progress Club) and *Hürriyet Kulübü* (Freedom Club), which joined under the name of *Hürriyet ve Terraki Kulübü* (Progress and Freedom Club) a year later.<sup>362</sup> This organization made its first mass public demonstration on 29 September 1911, the day that Balkan Wars started, where more than 3,000 Muslims protested *enotist* claims in Nicosia, under the leadership of Cypriot Muslim elites.<sup>363</sup>

While the transformation of the ethno-religious identity consciousnesses to ethno-national consciousnesses started to spread to the masses, Britain was once again questioning the possession of the island in 1912, during the first Balkan War in

---

<sup>360</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 184-185.

<sup>361</sup>Coufoudakis, V. (1976). "The Dynamics of Political Partition and Division in Multiethnic and Multireligious Societies: The Cyprus Case." In Coufoudakis, V. (Ed.) *Essays on the Cyprus Conflict*. New York: Pella Publishing Company, p. 31.

<sup>362</sup>Evre, B. (2004) *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, p. 48.

<sup>363</sup>Ibid, p. 43.

which Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro and Serbia attacked the Ottoman Empire. After the occupation of Thessaloniki by the Greeks, British interests in the Aegean region relied on Greek control in case of a possible Russian expansionist attempt. British interest was renewed over the Ionian Islands which had been ceded to Greece in 1862. Britain, while supporting the Greek claim on all Aegean islands against the Ottomans, was hoping to make an agreement with them in exchange for Cyprus for a base in Cephalonia. However, the island was legally still an Ottoman possession and it was not possible to make such a deal with Greece.<sup>364</sup>

1912 also witnessed a noteworthy political crisis between the Orthodox Christian members of the Legislative Council and the British authorities when they rejected to pay the tribute,<sup>365</sup> which resulted in the resignation of all Orthodox Christian members of the Legislative Council. The main aim behind the resignations was to impede the legislative system so that the British authorities would accept the abolishment of the tribute payments. Due to this attitude of the Orthodox Christians members, the Legislative Council could not meet regularly in 1912,<sup>366</sup> which highly disturbed its Muslim members, since they were in favor of the regular functioning of this body.. This situation made the political tension, which had emerged between the Orthodox Christian and Muslim members of the Legislative Council due to the *enotists* claims, more intense,<sup>367</sup> and led to the

---

<sup>364</sup>Markides, D. (2006). "Cyprus 1878-1925: Ambiguities and Uncertainties." In Faustmann, H. and Peristianis, N. (Eds.) *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism, 1878-2006*. Möhnesse: Bibliopolis, p. 29.

<sup>365</sup>Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 186.

<sup>366</sup>*Cyprus, Annual Report for the Year 1912-13*. (1913). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 11.

<sup>367</sup>Altay Nevzat gives following story to interpret the existed tensions between the communities; "In 1912 a Christian shopkeeper renting a shop in the Moslem quarter had refused to allow a string

emergence of the first inter-ethnic conflict between the two communities same year.<sup>368</sup> The disturbance resulted in four people dead and more than a hundred people wounded.<sup>369</sup>

After the disturbance, the Ottoman authorities warned the British to take the necessary security measures in order to prevent such events in the future. Also, the Muslim members of the Legislative Council, terrified by the developments, sent a letter to London stating that if there would be a change in the status of Cyprus, they would prefer the island to remain under British possession or be handed over to Egypt.<sup>370</sup> It was clear that the Turkish Cypriots were disturbed from the idea of *enosis* and primarily favored the continuation of British rule. However, if that would not be the case, then Egyptian rule was the second preferred option, since Egypt was also a British colony with an Ottoman heritage, and was inhabited mostly by Muslims.

The schools became another aspect that contributed to the emergence of antagonism in the island on the eve of the World War I. The teachers in the elementary and secondary schools, which were funded and controlled by the respective religious institutions of the communities, were focusing more on the distinctions among Cypriots in terms of language, religion and ethnicity. Although the British supervision on these educational institutions was compulsory,

---

upon which Ottoman flags would be drawn to commemorate the ascension to the throne of the Sultan to be attached to his shop, because he said that he feared being boycotted by his own community.” Nevzat, A. (2005). *Nationalism amongst the Turks of Cyprus: The First Wave*, PhD. Thesis, Oulu: Oulu University Press, p. 109.

<sup>368</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Koloniyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika Vol. II*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, p. 50.

<sup>369</sup>Ibid.

<sup>370</sup>Evre, B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, p. 44.

the inspections were not effective to prevent the rise of hostile ethno-nationalisms in the island<sup>371</sup>

When the World War I started in 1914, the Ottoman Empire joined the Central Powers after signing the secret Ottoman-German Alliance Agreement in August 1914. The act of the Ottoman Empire was regarded as a state of war by the British Empire and the British authorities unilaterally annulled the 1878 Cyprus Convention. After the annulment, by Order in Council of 5 November 1914 the island was annexed to the British Crown.<sup>372</sup> In 1915, British Prime Minister offered the island to Greece in exchange for Greek involvement in the war alongside with Entente Powers. The Greek authorities, however their offer was rejected, since the Greek King was not willing to participate in war and preferred to stay neutral.<sup>373</sup>

This offer of British Prime Minister, even if it was rejected, fostered the *enotist* movement in the island and built a stronger sense of political identity among the Orthodox Christian community and hope for the possible future unification of the island with Greece.

The Turkish Cypriots, on the other hand, who had already been split into two political groups, experienced a deeper division during the World War I. The Young Turkist stand against the British government rigidified after the Ottoman Empire joined Germany and Austro-Hungary Empire against the Allied Powers. In

---

<sup>371</sup>*Cyprus, Annual Report for the Year 1913-14.* (1914). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, pp.13-14.

<sup>372</sup>*Colonial Reports Annual, Cyprus Report for 1923.* (1924). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 3.

<sup>373</sup>Dodd, H. C. (Ed.) (1999). *Cyprus: The Need for New Perspectives.* England: the Eothen Press, p. 3.

1915, the British High Commissioner was informing London about the division between *Eski Türkiye Partisi* (the Old Turkey Party) and *Jön-Türk Partisi* (Young Turk Party). He was also stating that the majority of the Muslims Cypriots were supporting the *Eski Türkiye Partisi* which was conservative, so it was necessary for him to establish contacts with them and to influence its supporters.<sup>374</sup> However, the *Jön-Türk Partisi*, while not being as popular as the *Eski Türkiye Partisi*, was also quite influential. It carried out campaigns against Britain during the war, and influenced a considerable section of the Muslims, so much so that in some cases, they acted in a disloyal way against the British police forces.<sup>375</sup>

In 1917 Greece joined the war alongside the Allied Powers, due to the strong threat of occupation by the Central Powers. This development was welcomed by the Greek Cypriots whom at the time started to hope that the island would be given to Greece, as it was offered two years ago. At the end of the war, while Greek Cypriots were celebrating the victory of the Allies, Turkish Cypriots (under the influence of Young Turkist ideology) were organizing demonstrations for the return of the island back to the Ottoman Empire. To that end, they decided to send a committee to London to express their will in 1918 under the leadership of *Mufti Ziya Efendi*.<sup>376</sup> A year later, under the leadership of the influential members of the *Hürriyet ve Terraki Kulübü* (Progress and Freedom Club), Turkish Cypriots attempted to organize an uprising in order to save the Turkish-Ottoman prisoners of war who were brought to island by the British army back in 1915 and 1916. However, their attempt failed when the British officials arrested the members of

---

<sup>374</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Kolonyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika Vol. II*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, p. 162.

<sup>375</sup>Evre, B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, p. 49.

<sup>376</sup>İsmail, S. (1992). *Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti'nin Doğuşu ve Çöküşü ve KKTC'nin Kuruluşu (1960–1983)*. İstanbul; Akdeniz Haber Ajansı Yayınları, p. 5.

Progress and Freedom Club.<sup>377</sup> After this incident the Turkish Cypriot reactions against British authorities decreased.

The Greek Cypriot *enotist* claims, on the other hand, gained more of a serious nature after the World War I and the Turkish War of Independence (1919-1922) in Anatolia. In 1919, a committee composed of the Greek Cypriot members of the Legislative Council, led by Archbishop Kryllios visited London in order to demand immediate unification of the island with Greece. After the visit, the Turkish Cypriot concerns about the *enotist* claims turned into a major unrest and as a response *Türkiye'ye İlhak Partisi* (Annexation to Turkey Party) was established with the efforts of Dr. Hüseyin Behiç. Soon after it was formed, the party started openly demanding the return of the island to the Ottomans.<sup>378</sup>

The War of Independence in the Ottoman mainland was followed closely and supported by the Turkish Cypriots.<sup>379</sup> Some of the Turkish Cypriots fled to Anatolia to fight in the war, whereas others organized various associations to support it. These associations organized theatrical performances all over the island between 1920 and 1922, promoting Turkish nationalism. The money which was collected from these shows, as well as individual contributions, was sent to Anatolia. These campaigns were significant in regard to the development of loyalty to Turkey, considering the fact that Turkish Cypriots were actually in no condition to make such monetary support to this war, as they had been exposed to three years of famine. Their sacrifice was a reflection of their tendency to take part

---

<sup>377</sup>Ibid, p. 6.

<sup>378</sup>Evre, B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, pp. 50-51.

<sup>379</sup>Ibid, p. 53.

in the process of formation of the future of the island.<sup>380</sup> Turkish nationalism was on its peak and Turkish Cypriot elites were basically expecting Mustafa Kemal to conquer the island after the war.<sup>381</sup>

When İzmir was invaded by Greeks in accordance with *Megali Idea*, the two major communities of the island had divergent feelings. The invasion created an excitement among the Greek Cypriots, whereas the Turkish Cypriot community felt a deep grief. On 9 September 1922, when Greeks were removed from İzmir, the grief of Turkish Cypriots turned into a joyful celebration, whereas this time the Greek Cypriots got furious. They organized a referendum in the Omorpho (Güzelyurt) district on 25 March 1921 for unification with Greece. Later, the Greek Cypriots applied to the British administration for the unification with Greece. However, their demands were immediately rejected.<sup>382</sup>

After the success of the War of Independence in Anatolia, the idea of returning the island to Turkey, as the new successor of the Ottoman Empire, rekindled among the Turkish Cypriots who started to use Turkish flags and brought Mustafa Kemal's pictures from Anatolia, even before the proclamation of the Republic of Turkey.<sup>383</sup>

This attitude caused worries among the Greek Cypriots and they demand demanded expansion of their rights in governance from the British authorities. As

---

<sup>380</sup>Ibid, pp. 54-56.

<sup>381</sup>Ibid, p. 56.

<sup>382</sup>*Osmanlı İdaresinde Kıbrıs: Nüfusu, Arazi Dağılımı ve Türk Vakıflar.* (2000). Ankara; Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, p. 29.

<sup>383</sup>Evre, B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi.* Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, pp. 58-59.

a respond, in December 1922 the Muslim Legislative Council member, Dr. Eyüp Necmettin wrote a letter to British High Commissioner, stating that the Muslim community was against the Greek Cypriot demands for expanded rights. According to the 1921 census, the population of the island was 310,709 and the Muslims constituted approximately one-fifth of this number.<sup>384</sup> Therefore, if the rights of the Greek Cypriots would be expanded, that would make it impossible for the Turkish minority to resist the Greek Cypriot will of *enosis*. So, it was more logical and beneficial for the Cypriot Turks either to be represented in the Legislative Council in a proportional way, just as the way prior to 1914, or Cyprus to be annexed to Turkey. In addition, they also demanded the establishment of a Muslim Council, which would be responsible from the control of Muslim schools and foundations. British authorities rejected all of the demands of both communities.<sup>385</sup>

After the Turkish War of Independence (1919-1923) that resulted in the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the Lausanne Treaty was signed on 24 July 1923. According to the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> articles of the Lausanne Treaty, Turkey gave up all of the Ottoman claims on the island and recognized the British annexation of Cyprus. Consequently, the legal possession of the island shifted to Britain eight years after its annexation. However, considering broader opportunities which might appear in the future, Britain did not declare the island a Crown Colony till 1925.

This unexpected development created a deep disappointment among the Turkish Cypriots. However, despite this decision on the part of Turkey, Britain preference

---

<sup>384</sup> *Colonial Reports Annual, Cyprus Report for 1923*. (1924). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 3.

<sup>385</sup> Hill, G. H. (1952). *A History of Cyprus, Vol. IV: The Ottoman Province. The British Colony, 1571-1948*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 537.

of not handing the island over to Greece renewed the trust among the Turkish Cypriots toward the British officials. In this era, relations between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots also improved. In 1924, a joint trade union, Limassol Labor Centre, was established.<sup>386</sup> However, this inter-communal cooperation was not sufficient to form a consensus on issues related to the future of the island.<sup>387</sup>

The preservation of close relations with Greece and Turkey among the Greek and Turkish Cypriots was encouraged by the British government in this era. In 1923, with the adaptation of a new law concerning the education in the island the curriculums in the newly opened secondary schools made compatible to the ones in Greece and Turkey, in order to encourage and prepare the students for higher education in Istanbul and Athens respectively.<sup>388</sup>

Nevertheless, the British attitude towards establishing close relations with Turkey and Greece was not a consistent policy. For instance, when large numbers of Muslims, disturbed by the Greek Cypriot demand on *enosis* started to leave the island and migrate to Turkey in accordance with the Lausanne Treaty.<sup>389</sup> The Consulate of the Turkish Republic was opened in the island very same year in order to administer the migration process. With the establishment of the Consulate, Turkish Republic Day (29 October) started to be celebrated widely in the island annually. The Consulate was also providing funds for the Turkish nationalist

---

<sup>386</sup>Nevzat, A. (2005). *Nationalism amongst the Turks of Cyprus: The First Wave*, PhD. Thesis, Oulu: Oulu University Press, p. 109.

<sup>387</sup>Ibid, p. 181.

<sup>388</sup>*Colonial Reports Annual, Cyprus Report for 1923*. (1924). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, pp. 30-31.

<sup>389</sup>*Colonial Reports Annual, Annual Report on the Social and Economic Progress of the People of Cyprus, 1931*. (1932). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 5.

publications and fostering Turkish nationalist ideas in the island.<sup>390</sup> These activities of the Consulate and its close relations with the Turkish Cypriots as well as the mass migrations to Anatolia started to disturb the British authorities, since the existence of the Turkish community in the island was considered as a political need in terms of justifying their unwillingness to accept either *enosis* or self-determination. In a period of approximately two years since the establishment of the new Turkish state, about 2,000 Turkish Cypriot migrated to Anatolia, whereas 9,327 Turkish Cypriots applied for Turkish citizenship.<sup>391</sup>

During this period, in addition to Muslim out-migration, hundreds of Greek fugitives from Anatolia immigrated to Cyprus. Among these fugitives, the ones who had previous connections with Cyprus were allowed to join their relatives who promised to support them. As for the rest, they were sent to Greece or other British colonies, such as Australia, in 1922.<sup>392</sup> Due to this migration flows, the population of the island increased from 311,000 in 1921<sup>393</sup> to 322,000 in 1923.<sup>394</sup> The British administrators tried to prevent the migrations to Anatolia constantly, and when the application period of the Turkish Cypriots for migration to Turkey officially ended, the Consulate was closed down by Britain. However, as a result of reactions coming from the Turkish Cypriot elites and diplomatic efforts of Turkey, the Consulate was re-opened with the same staff.<sup>395</sup>

---

<sup>390</sup>Evre , B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, p. 64.

<sup>391</sup>Ibid, pp. 61-63.

<sup>392</sup>*Colonial Reports Annual, Cyprus Report for 1923*. (1924). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 8.

<sup>393</sup>*Advisory Council Cyprus, The Census of Population 1946: Sessional Paper*. (1947). Nicosia: Cyprus Government Printing Office, p. 5.

<sup>394</sup>*Colonial Reports Annual, Cyprus Report for 1923*. (1924). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 3.

<sup>395</sup>Evre , B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, p. 65.

On 10 March 1925, Cyprus was declared as a Crown Colony. The decision was taken mostly as a result of the relative stability in the island as well as the absence of any further benefits that Cyprus might provide to Britain. This new development was accepted by the Muslims, but not welcomed by the Orthodox Christians. On 1 May 1925, Archbishop Kyrillos, as the representative of Greek Cypriot Community, expressed his discontent with a letter that he sent to the British Colonial Secretary C. D. Fenn. Kyrillos was stating in his letter that, the clergy and the people had very deep grief because of the declaration of the island as a colony, as their desire was unification with Greece. The answer of the Colonial Secretary Fenn was clear and reflecting the new British attitude towards the island: in his letter of 12 June 1925, Fenn openly expressed that the question of the union with Greece had been closed once and for all and cannot be reconsidered.<sup>396</sup>

After the declaration of the island as a Crown Colony, Britain started to make further changes in the administrative structure of Cyprus. The High Commissioner was replaced by a Governor aided by an Executive and a Legislative Council. The Executive Council was established which was consisted of four official and three civil members. The Legislative Council was reorganized as being headed by the Governor as the President of the Council along with twenty four members: nine British officials and fifteen elected members composed of three Muslims and twelve Christians. The Council was subjected to dissolution by the Governor, if he thought fit.<sup>397</sup>

---

<sup>396</sup>*The Cyprus Gazette for the Year 1925*. (1926). Nicosia: Government Printing Office, p. 316.

<sup>397</sup>Colonial Reports Annual, Annual Report on the Social and Economic Progress of the People of Cyprus, 1931. (1932). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 4.

In 1927, the regulation for the legal identification of the inhabitants was put into force under the supervision of Governor of Cyprus Sir Ronald Storrs. The British administration disturbed from the rise of nationalist sentiments among the Orthodox Christian community tried create island patriotism<sup>398</sup> and constructed the word Cypriot. However, again with the demands of both communities Muslims started to be referred as “Ottoman Turks” and Orthodox Christians as “Greeks” in the British legal papers. However, as opposite to what was expected this regulation directly contributed to the transformation of the religious identity perceptions within the two communities into national ones.<sup>399</sup>

In line with their aroused national feelings at the time, Turkish Cypriot elites wanted to create loyalty among their own community towards Turkey. It was not a difficult process to create such an attachment since Turkish Cypriots were the minority group without any significant economic means. As a result of Turkish Cypriot demands, implication of the Kemalist reforms in the island right after these reforms were adopted in Turkey. The “motherland” the reforms were voluntarily adopted, even if some of them were “clashing with the existing codes of the Turkish Cypriots.”<sup>400</sup> Furthermore, in the school year 1929-1930, as a result of considerable efforts of the Turkish Cypriot members of the Legislative Council, the new Turkish alphabet started to be used in the Muslim schools, and became obligatory for the official purposes in 1932.<sup>401</sup>

---

<sup>398</sup>Hasgüler, M. (2008). “Kıbrıslılık Kimliği: Kıbrıslı Türkler ve Kıbrıslı Rumlardaki Farklılaşma.” In Hasgüler, M. (Ed.) *Kıbrıslılık*. İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı, p. 2. & An, A. (2005). *Forms of Cypriotism in the Turkish Cypriot Community: Obstacles and Necessary Conditions*. Paper presented at Seminar of the New Cyprus Association, Limassol, Republic of Cyprus.

<sup>399</sup>Hasgüler, M. (2008). “Kıbrıslılık Kimliği: Kıbrıslı Türkler ve Kıbrıslı Rumlardaki Farklılaşma.” In Hasgüler, M. (Ed.), *Kıbrıslılık*. İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı, p. 2.

<sup>400</sup>Evre , B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, p. 65.

<sup>401</sup>*Colonial Reports Annual, Annual Report on the Social and Economic Progress of the People of Cyprus, 1931*. (1932). London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, p. 4.

The economic hardship was still relevant after the declaration of the island as Crown Colony. In 1927, both Greek and Turkish Cypriot Legislative Council members demanded an increase in the investments made to the island; British administration accepted this demand with the condition of imposing an additional tax on the island. They forced the Cypriots to pay 10,000 pounds sterling annually for the imperial defense, so that they could invest to the island without any economic burden to the British Treasury. This negative development aroused discontent in the island; Cypriots claimed that after the annexation of the island to Britain as a Crown Colony, this kind of a regulation was no more legal. However, British authorities ignored Cypriot arguments and increased the regular taxes in the island, mostly due to the conditions aroused by the worldwide economic crisis in 1930s.<sup>402</sup>

In a Legislative Council meeting held in 1931, the Colonial Administration proposed a temporary levy of five per cent on official salaries of over hundred pounds a year. The proposal was rejected by thirteen to twelve votes: where the twelve Greek Cypriots who voted against the measure were joined by one Turkish Cypriot member, Mehmet Necati.<sup>403</sup> Mehmet Necati was related to the *Halkçı Cephe* (People's Front) which was a political movement supporting Turkish nationalism and rejecting cooperation with the British officials, often blaming them for the bad economic conditions of Turkish Cypriot community.<sup>404</sup> On 1 May 1931, in the *Kıbrıs Türk Milli Kongresi* (Cyprus Turkish National Congress) similar opinions were expressed and it was stated that the primary concern of the

---

<sup>402</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. 21-22.

<sup>403</sup>Mallison, W. (2005). *A Modern History of Cyprus*. London: I. B. Tauris, pp. 10-11.

<sup>404</sup>Evre , B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi, p. 74.

Turkish community should be to regain the rights which they had possessed earlier and rejecting British impositions. This new stand among the Turkish Cypriots was basically in favor of the continuation of the British rule, only if their demands were satisfied.<sup>405</sup> The subsequent new pattern of political cooperation between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots at the elite level basically aimed to seek separate economic and political advantages for their own communities.<sup>406</sup>

Despite the rejection of the Legislative Council on the temporary levies, British Governor, as the head of the government, passed the law. This decision of British government created unrest strong resentment, especially among the Greek Cypriots, who organized a massive protest on 22 October 1931 against British authorities in Nicosia. The Greek Cypriot clergy and students participating in the demonstration protested the policies of the British administration in the island and they demanded *enosis*. The riot ended with the destruction of the Government House; there were several injuries among the civilians as well as six deaths. Before the British authorities could resume control, massive protests erupted all over the island, and various similar incidents occurred in 598 villages. After these developments, the British authorities immediately dispatched military reinforcements in the island.<sup>407</sup>

As a consequence of the riots which broke out in Cyprus in October 1931, the Legislative Council of the Colony was abolished and the power to legislate was granted to the Governor of the Colony as an emergency measure by the Letter of

---

<sup>405</sup>Ibid, p. 78.

<sup>406</sup>Katsiaounis, R. (1996). *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus: During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Cyprus Research Center: Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus XXIV, pp. 15-16.

<sup>407</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 21.

Patent of His Majesty dated 12 November 1931, “pending consideration of the question of the constitutional future of the island.”<sup>408</sup> The emergency measures also included the suspension of the Cyprus Constitution, imposition of criminal fines against the offenders, prohibition of the importation of publications from outside the island, and the usage of Greek and Turkish flags and ringing of the Church bells.<sup>409</sup> Ten Greek Cypriot elites, including Larnaca and Kyrenia bishops, were sent to exile, which actually became the basic reason of the radicalization of the *enotist* tendencies in the future. The history courses which were identical to the ones in Greece and Turkey in the Greek and Turkish Cypriot schools were also changed, and hanging posters and pictures of the Greek and Turkish figures were prohibited in public areas. The political parties were outlawed and the municipal elections were suspended in order to make Greek and Turkish Cypriots entirely politically inactive. After the abolishment of the Legislative Council, an Advisory Council was established in 1933, which was composed of appointed Cypriot members whose advices had to be taken into consideration in domestic matters.<sup>410</sup>

---

<sup>408</sup>*The Cyprus Blue Book 1932*. (1933). Nicosia: Government Printing Office, p. 112.

<sup>409</sup>*Ibid.* p. 104.

<sup>410</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 21.

## CHAPTER IV

### BRITISH RULE IN CYPRUS: CONSOLIDATION AND CLASH OF ETHNO-NATIONAL IDENTITIES

#### 4.1. British Rule in Cyprus: 1931-1960

The repressive measures that are imposed in 1931 remained effective until 1940 turned the island's administration into an autocracy and made Cypriots politically and socially inactive. However, they could neither prevent the rise of Greek nationalist tendencies nor the discontent among the Turkish Cypriots to these measures.<sup>411</sup>

After these occurrences, the British authorities came to realize the importance of the Orthodox Church in the island; therefore, as a first attempt they aimed to decrease its influence, they postponed the Church elections indefinitely after the death of Archbishop Kyrillos. Furthermore, as they were now aware of the influence of the archbishops in the *enotist* movement, they also passed a special law that made the archbishopric elections to be held under the control of the government. In addition to these measures, the British authorities did not allow the exiled bishops of Cyprus to come back to island till 1947.<sup>412</sup>

---

<sup>411</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 22.

<sup>412</sup>Ibid, p. 22-23.

Under these circumstances, the *enotist* movement shifted to London. Greek Cypriots in London were trying to assure the British Parliament the need of giving the island to Greece by an organization, the *Committee for Cyprus Autonomy*, however they could not be influential.<sup>413</sup>

During the World War II, Britain wanted to retain good relations with both Turkey and Greece, since Greece was one of the Entente Powers where Turkey preferred to stay neutral. However, as Turkey was in the center of the British-controlled Middle East, it still had great importance. Accordingly with their imperial interest in the region, British administration in the island tried to maintain their close relations via the Greek and Turkish Cypriots by encouraging them to have close relations with Greece and Turkey again. The repressive measures were relaxed a little bit, however there was no attempt to adopt a new constitution in the island or to restore civic freedoms. Only some political meetings were allowed and the ban on using the Greek and Turkish flags was removed.

In 1940, Italians seized Greece, at that time, the *enosis* claims of the Greek Cypriots disappeared and the Orthodox Church of Cyprus, which was the champion of *enosis* ideology, did not make its previous demands. The *Locum Tenens*<sup>414</sup> of the Orthodox Christian Church of Cyprus even gave a public speech same year wearing a dress made from Turkish, Greek and British flags, in which he stated that the past disputes should be forgotten, and that the war would end with the victory of Greece with the help of Turkey and Britain.<sup>415</sup> Within a few

---

<sup>413</sup>Ibid, p. 23.

<sup>414</sup>*Locum Tenens* of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus refers to the person who temporarily holds the Archbishopric chair of the Church.

<sup>415</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Kolonyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika Vol. II*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, p. 9.

days of the seize, the Italians were defeated with the help of British forces and Turkey. Later that year, Britain took both Crete and Lemnos with Greek support, and in 1941 Greek Prime Minister Georgios Tsolakoglou asked British officials if they would consider ceding Cyprus as a reward in return of Greece's war efforts, however, his demand was rejected.<sup>416</sup>

A few months later, Greece was seized by Germans who also invaded Crete in 1941. This failure in the war led to the reemergence of the *enosis* claims and anti-colonial reaction in the island, this time not only with the support of the Orthodox Church, but also the newly established Cypriot Marxist Party *Anorthotikó Kómma Ergazómenou Laou* (AKEL-Progressive Party of Working People). In 1942, there was a massive Greek Cypriot propaganda campaign suggesting the unification of the island with Greece after the war.<sup>417</sup>

British authorities by that time had already started to consider ceding the island to Greece, not due to the claims of the natural right of unification with Greece in the island, but due to the anxiety that they felt after the invasion of Crete. The invasion of Crete was very fast, it was feared that it could set an example for a potential Cyprus occupation, a development which would threaten all Eastern Mediterranean. At the time, Cyprus was too small and weak to be used as a military base in the war; it did not even have enough soldiers for its own protection, mostly because of British preference for not turning the island into a *place d'armes* after the invasion of Egypt back in 1882.<sup>418</sup> It was widely argued by

---

<sup>416</sup>Stefanidis, I. D. (1999). *Isle of Discord: Nationalism, Imperialism and the Making of the Cyprus Problem*. London: C Hurst & Co Publishers, p. 3.

<sup>417</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Koloniyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, pp. 9-10.

<sup>418</sup>Ibid, p. 22.

the British General Staff and the Parliament that, the most prominent chance in case of a risk of German invasion would be ceding the island to Greece. However these proposals were rejected due to the possibility of finding alternative solutions, which might emerge later on, depending on the future developments in the region.<sup>419</sup>

While the discussions about ceding the island to Greece were once again closed, there emerged a new kind of hostility among the Greek Cypriots in the island. The conservative Greek Cypriots, the Greek Cypriot clergy and some merchants, were organized under an association named *Panagrotiki Enosis Kyprou* (PEK-Panagrarian Union of Cyprus) were against the AKEL, even if they also wanted *enosis* for their own purposes. However, the rise of AKEL's influence in Cyprus could not be prevented and in the 1943 municipal elections, AKEL's candidates became the mayors of Famagusta and Limassol.<sup>420</sup>

AKEL was supported basically by the British government during the World War II even if it had a strong British opposition and looked positively to the *enosis* movement. This was basically due to the close relations that AKEL had developed with the British trade unions, especially the Trade Union Congress, and British left-wing parties. Furthermore, the British also hoped to use AKEL as an actor that could counterbalance the influence of the Orthodox Church. Finally, the British also wanted to prevent AKEL's cooperation with the Soviet Union during the war.<sup>421</sup>

---

<sup>419</sup>Ibid, p. 23.

<sup>420</sup>Ibid, p. 10.

<sup>421</sup>Ibid, pp.12-20.

AKEL as a political organization, different from the right-wing *enosis* supporters, was mostly concerned about the re-payment of the tax revenues received by Cyprus to the inhabitants of the island and more democratic rights for Cypriots. To realize these goals, during the war they organized various riots and protests against the British administration and demanded the solution of problems such as unemployment and economic crisis.

Turkish Cypriots on the other hand, were now defining themselves as Turks and they were feeling strong attachments to Republic of Turkey. Turkish Cypriots, enjoying the relaxation of emergency measures, celebrated in 1942 the anniversaries of the foundation of the first Turkish Grand National Assembly on 23 April 1920 and the establishment of the Republic of Turkey on 29 October 1923. They also sent loyalty messages to the Turkish Prime Minister and collected money for the Turkish army.<sup>422</sup>

The Greek government authorities were pressuring British Prime Minister Anthony Eden to make an announcement about the transferring the island's possession to Greece in 1941. British authorities however, were insisting that there was nothing to be announced yet, even if they were not quite sure about the future status of the island themselves.<sup>423</sup> The Turkish Cypriots, disturbed from these outside developments, started to be organized politically in this era. In 1943 *Kıbrıs Adası Türk Azınlığı Kurumu* (KATAK- Association of the Turkish Minority of the Island of Cyprus) was formed in order to protect the interests of the Turkish Cypriots. However, when the members of KATAK fell into dispute among themselves, Dr. Fazıl Küçük, the leader of KATAK, formed *Kıbrıs Türk Milli*

---

<sup>422</sup>Ibid, pp. 11-12.

<sup>423</sup>Ibid, p.12.

*Halk Partisi* (KTMHP - Cyprus Turkish National People's Party) in 1944.<sup>424</sup> Along with the emerging political organizations in the island, the Turkish Cypriots who had migrated to Turkey also started to form political organizations in the cities that they live in, in order to support the Turkish Cypriot movement in the island.

In the post-war period, when the United States of America (USA) emerged as a powerful actor in the world arena and its interests in the Middle East started to clash with those of Britain, British strategy in the Mediterranean region went through a fundamental change, so as their internal policy in Cyprus.

The British colonial administration started to adopt strong measures on AKEL, in order to prevent the possible future connection of the party with the Soviets. The party, along with and the *Pankypria Ergatiki Omospondia* (PEO- Pancyprian Federation of Labour) underwent an investigation: both were found guilty for attempting to destroy the existing regime and to establish a socialist regime. On 21 January 1946, the verdict was announced: twelve out of eighteen AKEL members were sentenced to eighteen months, whereas the rest were sentenced for a year. However, even this suppressive attempt of the British administration could not prevent the AKEL and the PEO coalition to win the municipal elections of Nicosia in 1947.

After the decolonization of India in 1946, British position in the Middle East was threatened with the anti-colonial movements as well. Thus the new British governor, Lord Reginald Fletcher Winster, who arrived at the island on 27 March 1947, wanted to implement major reforms in the island in order to stop the anti-colonial unrest, but his reformist ideas were not welcomed by the Greek Cypriots.

---

<sup>424</sup>Ibid, p. 15.

Although Lord Winster wanted to adopt these reforms immediately, due to the massive protests against him, he preferred to form the new Legislative Council right after the Archbishopric elections. After the elections, Leontios (who was the *Locum Tenens* since 1931) became the new Archbishop with the support of AKEL.<sup>425</sup> Leontios tried to re-organize the administration of the Orthodox Church without any influence coming from either the conservative members of the Church or AKEL. However, he died soon after the elections, and Myriantheus, the Bishop of Kyrenia who was exiled after the 1931 riots, became the new *Locum Tenens*. In the 1941 Archbishopric elections, Myriantheus became the Archbishop and took the name Makarios III who pledged that he would not rest until *enosis* was achieved, during his inauguration speech. Makarios III aimed to paralyze the British system in the island, when the new Legislative Council was formed on 1 November 1947, while preventing the participation from the right wing members. The new assembly was composed of eighteen members, two members were appointed by the British authorities, seven left wing members out of Greek Cypriots, seven Turks and one Maronite.<sup>426</sup>

The leftist Greek Cypriot members of the assembly, on the other hand, demanded self-governance from the governor in the first meeting of the assembly. AKEL also sent a memorandum to British Minister of Colonies Arthur Creech Jones, demanding the enforcement of the same procedure of decolonization through the right of self-determination, applied in Malta and Ceylon. However, as they could not get a reply from the British, AKEL members decided to form a committee that would visit London and demand self-determination. Although the visit was

---

<sup>425</sup>Stefanidis, I. D. (1999). *Isle of Discord: Nationalism, Imperialism and the Making of the Cyprus Problem*. London: C Hurst & Co Publishers, p. 2.

<sup>426</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Koloniyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika Vol II*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, p. 61.

realized, it was not efficient, since they were only able to have a short informal meeting with the minister.<sup>427</sup>

The opposition in the island against the British rule, especially among the Greek Cypriots, was becoming more visible. Lord Winster eventually decided that he could not realize his reforms with the help of the Legislative Council. In May 1948, the British administration unilaterally published a document regarding the reforms in which they proposed a new constitution. According to this constitution, all male Cypriots who had British citizenship over the age of 21 was granted the right to vote; the seats in the Legislative Council were arranged accordingly to the population rate<sup>428</sup> (which meant granting the majority of the seats to the Greek Cypriots); the executive power was divided between the governor and the executive council (however the majority of the members of the executive council were still appointed by the governor); and all citizens within the frame of “commonwealth status” were granted the right to freedom of speech.

However, the new constitution gave the decision-making authority in the fields of defense, foreign relations and minority rights to the governor, as well as the right to enforce the laws in order to maintain the principles of public order, justice and good governance. The newly proposed constitution was accepted by the Turkish Cypriot members of the consultative assembly, but rejected by the Greek Cypriot members under the influence of the Church, since the proposal would not

---

<sup>427</sup>Ibid, p. 62.

<sup>428</sup>According to the 1946 Census, the population of Cyprus was composed of 361.199 Greek Cypriots and 80.548 Turkish Cypriots. For further information, see: *Advisory Council Cyprus, The Census of Population 1946: Sessional Paper*. (1947). Nicosia: Cyprus Government Printing Office, p. 5.

contribute to the realization of *enosis*.<sup>429</sup> Therefore, the draft of the new constitution was rejected in the Legislative Council on 20 May 1948. The Greek Cypriot leftist members declared that they were against the constitution and left the assembly. It was now impossible to reach a decision in the assembly with the remaining members.<sup>430</sup>

The Greek Christian right wing groups, who were not present in the assembly, also announced that they were against the constitution. Lord Winster had to annul the Legislative Council on 12 August 1948, and in a speech that he made afterwards, he stated that there would be no change in the status of the island in the future, however it would be possible to discuss the new draft version of the constitution with the group leaders who would be willing to do so in the future.<sup>431</sup>

The Church saw this development as a victory both against the colonial administration and AKEL. In the latter months of 1948, Cyprus witnessed many protest against the British administration, and great number of Greek Cypriots migrated from the island.<sup>432</sup> AKEL prepared a total 250 days of strikes throughout the year; however the strikes were not successful. The failure in the strikes decreased the influence of both AKEL and the PEO. The Church was becoming much more influential. The rivalry between AKEL and the Church resurfaced. On 13 December 1948, Makarios III announced that people with communist

---

<sup>429</sup>Hatzivassiliou, E. (2006) "British Strategic Priorities and the Cyprus Question, 1954-1958." In Faustmann, H. and Peristianis, N. (Eds.) *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism, 1878-2006*. Möhnesse: Bibliopolis, p. 46.

<sup>430</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Koloniyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, p. 62.

<sup>431</sup>Ibid, p. 63.

<sup>432</sup>There were 2,238 people in the island who migrated from Cyprus. For further information, see: *Colonial Office Report on Cyprus for the Year 1949*. (1950). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 9.

tendencies would not be allowed to vote in the elections by the Church. Consequently, as a result of the municipal elections of 1948, the Cypriot right wing candidate could win eleven out of fifteen municipalities. That was a big failure on the part of AKEL.<sup>433</sup>

There were some developments in the area of education as well. The language of instruction in the island was still Greek and Turkish for the respective communities and Greek and Turkish curricula were taught at the schools in order to enable the entrance of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot students to universities in Greece and Turkey. This practice, more specifically the history curricula, created a strong sense of trust among the Greek and Turkish Cypriots towards Greece and Turkey. Both Greek and Turkish official history books were mainly about the heroic nature of the Greeks and Turks who could not be ruled under other nations, resulting in Greek and Turkish Cypriots turning their faces respectively to their own mainlands, when they needed help.<sup>434</sup>

One such incident took place when the Turkish Cypriot leader Dr. Küçük came to Ankara and openly demanded help from Turkey in 1945 about the future of the island. Although Cyprus was considered as an important issue by the Turkish public, and there had been mass protests in Turkey in 1948 for solving the Cyprus problem, the Turkish officials were not willing to be involved in the issue. Dr. Küçük's attempt to get the support of Turkey failed, when Turkish Foreign Minister Necmettin Sadak declared that "there was no Cyprus issue" in a speech on 17 December 1949. Sadak also stated that Turkish state believed that Britain

---

<sup>433</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Koloniyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, p. 65.

<sup>434</sup>Ibid, pp. 65-66.

would not leave the island.<sup>435</sup> After the 1950 elections in Turkey, the new Turkish Foreign Minister Mehmet Fuad Köprülü also made a similar statement on 20 June 1950, when he stated that Turkey did not have the issue of Cyprus on its agenda. It was obvious that Turkey's stand was clear on the issue: the problems in the island were perceived to be part of domestic politics and/or an internal issue of Britain.

Turkish Cypriots felt that they were left all alone, and without much support coming from Turkey, they initiated an attempt on 8 September 1949 with which all Turkish Cypriot political organizations were united under the *Kıbrıs Türk Kurumları Federasyonu* (Cyprus Turkish Associations Federation) in order to realize a more stable and strong opposition.<sup>436</sup>

However, around the same times, the anti-colonial reaction demanding *enosis* was on its peak among the Greek Cypriots, and the Orthodox Church was championing the Greek Cypriot will. In November 1949, one of the Greek parliamentarians, Georgios Kassimatis stated in a speech that he made at the European Council that there was a need for organizing a plebiscite on self-determination in Cyprus for the solution of this national cause. After the speech, AKEL started to plan the plebiscite in order to find out more about the general tendencies of both of the Cypriot communities, also taking the support of the Orthodox Church. The aim of AKEL for organizing the plebiscite was to draw international attention to Cyprus so that the island would get the right of self-determination. However the Church rejected their proposal of cooperation and organized a separate plebiscite under the supervision of clergy.<sup>437</sup>

---

<sup>435</sup>Albayrak, M. (2000). "Türkiye'nin Kıbrıs Politikaları (1950-1960)." *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, 46(16), p. 250.

<sup>436</sup>Kızılyürek, N. (2002). *Milliyetçilik Kıskaçında Kıbrıs*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 243.

<sup>437</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Kolonyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, p. 65.

On 12 December 1949 Turkish Cypriots organized a mass demonstration in which thousands of people protested against *enosis* and the plebiscite, but the protest could not stop the process initiated by the Greek Cypriots. The plebiscite was held on 15 January 1950. Next year, Archbishop Makarios wrote a letter to United Nations General-Secretary in which he sent the results of the plebiscite, claiming that 80 percent of the island's inhabitants were willing to unify with Greece. The letter as well as the demands of the Church totally ignored the will of Turkish Cypriots, resulting in the emergence of doubts and distrust as well as a belief in the impossibility of a creating common political structure where both Turkish and Greek Cypriots can meet among the Turks of the island.<sup>438</sup>

When the case was taken to UN, Britain insisted that the case was an internal issue and did not have any place in the UN agenda, since after the loss of Palestine in 1948 Britain was not willing to lose Cyprus as well. Eventually the demand of the Orthodox Christian Church for self-determination was rejected.<sup>439</sup> Consequently, Archbishop Makarios modified his plans and decided to ask for assistance from Cyprus-born Greek Colonel Georgios Grivas in order to establish a guerilla organization which would create unrest in the island, so that international attention could be taken to the *enosis*.

In 1951, *Ethniki Organosis Kypriou Agoniston* (EOKA- National Organization of Cypriot Fighters) was established and the guerilla operations broke out in April 1955.<sup>440</sup> Soon after EOKA was founded, however, Archbishop Makarios lost

---

<sup>438</sup>Ibid, p. 68.

<sup>439</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. 27-28.

<sup>440</sup>*Cyprus Report for 1955*. (1956). Colonial Office, Nicosia: Cyprus Government Printing Office, p. 58.

the control of the organization, and under the command of Colonel Grivas, EOKA turned into a terrorist organization. Along with its convictions for offences against the state, EOKA started to attack Greek Cypriots who were regarded as “traitors” because they were not supporting the Hellenic national goals, specifically the *enosis*. During this period, the EOKA militants were mostly attacking AKEL supporters, even if they were also supporting the *enosis*. The terrorist campaign came as a complete shock to Britain since “they convinced themselves over the years that the Greek Cypriot population were not capable of armed resistance and had grown accustomed to ignoring their grievances and wishes with comparative impunity.”<sup>441</sup>

Britain lost of possessions in the Suez Canal in 1954, and did not accept any argument from then on about leaving the island to some other county in the region since Cyprus became the one and only asset for securing the British interests in the region. The island started to be considered as an important *place d’armes* once again. Immediately after the withdrawal from the Suez Canal, Britain moved the British general quarters for the Middle East to Cyprus from Alexandria.<sup>442</sup>

However, the activities of EOKA supported by the Church was quite a success. The organization had great influence on the Greek Cypriot community, especially on young people, therefore it was no surprise that in the latter months of 1955 there were several strikes and demonstrations organized by Greek Cypriot secondary school students. British administration after the incidents announced a state of emergency in Cyprus and passed a number of laws. First, with an

---

<sup>441</sup>Newsinger, J. (2002). *British Countersurgency: From Palestine to Northern Ireland*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, p. 85.

<sup>442</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Koloniyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, pp. 27-36.

amendment to the Police Law, an Auxiliary Police Force was created,<sup>443</sup> which enabled the police forces to carry arms and get military assistance to provide internal security.<sup>444</sup> Second, the Detention of Persons Law and the Offensive Weapons (Prohibition) Law were enacted in order to detain any person who was or had been active in any organization responsible for any act of violence to overthrow by force or violence the rule of the Crown.<sup>445</sup> This law also prohibited the carrying of offensive weapons in public places without lawful authority or reasonable excuse.<sup>446</sup> Lastly, Assize Courts and Special Courts<sup>447</sup> were established as an emergency measure to deal with criminal offences arising from political conflicts.<sup>448</sup> By the end of 1955, there were 694 convictions recorded in the Assize Courts<sup>449</sup> and 211 in Special Courts.<sup>450</sup> Most of the offenders were Greek Cypriot secondary school students.

While British administration in the island spending enormous efforts to prevent the spread of the riots, Turkey changed its neutral stand on Cyprus and started to act together with Turkish Cypriots, who were completely terrified due to the developments. Turkey started to out-voice its demand for the return of the

---

<sup>443</sup>*Colonial Office Report on Cyprus for the Year 1955*. (1956). Nicosia: Cyprus Government Printing Office, p. 53.

<sup>444</sup>*Ibid*, p. 58.

<sup>445</sup>*Ibid*, p. 47.

<sup>446</sup>*Ibid*.

<sup>447</sup>*Assize Courts* were established which are headed by judge of a superior court for the most serious cases of offences such as political violence, and additional *Special Courts* for hearing the security or political offenses.

<sup>448</sup>*Colonial Office Report on Cyprus for the Year 1955*. (1956). Nicosia: Cyprus Government Printing Office, p. 55.

<sup>449</sup>*Ibid*, p. 56.

<sup>450</sup>*Ibid*, p. 57.

island to Turkish rule. In August 1955, Turkish Foreign Minister Fatin Rüştü Zorlu mentioned about the need for unification of the island with Turkey openly in a public speech. The Turkish support was welcomed by the Turkish Cypriots who already changed the name of *Kıbrıs Türk Milli Halk Partisi* (KTMHP-Cyprus Turkish National People's Party) to *Kıbrıs Türktür Partisi* (KTP-Cyprus is Turkish Party) for indicating their strong reaction to *enosis*.<sup>451</sup>

By the mid-1950s, *enosis* activism had become increasingly radical, despite the fact that British officials openly rejected the idea of unification of Cyprus with Greece. Relying on the popular demands coming from the Greek Cypriot community, the Church leaders found the opportunity to influence the “reluctant government of Greece first to raise the question of self-determination for Cyprus to the UN General Assembly, and then to acquiesce to a more dynamic course of action that would include violence in order to raise the demand's international profile.”<sup>452</sup>

In September 1955 Turkish Cypriots, disturbed from these demands, established an underground organization called *Volkan* as a counter organization to EOKA. Turkey, on the other hand, was still trying to adopt a semi-neutral position since it was considering the island as British land and favoring the continuation of the British rule there. However, the Turkish stand would change notably, when Greece made an application to the United Nations for the recognition of the right of self-determination for the Cypriot people on 16 August 1954. This change was not expected by Greece, since the ambassador of Turkey in Athens had informed the Greek officials that Turkey was not willing to be a part of the issue. He had also

---

<sup>451</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, pp.70-71.

<sup>452</sup>Grivas, G. (1962). *Guerrilla Warfare and EOKA's Struggle: A Politico-Military Study*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., p. 5.

stated that there would be no negative consequences of the issue on Greek-Turkish relations.<sup>453</sup>

The time period between 1955 and 1960 became significant in the history of Cyprus, due to the emerge of the Greek Cypriot terrorist campaign as well as and counter-reactionary Turkish Cypriot movement. Furthermore, Britain, facing massive unrest in the island, started to look for a solution of the problem which had emerged due to its negligent administrative practices for decades, with the assistance of USA, Greece and Turkey.

In 1955, with the encouragement of Britain, Turkey agreed to participate in a conference organized by the USA and Britain in London about the problem in the island. In the London Conference, held on 29 August 1955, Turkey accepted as one of the parties to the solution of the problem. Britain proposed self-government for Cyprus in the conference which required the “exercise of self-determination by the territory, rather than by its people till sometime in the future,”<sup>454</sup> referring to self-governance.

The reason behind the British proposal of self-government was to retain its position in the island (so in the region), since the decolonization wave that swept Asia and Africa starting with early 1950s, forced Britain to reconsider its existence in the island. British authorities disturbed from the increasing internal disturbances in Cyprus, tried to present plans for progressive constitutional development benefiting all involved parties,<sup>455</sup> however their plans failed when Greece and

---

<sup>453</sup>Sönmezoğlu, F. (1989) “Kıbrıs Sorunu’nda Tarafların Tutum ve Tezleri.” In Çam, E. (Ed.) *Türk Dış Politikasında Sorunlar*. İstanbul: Der Yayınları, p. 96.

<sup>454</sup>Richmond, O. P. (2002). Decolonisation and Post-Independence Causes of Conflict: The Case of Cyprus. *Civil Wars*, 5(3), p. 175.

<sup>455</sup>Ibid, p. 173.

Greek Cypriots insisted on self-determination, which would initially lead to the unification of the island with Greece. Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots, on the other hand, were in favor of the continuation of the British rule. As for Turkey, it was now openly demanding the unification of the island with Turkey.<sup>456</sup> The London conference failed due to the incompatibility of these demands, making the two communities of the island more polarized.

In October 1955, Lord John Harding, who was appointed as the new governor of Cyprus, offered an economic development plan for the island in exchange for abandoning self-determination demands in a meeting with Makarios. His proposal was rejected, and EOKA continued its activities. Soon, a state of emergency was declared in the island. All public meetings and strikes as well as carrying guns were banned. In 1956 Makarios was sent to exile to Seychelles, however this did not prevent the gradually increasing EOKA violence. Britain continued its efforts to reach reconciliation with the Greek Cypriots. In July 1956, Lord Radcliff was appointed as the new High Commissioner of the island responsible from constitutional reforms. He proposed a constitutional change, according to which a more balanced Legislative Council would be established where the Turkish Cypriots would be better represented. As for the independence of the island, it would be postponed to an unknown future. This proposal for a new constitution was rejected by the Greek Cypriots.

Britain, while trying to solve the problem in the island without losing its possession, attempted to retake control of the Suez Canal and attacked Egypt in 1956 together with France and Israel. This act of Britain was simply an effort to gain back its position in the Mediterranean, and an effort to rebuff the claims on Cyprus while restoring its prestige. Cyprus was used as a military base for the first

---

<sup>456</sup>Bölükbaşı, S. (2001). *Barışçıl Çözumsuzlük*. Ankara: İmge Yayınevi, p. 69.

time during this attack in its history. However, the British army suffered from its previous decisions of not building effective bases in the island and Britain faced defeat. The British influence and role in the region changed forever. Britain regressed into a position where it can only exist in the region under the permission of the USA, and could only have a military existence in Cyprus limited only to NATO purposes.<sup>457</sup>

Same year, Greece took the Cyprus case to UN one more time, only to be rejected once again with 1 to 51 votes in UN Council on 17 December 1957.<sup>458</sup> This attempt rigidified the anti-*enotist* position of Turkish Cypriots in the island. In January 1956, Rauf Denktaş became the president of the Cyprus Turkish Associations Federation and organized a protest against *enosis* claims on 27 January. In the demonstration, the British police forces opened fire on the demonstrators, resulting in further violence next day, when Turkish Cypriots attacked back. The British officials were now concerned about another rise of protests and they decided to dissolve both the KATAK and the KTMHP. This ban raised the anti-colonial sentiments among the Turkish Cypriots and various incidents between British forces and Turkish Cypriots occurred. Turkey, now concerned about the new developments, gave an aide memoire to Britain and asked them to take the necessary measures.<sup>459</sup>

EOKA, during this time was also totally committed to their goal of removing the British from the island, and asked the Turkish Cypriots “to stand clear, to refrain

---

<sup>457</sup>Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Koloniyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika Vol. II*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, p. 46.

<sup>458</sup>Bölükbaşı, S. (2001). *Barışçıl Çözumsuzlük*. Ankara: İmge Yayınevi, p. 413.

<sup>459</sup>Denktaş, R. (1982). *The Cyprus Triangle*. Boston: George Allen & Unwin, p. 195.

from opposition, and to avoid any alliance with the British.”<sup>460</sup> However, the Turkish Cypriots were keen on opposing the *enosis* and preferred not to act together with the Greek Cypriots against Britain. The reason behind this choice was twofold. First, the Turkish Cypriot elites were concerned about the risk of experiencing the same cruelty that Muslim minority in Crete and Tyre had faced.<sup>461</sup> Second, they believed that the idea of *enosis* was another type of colonization for them which would abolish their basic human rights and eliminate them physically from the island.<sup>462</sup>

The illiterate Turkish Cypriot population in the villages, too, rejected the Greek Cypriot demand for *enosis* because of economic concerns. The British authorities, after they had established the Auxiliary Police Forces started to employ Turkish Cypriots who were living in the small villages away from the capital. They were paying high wages for the position, consequently, many Turkish Cypriots “started to migrate from the villages to the cities in order to join the police forces while selling their lands and animals, and leaving their shops and small factories behind.”<sup>463</sup> This choice on the part of the Turkish Cypriots to be involved in the Auxiliary Police Forces in order to fight against Greek Cypriots became the main reason of the inter-communal dispute that would emerge soon. The EOKA militants perceived every Cypriot who protested them or arrested them, as the collaborators of the foreign power in their own country acting against their own people. In the case of Turkish Cypriots, they were accused further as being part of

---

<sup>460</sup>Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 30.

<sup>461</sup>Bryant, R. (2004). *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London: I. B. Tauris, p. 2.

<sup>462</sup>Denktaş, R. (1982). *The Cyprus Triangle*. Boston: George Allen& Unwin, p. 196.

<sup>463</sup>Hasgüler, M. (2007). *Kıbrıs'ta Enosis ve Taksim Politikalarının Sonu*. Istanbul: Alfa Yayıncılık, p. 27.

the British police establishment. Soon, inter-communal hostility in the island would dramatically increase.<sup>464</sup>

In January 1957, the murder of a Turkish Cypriot policeman by an EOKA member started a disturbance between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots.<sup>465</sup> The tension and polarization between the two communities gradually increased and became more visible, at least in big cities. On 1 April 1957, Turkish Cypriots under the leadership of Denktaş formed the *Türk Mukavemet Teşkilatı* (TMT- Turkish Resistance Organisation) with the help of Turkey, as a reaction to the continuation of the activities of EOKA.<sup>466</sup> The struggle against the colonizer now turned into an inter-communal dispute and several shootouts occurred between Greek and Turkish Cypriots especially in Nicosia, Larnaca and Famagusta in the coming months.

As of 1958, the island was in a civil war; however, Britain perceived the incidents mostly as a continuation of self determination demands and decolonization.<sup>467</sup> In order to resolve the problem, British authorities decided to adopt some liberal measures. First they allowed Makarios to come back to the island on 28 March 1957,<sup>468</sup> along with 37,917 Greek Cypriots who were migrated to other countries

---

<sup>464</sup>Hasgüler, M. (2007). *Kıbrıs'ta Enosis ve Taksim Politikalarının Sonu*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayıncılık, p. 28.

<sup>465</sup>*Cyprus Report for 1957*. (1958) Colonial Office, Nicosia: Cyprus Government Printing Office, p. 63.

<sup>466</sup>İsmail, S. (1992). *Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti'nin Doğuşu ve Çöküşü ve KKTC'nin Kuruluşu (1960–1983)*. İstanbul; Akdeniz Haber Ajansı Yayınları, p. 12.

<sup>467</sup>Richmond, O. P. (2002). “Decolonisation and Post-Independence Causes of Conflict: The Case of Cyprus.” *Civil Wars*, 5(3), p. 173.

<sup>468</sup>*Colonial Office Report on Cyprus for the Year 1957*. (1958). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 64.

previously.<sup>469</sup> Later, however, the British government progressively resumed some of these regulations. “British Servicemen” (the British civil servants) were no longer ordered to carry weapons off-duty and all restrictions on their movements were lifted.<sup>470</sup> The British governor agreed on lifting these restrictions since various militants were killed during the clashes with British police and military (including one of leading lieutenants of Grivas) and many others were captured along with large amounts of guns by the British security forces operating that year.<sup>471</sup> By the end of February 1957, EOKA activity started to decline, and on 14 March Grivas announced that he was prepared to suspend the operations. However, this announcement was just a tactical step for allowing the militants to have a breathing space, since the terrorist activities would soon be resumed.<sup>472</sup>

By late 1957, Britain came up with another proposal in order to solve the problem which was granting “double right of both Cypriot communities,”<sup>473</sup> which would enable them to be involved politically with Greece and Turkey. In June 1958, British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan made a proposal which suggested the common administration of the island by the Greek and Turkish Cypriots as well as Turkey, Greece and Britain. Greece and Greek Cypriots rejected the proposal, suggesting that this meant the partition of the island. Nevertheless, Britain put the plan on force and after this development Greek and Turkish representatives had to

---

<sup>469</sup>Ibid, p. 15.

<sup>470</sup>Ibid, p. 64.

<sup>471</sup>Ibid, p. 63.

<sup>472</sup>Ibid, p. 64.

<sup>473</sup>Richmond, O. P. (2002). Decolonisation and Post-Independence Causes of Conflict: The Case of Cyprus. *Civil Wars*, 5(3), p. 173.

come together to discuss a common solution for the island with Britain in January 1958.<sup>474</sup>

Around this time, the USA also began to force Turkey and Greece to find a solution that would ease the tensions under the specific conditions of the Cold War.<sup>475</sup> Britain believed that it would be easier to solve this issue with the US help. Second, there was the possible threat of “Greece taking the island and changing all the strategic balances in the region against Turkey.”<sup>476</sup> In addition to these factors, the effects of the growing support of the developing countries for self-determination all over the world, Britain’s new role in global security due to its defeat in the Suez, Greece’s wish to avoid alienating NATO and Turkey, forced Britain to perceive the independence of Cyprus as a possible solution in the island.<sup>477</sup>

In 1959, Britain was convinced to withdraw from Cyprus with the condition of leaving two military bases, Akrotiri and Dhekelia, behind. These military bases were seen as the “spinning victory out of a defeat”<sup>478</sup> for Britain, as it could retain its ability to control the region after the independence of Cyprus. With the influence of USA, Greece and Turkey (as NATO members) also abandoned their

---

<sup>474</sup>*Osmanlı İdaresinde Kıbrıs: Nüfusu, Arazi Dağılımı ve Türk Vakıfları*. (2000). Ankara; Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, p. 31.

<sup>475</sup>Tayfur, F. M. (2002). “Akdeniz’de Bir Adanın Kalın Uçlu Bir Kalemle Yazılmış Hikayesi: Kıbrıs.” In Türel, O. (Ed.) *Akdeniz’de Bir Ada: KKTC’nin Varoluş Öyküsü*. Ankara: İmge Yayınevi, p. 33.

<sup>476</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>477</sup>Richmond, O. P. (2002). “Decolonisation and Post-Independence Causes of Conflict: The Case of Cyprus.” *Civil Wars*, 5(3), p. 173.

<sup>478</sup>Constantinou, C. M. and Richmond, O. P. (2005). “The Long Mile of Empire: Power, Legitimation and the UK Bases in Cyprus.” *Mediterranean Politics*, 10(1), p. 65.

claims of *enosis* and *taksim*. On 5 February 1959, Prime Ministers of Turkey and Greece, Konstantinos Karamanlis and Adnan Menderes, came together in Zurich and after six days of negotiations, they agreed on a new constitution. The Zurich and London Agreements, signed in the Lancaster House in London on 19 February 1959, created an independent republic in the island.

The parties to the agreement were Turkey, Greece, and the United Kingdom on the one hand; and Archbishop Makarios III as the Greek Cypriot community leader and Dr. Küçük as the Turkish Cypriot community leader, on the other. In 1960, the Treaty of Guarantee was signed between the same parties as a pact designed to preserve the territorial independence of the Republic of Cyprus. The constitution provided by the Zürich and London Agreements divided the communities on the basis of their ethnic origin. The Turkish Cypriots were accepted as a minority group and were given rights disproportionate to their size because they were just composing the eighteen percent of the population. According to the constitution, the president had to be a Greek Cypriot elected by the Greek Cypriots, and the vice president had to be a Turkish Cypriot elected by the Turkish Cypriots. The vice president was granted the right of a final veto on fundamental laws passed by the House of Representatives and on decisions of the Council of Ministers, which was composed of ten ministers, three of whom had to be Turkish Cypriots, and be nominated for appointment by the Vice-President. In the House of Representatives, the Turkish Cypriots were elected separately by their own community. The House had no power to modify the constitution. In addition to these primary rules, under the provisions of the treaty, the United Kingdom, Turkey, and Greece were responsible for assisting their communities living in Cyprus in the event of a major clash between the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, or in the cases of *enosis* and *taksim*.

After the first elections held in the island in 1960, Makarios was elected as the first President of the Republic of Cyprus, while Dr. Küçük was elected as the Vice-President. Cyprus became a member of the United Nations same year and in 1961 it became a member of Commonwealth. The establishment of the Republic of Cyprus was seen as an act of Turkey, Greece, Britain and the USA designed to improve their own interests; as such, it was not welcomed by either of the Cypriot communities. Most of the Greek Cypriots perceived the newly established independent republic “as a frustrating delay on the road to *enosis*, while Turkish Cypriots feared that the Greeks would look for any pretext to end Cypriot independence through union with Greece.”<sup>479</sup>

In this chapter, the internal developments in Cyprus under the British rule that led to the creation of antagonistic nationalist ideologies due to the shifting policies of the British administration is given under two headings. The main motivation of the British Empire in acquiring the possession of the island and its perception on both the Ottoman Empire and the situation in the region are given in the first part. In the second part, the 82 years period of British rule in the island is analyzed, with a focus on the British internal policies that are motivated by its imperial foreign policy in the Mediterranean region as well as its effects on the rise of ethno-national identity perceptions of the Cypriot communities. In the Conclusion, the general assessment of the British rule in Cyprus in terms of its impact on the formation of antagonistic national identities between the two major communities of the island that turned into a violent conflict in the late-1950s is given within the theoretical framework introduced in the Introduction.

---

<sup>479</sup>Morag, N. (2004). “Cyprus and the Clash of Greek and Turkish Nationalisms.” *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 10 (4), p. 600.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

This thesis aimed to give an insightful analysis about the developments that led to the shift of different identity consciousnesses of the Greek and Turkish communities in Cyprus as well as the radicalization of these perceptions by putting a special emphasis on the British period in the island. As was explained in the Introduction, this thesis also aimed to elucidate the relevance of the ethno-symbolist theory of nationalism of Anthony D. Smith to the specific case of Cyprus and evaluate the historical developments in line with the main assumptions of this theory.

The relevance of ethno-symbolism above others to elucidate the nation formation and emergence of antagonistic nationalisms in Cyprus lies in the fact that the development of national consciousnesses among both Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities exemplify, what Smith calls, *vertical* route of formation of states.

The long dominance of the Greco-rule in the island prior to the Catholic (English, Knights Templar, Lusignan and Venetian) and the Ottoman rule, including the Roman and the Byzantine Empires, carried the characteristics of both the *early coalescence* and *consolidation* period defined by Smith. This period witnessed the spread of ethnic Greco-culture among the natives of the island, as well as the performance of military exploits and the creation of group sages, saints and heroes, which was associated with the myths of ancestry and liberation of the Greek Cypriots today.

The Catholic rule in the island witnessed the suppression of Orthodox Christianity as well as the establishment of a feudal system where the natives became serfs. The suppression of religion, along with the social and economic hardships, led to the creation of a stronger sense of ‘self’ in religious terms among the natives in this period, which reflects to the *third stage of nation formation* of Smith, since the identity perceptions of the community ossified due to pressure that they experienced both administratively, socially and religiously.

Under the Ottoman rule, however, due to the transformation of the previous system of administration into the *millet system*, the Orthodox Christian natives were emancipated from religious and social suppression. Under the Ottoman rule, the special rights that were granted to the Orthodox Christian community enabled them to preserve their culture; consequently they internalized their identities while co-existing in the island with the new settled Anatolian Muslim community. The Anatolian Muslim settlers, on the other hand, had already achieved the first three stages of nation formation, when they arrived at the island, since the ancestors of the Ottomans, the Turks, migrated from Central Asia to Anatolia five centuries ago, and had been converted to Islam as early as the mid-700s. Their lack of experience in facing a challenge in religious terms along with the effect of Islamic laws that they long lived under was the reason of their identity perceptions.

Nevertheless, it is fair to state that the later decades of the Ottoman rule became the preparatory years for the *fourth stage* of nation formation, that is, nationalism. There existed a degree of hostility among the community elites in the island, due to the establishment of Greece in 1821; and the Greek missionary activities, where Orthodox Christian inhabitants of the island developed a sense of emulation towards the *Megali Idea* was regarded by the Muslim inhabitants as betrayal. However, these sentiments were just limited to the elites of both communities; it is

not possible to claim that same aspirations and considerations existed among the majority of inhabitants.

When the island's possession shifted to Britain in 1878, with the motivation of transforming the island into a *place d'armes* through the implementation of modern administrative practices presenting the island as a model of good governance in the region, due to the inconvenient climate and physical conditions, the plan was first adjourned; then with the occupation of Egypt in 1882, abjured. Subsequently, the British Treasury, mostly due to the insignificance of the island to British imperial interests, neglected to invest in the infrastructure of the island and attempted to re-fund the money that they lent to the Ottoman Empire during the 1856 Crimean War from Cypriots via high taxation.

The only concern of Britain considering the island till the late 1940s was just preventing other nations in the region to conquer it, so that they could cede the island to whomever they thought fitted if a better opportunity in the region would arise. That was the main reason behind the variability of the British administrative policies in the island. The constantly changing policies of Britain concerning the island, which often consisted plans for ceding the island to Greece in exchange of other means in the Mediterranean, created a convenient political space of Cyprus for the manipulation and politicization of the identity perceptions by the indigenous intelligentsia and missionaries from Greece and Turkey. Britain also manipulated this situation from time to time and solidified the nationalist ideologies in the island. The emergence of antagonistic nationalisms in Cyprus, which led to the inter-communal conflict, was therefore the result of all combined characteristics of the British period in Cyprus.

The plans on the implementation of modern administrative practices in the island also failed, just as the plan of transforming the island into a *place d'armes*. Till the

annexation, the British authorities did not want to offend the Ottomans by making significant changes in the island's administration. Thus, while preserving the divisive structure in the island, they attempted to make moderate changes. However, such changes without the removal of the pre-existing system like separating the church and the state, establishing civil structures that legally identified the inhabitants, establishing equitable legal practices, attempts to reform the education system without investment, as well as giving a considerable freedom to political association and print-media about the content of the publications created a confusion among the inhabitants. This confusion established a conducive environment for the rise of nationalist tendencies in the island. After the annexation and in the following periods, even if Britain intended to adopt modern measures fully, it was now too late, since the nationalist movements in the island had already been strengthened and the majority of people of the island wanted a different future for Cyprus.

As was mentioned in the third chapter, the British administrative policy of establishing a secular colonial bureaucracy along with the continuing divisive system created complexity in the island's administration. The new equitable practices were not compatible with the traditional Ottoman system of governance, and they resulted in the emergence of the creation of the negative perceptions by the traditional elites, mainly the Ottoman clergy, about the British Empire, paving the way to nationalist movements.

The impact of both Greek and Turkish intelligentsia in the nation formation processes, even if not in the same time periods of time and with the same motivations, was striking in Cyprus due to this conducive environment enabled by the shifting policies of the British administration. The *vertical* route to nation formation was salient; the Orthodox Christian intelligentsia was already supporting the Greek nationalist movements and was in close contact with the missionaries, and

with the support of the clergy they started to get more influential on the Orthodox Christian masses.

British administration's attempts to reform the education system and defining the legal languages and identities for the two communities of the island were met with mass protests from both community elites. Due to the lack of funds, the British administration had to pass regulations in accordance with the elite demands. The preservation of separate community schools under the local control gradually turned these schools into the main camps of, first Greek and later Turkish nationalisms that can be explained by the historicism of the *vertical* route of Smith. Furthermore, the acceptance of official Greek and Ottoman-later Turkish-languages as the legal languages of the island, as well as the legal identification of the inhabitants as Greeks and Turks, enabled the spread of sense of belonging to Greece and Turkey, enabling the nationalist ideologies to find a space to flourish.

The lack of control on the activities of Greek and Turkish missionaries in the island, primarily due to the neglect and the semi-functioning modern administrative system, became another significant aspect of the British rule. The mass mobilization of both communities, albeit in different times, began under the support of these missionaries by the indigenous intelligentsia. Also, the continuing British calculations of ceding the island to Greece till early 1940s strengthened the nationalist identity perceptions of both communities. All these attempts, even if they would fail, increased the hope among the Greek Cypriots while leading to anxiety and rise of reactionary nationalism among the Turkish Cypriot community.

The anti-colonial reaction among the Greek Cypriots, gained a serious nature towards *enosis*, first in 1931 due to the influence of nationalist ideologies and economic hardship. However, the British authorities could not manage to reduce these tendencies and instead applied suppressive political measures for both of the

communities of the island till the 1940. During this time, the nationalist tendencies in Cyprus strengthened. In 1940, when these measures were relaxed and the close relationship between Greece and Turkey was encouraged by the British authorities under the war conditions, once the war was over, the nationalist aspirations, especially among the Greek Cypriots, resurfaced more strongly. Again the calculation of British authorities to cede the island to Greece was influential in the increase of nationalism.

After the war, the Greek Cypriot community started to look for other ways to emancipate the island from British rule since it seemed impossible to achieve this goal with the opposing Turkish Cypriot and British stands. Starting from late 1940s till the 1950s, both the Greek Cypriots and Greece tried to take the case of de-colonization to UN, which would eventually end up with *enosis*. The Turkish Cypriots, on the other hand, increasingly started to ask for the assistance of Turkey about the issue, and looked for support from the Turkish public. In the mid-1950s, the Greek Cypriots came to realize that it was not possible to draw international attention to the island, since it was considered as a British domestic problem. As a result, they established a guerilla organization, EOKA, in order to put an international pressure on Britain. However, the British authorities were keen on not leaving the island, since Cyprus became the only territory in the Mediterranean belonging to Britain after the de-colonization wave.

EOKA soon turned into a violent terrorist organization attacking both the Greek Cypriots opposing the *enosis* and the British officials. The activities of this organization resulted in the emergence of an inter-ethnic conflict in 1957, when the Turkish Cypriot police-force members were killed in an attack. The outburst of this inter-communal conflict was the result of the completion of the fourth stage of nation formation by both of the communities. The last stage of the nation formation, the nation-state, was highly desired by both communities; eventually

the national identity consciousnesses of the islanders turned into antagonistic ones and Cyprus witnessed a disastrous inter-communal conflict in the latter years of the British rule.

Due to the limited nature of the present thesis the re-occurrence of the inter-communal conflict just after the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus in 1963, followed by a series of inter-communal clashes, which from time to time were supported by outside actors during 1960s till 1974 until the separation of the island into two territorial divisions, could not be analyzed. However, it would be beneficial to use the ethno-symbolist approach on nationalism in future research as this approach showed that the incompleteness of the fifth stage of nation formation led to the emergence of inter-communal dispute.

## REFERENCES

### Archival Sources

*Advisory Council Cyprus, The Census of Population 1946: Sessional Paper.* (1947). Nicosia: Cyprus Government Printing Office.

*British Empire Series Vol. V: General.* (1902). London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Ltd.

*Colonial Office Report on Cyprus for the Year 1949.* (1950). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

*Colonial Office Report on Cyprus for the Year 1955.* (1956). Nicosia: Cyprus Government Printing Office.

*Colonial Office Report on Cyprus for the Year 1957.* (1958). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

*Colonial Reports Annual, Annual Report on the Social and Economic Progress of the People of Cyprus, 1931.* (1932). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

*Colonial Reports Annual, Cyprus Report for 1923.* (1924). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

*Cyprus Report for 1955.* (1956). Colonial Office, Nicosia: Cyprus Government Printing Office.

*Cyprus Report for 1957.* (1958) Colonial Office, Nicosia: Cyprus Government Printing Office.

*Cyprus, Annual Report for the Year 1912-13.* (1913). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

*Cyprus, Annual Report for the Year 1913-14.* (1914). London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

*The Cyprus Blue Book 1932.* (1933). Nicosia: Government Printing Office.

*The Cyprus Gazette for the Year 1925.* (1926). Nicosia: Government Printing Office.

## World-Wide Web Sources

Cyprus Map. *Nations Online*, [cited 24.02.2010]. Available at: [www.nationsonline.org/maps/cyprus\\_map.jpg](http://www.nationsonline.org/maps/cyprus_map.jpg)

Demographical Report 2008. *Statistical Service of the Republic of Cyprus*, [cited 24.02.2010]. Available at: <http://www.mof.gov.cy/mof/cystat/statistics.nsf/All/CBAA25D58105CAF3C225767B00381C70?OpenDocument&sub=1&e=>

Documents Regarding Cyprus Signed and Initialled at Lancaster House, London, February 19, 1959. Kypros-Net Official Website.[Cited 20 April 2010]. Available at: <http://www.kypros.org/Constitution/treaty.htm#1>

KKTC Genel Nüfus ve Konut Sayımı Toplu Sonuçlar, 10 Eylül 2007. *KKTC Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Örgütü*, [cited 24.02.2010]. Available at: <http://nufussayimi.devplan.org/Nufus-nitelikleri-index.html>

Smith, A. D. (1995). *Nations and Their Pasts*, in 24 October 1995 The Warwick Debates on Nations and Nationalism. [Cited 15 February 2010]. Available at: <http://www.members.tripod.com/GellnerPage/Warwick.html>

The Text of the Annan Plan. Hellenic Resources Network Official Website. [Cited 07 April 2010]. Available at: [http://www.hri.org/docs/annan/Annan\\_Plan\\_Text.html](http://www.hri.org/docs/annan/Annan_Plan_Text.html)

The Third Vienna Agreement - August 1975. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cyprus Official Website. [Cited 21 July 2010]. Available at: [http://www.mfa.gov.cy/mfa/mfa2006.nsf/All/0658E5B2F4D1A538C22571D30034D15D/\\$file/August%201975.pdf](http://www.mfa.gov.cy/mfa/mfa2006.nsf/All/0658E5B2F4D1A538C22571D30034D15D/$file/August%201975.pdf)

United Kingdom Commonwealth Secretariat, Official Website. [Cited 20 April 2010]. Available at: <http://www.thecommonwealth.org/YearbookHomeInternal/138423/>

United Nations Security Council Resolution 186 (1964). United Nations Security Council 1102<sup>th</sup> meeting, United Nations Official Website. [Cited 07 April 2010]. Available at: <http://www.un.int/cyprus/scr186.htm>

United Nations Security Council Resolutions 353-354-355-356-357-358-359 (1974). United Nations Official Website. [Cited 07 April 2010]. Available at: <http://www.un.int/cyprus/resolut.htm>

## Literature Sources

- Adanır, F. and Faroqhi, S. (2002). *The Ottomans and the Balkans: a Discussion of Historiography*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers.
- Albayrak, M. (2000). "Türkiye'nin Kıbrıs Politikaları (1950-1960)." *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, 46(16), p. 249-277.
- An, A. (2005). *Forms of Cypriotism in the Turkish Cypriot Community: Obstacles and Necessary Conditions*. Paper presented at Seminar of the New Cyprus Association, Limassol, Republic of Cyprus.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Archibald, F. (1878). "The Fiasco of Cyprus." *Nineteenth Century: A Monthly Review*, 4(20), p. 609-626.
- Atun, A. (2005). *Milat Öncesinden Günümüze Kıbrıs Tarihi Üzerine Belgeler*, Lefkoşa: Samtay Vakfı Yayınları.
- Austin, M. M. (2006). *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baumann, G. (2006). *Çokkültürlülük Bilmecesi: Ulusal, Etnik ve Dinsel Kimlikleri Yeniden Düşünmek*. (Demirakın, I. Trans). Ankara: Dost Yayınevi, (Original work published in 1996).
- Beckingham, C. F. (1957). "The Turks of Cyprus." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 87(2), pp. 165-174.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bölükbaşı, S. (2001). *Barışçıl Çözumsuzlük*. Ankara: İmge Yayınevi.
- Borowiec, A. (2000). *Cyprus: A Troubled Island*. Wesport: Praeger.
- Bowles, T. G. (1896) "The Cyprus Convention." *Fortnightly Review*, 60(359), pp. 626-634.
- Braund, D. (2003). "After Alexander: the Emerge of the Hellenistic World." In Erskine, A. *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. (pp. 323-281). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Breuilly, J. (1994). *Nationalism and the State*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Briant, P. (2002). *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. USA: Einsenbrauns Publications.

- Bryant, R. (2004). *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Caldarola, C. (1982). *Religions and Societies, Asia and the Middle East*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Calotychos, V. (1998). "Interdisciplinary Perspectives: Difference at the Heart of the Cyprus Identity and Its Study." In Calotychos, V. (Ed.) *Cyprus and Its People*. (pp. 1-34). Colorado: Westview Press.
- Camp, G. D. (1980). "Greek-Turkish Conflict over Cyprus." *Political Science Quarterly*. 95(1), Spring, pp. 43-70.
- Carboni, S. (2007). *Venice and the Islamic World: 828-1797*. French Metropolitan Museum of Art: Yale University Press.
- Cavendish, A. (Ed.) (1991) *Cyprus 1878: The Journal of Sir Garnet Wolseley*. Nicosia: Cultural Center of the Cyprus Popular Bank.
- Çevikel, N. (2006). *Kıbrıs: Akdeniz'de Bir Osmanlı Adası (1570-1878)*. İstanbul: 47 Numara Yayıncılık.
- Chrysafi, A. C. (2003). *Who Shall Govern Cyprus - Brussels or Nicosia?* London: Evandia Publishing.
- Clerides, G. (2000). "Impediments to the Solution of the Cyprus Problem." *Seton Hall Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, Summer/Fall, pp. 15-19.
- Cobham, C. D. (1908). *Excerpta Cyprica: Materials for a History of Cyprus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, W. (1994). *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Constantinou, C. M. (2007). "Aporias of Identity: Bicomunalism, Hybridity and the 'Cyprus Problem'." *Cooperation and Conflict: Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association*, 42(3), pp. 247-270.
- Constantinou, C. M. and Richmond, O. P. (2005). "The Long Mile of Empire: Power, Legitimation and the UK Bases in Cyprus." *Mediterranean Politics*, 10(1), pp. 65-84.
- Coufoudakis, V. (1976). "The Dynamics of Political Partition and Division in Multiethnic and Multireligious Societies: The Cyprus Case." In Coufoudakis, V. (Ed.) *Essays on the Cyprus Conflict*. (pp:27-49). New York: Pella Publishing Company.
- Cougland, R. and Mallison, W. (2005). "Enosis, Socio-Cultural Imperialism and Strategy Difficult Bedfellows." *Middle Eastern Studies*. 41, pp. 575- 604.

- Crawshaw, N. (1978). *The Cyprus Revolt: An Account of the Struggle for Union with Greece*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Creasy, E. D. (1961). *History of Ottoman Turks; From the Beginning of Their Empire to the Present Time*. London: Bentley.
- Denktaş, R. (1982). *The Cyprus Triangle*. Boston: George Allen& Unwin.
- Dietzel, I. and Makrides, V. N. (2009). "Ethno-Religious Coexistence and Plurality in Cyprus under British Rule (1878-1960)." *Social Compass*, 56 (1), pp. 69-83.
- Dodd, H. C. (Ed.) (1999). *Cyprus: The Need for New Perspectives*. England: the Eothen Press.
- Eilers, C. (2006). "A Roman East: Protelmy's Settlement to the Death of Augustus." In Erskine, A. *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. (pp. 90-102). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Evre , B. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk Milliyetçiliği: Oluşumu ve Gelişimi*. Lefkoşa: Işık Kitabevi.
- Finley, G. *The History of Greece: From Its Conquest by the Crusaders to Its Conquest by the Turks and of the Empire of Trebizond 1204-1461*. London; William Blackwood and Sons.
- Fisher, F. H. (1878). *Cyprus: Our New Colony and What We Know About It*. London: Georger Routledge and Sons.
- Freeman, M. (1998). "Theories of Ethnicity, Tribalism and Nationalism." In Christie, K. *Ethnic Conflict, Tribal Politics: A Global Perspective*. (pp. 15-34) Great Britain: Curzon Press.
- Gantzel, K. J. and Schwinghammer, T. (2000) *Warfare Since the Second World War*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Gazi, E. (2009). "Revisiting Religion and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Greece." In Beaton, R and Ricks, D. (Eds.) *The Making of Modern Greece: Nationalism, Romanticism, and the Uses of the Past (1797-1896)*. (pp. 05-108). Burlington: Ashgate.
- Gazioğlu, A. (1997) *Kıbrıs Tarihi İngiliz Dönemi (1878-1960)*. Lefkoşa: Kıbrıs Araştırma ve Yayın Merkezi. .
- Gazioğlu, A. C. (1994). *Kıbrıs'ta Türkler, 1570-1878 : 308 Yıllık Türk Dönemine Yeni Bir Bakış*. Lefkoşa: CYREP.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Free Press.
- Gellner, E. (2006). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

- Glover, J. (1997). "Nations, Identity and Conflict." In McKim, R. and McMahan, J. (Eds.) *The Morality of Nationalism*. (pp. 11-30). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goffman, D. (2006). *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe: New Approaches to European History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grivas, G. (1962). *Guerrilla Warfare and EOKA's Struggle: A Politico-Military Study*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Gürel, Ş. S. (1985). *Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Koloniyalizm, Ulusçuluk ve Uluslararası Politika Vol. II*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.
- Guibernau i Berdún, M. M. (2007). *The Identity of Nations*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hackett J., B. D. (1901). *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus: From the Coming of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas to the Commencement of the British Occupation (A.D. 45- A.D. 1878) Together with Some Account of the Latin and Other Churches Existing in the Island*. London: Methuen & Co.
- Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis, M. C. (1987). *Identity Conflict Resolution in Divided Societies: The Case of Cyprus*. PhD Thesis, University Professors Programme, Boston University.
- Hakkı, M. M. (2007). *The Cyprus Issue: A Documentary History, 1878-2007*. London: I.B.Tauris.
- Halaçoğlu, Y. (2001). "Osmanlı Döneminde Kıbrıs'ta İskan Politikası." In Ahmetbeyoğlu, A. ; Afyoncu, E. *Dünden Bugüne Kıbrıs Meselesi*. İstanbul: Tarih ve Tabiat Vakfı Yayınları.
- Hanioğlu, Ş. M. (1995). *The Young Turks in Opposition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hasgüler, M. (2007). *Kıbrıs'ta Enosis ve Taksim Politikalarının Sonu*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayıncılık..
- Hasgüler, M. (2008). "Kıbrıslılık Kimliği: Kıbrıslı Türkler ve Kıbrıslı Rumlardaki Farklılaşma." In Hasgüler, M. (Ed.) *Kıbrıslılık*. (pp. 1-19) İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı.
- Hastings, A. (1999). *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatzivassiliou, E. (2006) "British Strategic Priorities and the Cyprus Question, 1954-1958." In Faustmann, H. and Peristianis, N. (Eds.) *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism, 1878-2006*. ( pp. 199- 201). Möhnesse: Bibliopolis.
- Hill, G. H. (1952). *A History of Cyprus, Vol. I: To The Conquest by Richard Lion Heart*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hill, G. H. (1952). *A History of Cyprus, Vol. II: The Frankish Period, 1192-1432*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, G. H. (1952). *A History of Cyprus, Vol. IV: The Ottoman Province*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (2008). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hogarth, W. D. (1889). "The Present Discontent in Cyprus." *Fortnightly Review*, 46(272), pp. 245-253.
- Holland, R. (1998). *Britain and the Revolt in Cyprus, 1954-1959*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Horowitz, D. L. (1985). *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ichijo, A. and Uzelac, G. (2005). *When is the Nation? Towards an Understanding of Theories of Nationalism*. London: Routledge.
- Imber, C. (2005). *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies, Vol. II*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- İsmail, S. (1992). *Kıbrıs Cumhuriyeti'nin Doğuşu ve Çöküşü ve KKTC'nin Kuruluşu (1960-1983)*. İstanbul; Akdeniz Haber Ajansı Yayınları.
- Jennings, R. C. (1993). *Christians and Muslims in Ottoman Cyprus and the Mediterranean World, 1571-1640*. New York: New York University Press.
- Jones, P. and Pennick, N. (1997). *A History of Pagan Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Katsiaounis, R. (1996). *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus: During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Cyprus Research Center: Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus XXIV..
- Kedourie, E. (1987). *England and the Middle East: The Destruction of the Ottoman Empire 1914-1921*. London: Mansell Publishing..
- Kedourie, E. (1993). *Nationalism*. USA : Blackwell Publishing.
- Kızılyürek, N. (2002). *Milliyetçilik Kıskaçında Kıbrıs*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Kohn, H. (2005). *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origins and Background*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Lake, J.J. (1878). *Ceded Cyprus: Its History, Condition, Products and Prospects*. London: Effingham Wilson, Royal Exchange.
- Larsen, A. R., Robin, D. M. and Levin, C. (2007). *Encyclopedia of Women in the Renaissance: Italy, France, and England*. California: ABC-Clío.
- Lee, D. E. (1931). "A Memorandum Concerning Cyprus, 1878." *The Journal of Modern History*, 3(2), pp. 235-241.

- Luke, H. C. (1921). *Cyprus Under the Turks: 1571-1878*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mahajan, S. (2002). *British Foreign Policy 1874-1914: The Role of India*. New York: Routledge.
- Mallison, W. (2005). *A Modern History of Cyprus*, I. B. Tauris.
- Mango, C. A. (2002). *The Oxford History of Byzantium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Markides, D. (2006). "Cyprus 1878-1925: Ambiguities and Uncertainties." In Faustmann, H. and Peristianis, N. (Eds.) *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism, 1878-2006*. ( pp. 19-33). Möhnesse: Bibliopolis.
- Marshall, P. J. (1996). *The Cambridge Illustrated History of the British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, R. M. (1837). *History of the Possessions of the Honorable East India Company*. London: Whittaker& Co. Ave Maria Lane.
- Mastnak, T. (2002). *Crusading Peace: Christendom, the Muslim World, and Western Political Order*. California: University of California Press.
- Morag, N. (2004). "Cyprus and the Clash of Greek and Turkish Nationalisms." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 10 (4), pp. 595-624.
- Nash, M. (1996). "The Core Elements of Ethnic Thinking." In Hutchinson, J. and Smith, A. D. (Eds.) *Ethnicity*. ( pp. pp. 24-28). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nevzat, A. (2005). *Nationalism Amongst the Turks of Cyprus: The First Wave*, PhD. Thesis, Oulu: Oulu University Press.
- Newsinger, J. (2002). *British Countersurgency: From Palestine to Northern Ireland*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nicolle, D.(2001). *The Crusades*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing.
- Ortaylı, İ. (2006). *Son İmparatorluk Osmanlı*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
- Osmanlı İdaresinde Kıbrıs: Nüfusu, Arazi Dağılımı ve Türk Vakıflar*. (2000). Ankara; Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü.
- Özkuş, A. E. (2005). *Kıbrıs'ın Sosyo-Ekonomik Tarihi: 1726-1750*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Papadakis, Y. (1998). "Greek Cypriot Narratives of History and Collective Identity: Nationalism as a Contested Process." *American Ethnologist*, 25(2), pp. 149-165.
- Papadakis, Y. (2006). "Nicosia After 1960: A River, A Bridge and A Dead Zone." *GMJ: Mediterranean Edition*, 1(1), pp. 1-16.

- Persianis, P. (1996). "The British Colonial Education 'Lending' Policy in Cyprus (1878-1960): An Intriguing Example of An Elusive 'Adapted Education' Policy." *Comparative Education*, 32 (1), pp. 45-68.
- Pollis, A. (1973). "Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus." *Comparative Politics*, 5(4), pp. 575-599.
- Purcell, H. D. (1969). *Cyprus*. New York: Praeger.
- Richmond, O. P. (2002). "Decolonisation and Post-Independence Causes of Conflict: The Case of Cyprus." *Civil Wars*, 5(3), pp. 163-190.
- Riley-Smith, J. (2002). *The Oxford History of the Crusades*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saville, A. R. (1878). *Cyprus*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Setton, K. M. (1984). *The Papacy and the Levant, 1204-1571: The Sixteenth Century Vol. IV*. Pennsylvania: Amer Philosophical Society Press..
- Shils, E. (1957). "Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties." *British Journal of Sociology*, 8, pp. 130-145.
- Smith, A. D. (1989). The Origins of Nations. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 12(3), pp. 340-667
- Smith, A. D. (1991). *National Identity*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Smith, A. D. (1995). *The Formation of National Identity*. In Harris, H. (Ed.) *Identity*. (pp. 129-154) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, A. D. (1998). *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, A. D. (1999) *Myth and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, A. D. (2000). *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Smith, A. D. (2000). Theories of Nationalism: Alternative Models of Nation Formation. In Leifer, M. (2000). *Asian Nationalism*. (pp. 1-20). London: Routledge.
- Smith, A. D. (2004). *The Antiquity of Nations*. Cambridge: Polity Press..
- Solsten, E. (1993). *Cyprus: A Country Study*. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Sönmezoğlu, F. (1989) "Kıbrıs Sorunu'nda Tarafların Tutum ve Tezleri." In Çam, E. (Ed.) *Türk Dış Politikasında Sorunlar*. (pp. 81-144). İstanbul: Der Yayınları.
- Spyridakis, C. (1964). *A Brief history of Cyprus*. Nicosia: Greek Communal Chamber Publications Department.

- Stavridines, Z. (1999). *The Cyprus Conflict: National Identity and Statehood*. Lefkoşa: CYREP.
- Stefanidis, I. D. (1999). *Isle of Discord: Nationalism, Imperialism and the Making of the Cyprus Problem*. London: C Hurst & Co Publishers.
- Tayfur, F. M. (2002). "Akdeniz'de Bir Adanın Kalın Uçlu Bir Kalemle Yazılmış Hikayesi: Kıbrıs." In Türel, O. (Ed.) *Akdeniz'de Bir Ada: KKTC'nin Varoluş Öyküsü*. (pp. 13-51). Ankara: İmge Yayınevi.
- Vamberly, A. (1886). "Russia and England; Batoum and Cyprus." *Fortnightly Review*, 40(237), pp. 372-373.
- Varnava, A. (2009). *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Weber, M. (1922). "Economy and Society." In Roth, G. and Wittich, C. (Eds.) (1978) *Ephraim Fischhof Vol. II*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- West, M. L. (1999). *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- William, R. (1842). *The History of Modern Europe: With an Account of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire; and a view of the Progress of Society, From the Rise of the Modern Kingdoms to the Peace of Paris 1763, in a series of letters from a Nobleman to His Son. Vol. I*. London: Longman, Brown & Co.