5th Biennial Hellenic Observatory PhD Symposium
on Contemporary Greece and Cyprus.
LSE, June 2 & 3, 2011, London

Ellada Evangelou
PhD Candidate – Cyprus University of Technology, Cyprus.

Title: "I beg you, to continue to live for our nation": The politics of nationalism in historical plays in Cyprus and Greece.

My paper proposes a study of historical plays of Greece and Cyprus, more specifically of their relation to the formation of local identity (centering on nationalism). The examined plays were written over a span of 110 years (between 1884 and 1993) and their historical reference is based on characters and historical events from the early Byzantine period of the 6th century, specifically Justinian rule which had characteristics which were both 'classical' and 'medieval' (1994, p.1) . The plays investigated are centered on the historical figures the Byzantine emperors Justinian and Theodora, and General Velisarios, whose turbulent and often scandalous lives are recorded by Prokopius, a rather empathetic historian of the time, although it is believed that "[he] is probably trustworthy in [his] main facts" (1987, 38). What my analysis will focus on is primarily the protagonist in each of these plays, and on a second level his/her relationship to the other characters.
In this examination I will argue that the way the protagonists are portrayed through this time span (late 19th to late 20th century) exemplifies the relationship of cultural production to the emergence of nationalism(s).

Historical drama or history plays were developed from the chronicle play, which was "a dramatic composition, loosely constructed, covering the entire life of a king or hero" (1927), whereas historical theatre is the collection of dramatic works which center on a familiar figure or incident from history, presenting a concentration on shorter periods in the historical figure's life, or even one specific incident. The historical plays examined in this paper are: *Theodora* (*Θεοδώρα)*, by Cleon Ragavis, *The Eagle* or *Justinian and*

Theodora (*Ο Αετός* ή *Ιουστινιανός και Θεοδώρα)*, by Ioannis Karageorgiadis, *Theodora* (*Θεοδώρα)*, by Loukis Akritas and *Velisarios* (*Βελισάριος)*, by Sophocles Sophocleous.

My first examination is of ***Theodora***, a play written by Greek expatriate playwright Cleon Ragavis (Leipzig, 1884), a long and historically scholastic account of the events taking place during the reign of Justinian between 521 (first meeting of Justinian and Theodora) and 548 (death of Empress Theodora), centering on the figure of the Emperor (which is quite inconsistent with the title). The author spends a large part of his introduction to compare Justinian rule to that of the French king Luis XIV. He concludes that "the Hellenic image is revealed as incomparably grander than the Gallic" ("αναδεικνύεται η Ελληνική εικών ασυγκρίτως μεγαλοπρεπεστέρα της Γαλατικής.") (p. iv), since, in addition to military reasons, the superiority of Justinian is based on the fact that he had only one woman, Theodora "who was the soul of this entire story" ("ήτις υπήρξεν η ψυχή πάσης της συγχρόνου αυτής ιστορίας») (p.vi), whereas Luis had many mistresses, proving the superiority of Justinian as an honorable man as well as a good ruler. In commenting on Theodora's presence in the play, theatre theorist Thodoros Hadjipandazis mentions that for large parts of the play Theodora is absent and reappears in the action around the end of the play, which is also the end of her life. In the most part of the play, it is Justinian, his generals, lawmakers, architect and other men who are the protagonists in the play. Hadjipandazis also notes that due to the tiring narration (the play stretches for 240 pages) "the reader has nothing else to do but observe the romantic details in the illustration of the portraits of the leading characters" (2006, p. 350), which enforces their portraits as virtuous and able, but also patriotic. The second play was published in 1913 in Limassol by Ioannis Karageorgiades, an expatriate Cypriot playwright and is entitled *The Eagle* or *Justinian and Theodora.* The historic time of the play is identified as the 6th century. Karageorgiadis states in his introduction that "Justinian's reign admittedly was one of the most famous reigns for the Byzantine state" («η βασιλεία του Ιουστινιανού ομολογουμένως υπήρξε μια των διασημοτέρων δια το Βυζαντινόν κράτος») (p. γ'). The protagonists of the play are the historic characters (Justinian, Theodora, Anthemios and Velisarios) and are all good and noble, in accordance to the romantic ideal encountered in Ragavis' *Theodora*.

Karageorgiadis enforces this romantic ideal by creating a clear distinction between the protagonists, who are inherently good and the enemies (the visible enemies, the Vandals and the invisible enemies, the conspirators of the court), who are inherently bad, in addition to presenting ghosts of great Hellenes of the past and the madness in Velisarios' daughter Eleni, a character quite reminiscent of Shakespeare's Ophelia. In regards to Justinian, the author makes the king into a worthy and essentially good ruler, but the victim of devious people. In Act 3, Scene 1, Justinian visits Velisarios in prison and begs his forgiveness for having put him there, after having accused him of treason: "my God, forgiveness… oh! I have sinned… what a shame! / I have been a victim of vulgar court gossipers" («Θεέ μου, συγχώρεσιν... ω! Ήμαρτον... τι κρίμα ! / Αισχρών κολάκων αυλικών φευ! εγενόμην θύμα.») (p. 31), whereas there are comments repeated by nameless citizens and even XX conspirators that testify to the fact that "the Emperor is benign but quite gullible" ("ο Αυτοκράτωρ αγαθός πλην εύπιστος πολλάκις») (p. 32). In relation to the character of Velisarios, there is also an interesting twist in how he is presented: in his introduction, the playwright mentions the greatness of Velisarios and his victories over many enemies, but also informs the reader that later he had partaken in a conspiracy against Justinian, was imprisoned but released after some time. He goes on to say that "that his eyes had been pulled out, fortunately lacks historical evidence" ("ότι τω είχον εξορύξει τους οφθαλμούς στερείται βάσεως ιστορικής ευτυχώς») (p. β'), as if trying to assure the reader that the worthiness of Velisarios (but mostly the king) was not trampled upon completely and that finally his heroic nature was recognized. This is also evident in the outcome of the play itself, which pronounces Velisarios innocent.

The following play examined is *Theodora*, by Loukis Akritas. The play was published in Cyprus in 1965, in memory of the playwright who had died that same year. In the play the departure from the romantic ideal is quite apparent and it is centered on the figure of Theodora, putting Justinian in an obvious second place in terms of furthering the action. The playwright also presents several secondary fictional characters creating a platform upon which Theodora's major dilemma is built: she must choose between the throne and her maternal instincts, incorporating a Lady Macbeth-like de-genderized quality into the character of the Empress. Akritas obviously does not hesitate to place upon

Justinian attributes that essentially harm his image as omnipotent Emperor, in order to stress the power of Theodora. In their communication, Theodora is called upon to support the nervous Justinian who exclaims that "you are in front of the storm, to soothe my agony, my kind and brave companion" ("μες τη μπόρα θα βρεθείς μπροστά, την αγωνία που έχω θα γαληνέψεις, καλή μου και γενναία συντρόφισσα!") (p. 28). In the same spirit of departing from the romantic character profile, the playwright also attributes to the evil character of Ioannis Kappadokis (a ruthless conniving conspirator of the court) humanizing qualities, such as his love for his daughter Evfimia, although at some point he does not hesitate to use her as a pawn in his plans. The only place where the "star-crossed lovers" are present (thus providing traces of the romantic model) is in the unfulfilled love of Evfimia with Theodora's lost son Ioannis.

The last play is entitled *Velisarios* and was published in 1993 by Cypriot author Sophocles Sophocleous. In agreement with the title, it makes General Velisarios into the absolute virtuous and competent hero, whereas Justinian is completely demystified and portrayed as a weak and insecure ruler, who is tormented by jealousy and inferiority towards Velisarios, while at the same time wishes he had the freedom to become a monk. Theodora is portrayed as wise and level-headed, one of the reasons that Justinian does not lose control of the Empire and the threatening crowds. This however, carries a personal cost for her since she has become rigid. She admits to Velisarios "No one has seen me cry before, general, and nor will they again. It is the tears that take the woman out of me" ("Δε με ξαναείδε ανθρώπου μάτι να κλαίω, στρατηγέ, και ούτε θα με ξαναδεί. Είναι το δάκρυ που αφαιρεί από μέσα μου τη γυναίκα") (p. 125). The stage directions dictate that "with one movement, Velisarios wipes away a tear that is rolling down her cheek" ("ο Βελισάριος με μια κίνηση σκουπίζει με το χέρι του ένα δάκρυ της που κυλά») (p. 125). The romantic ideal is identified sporadically in the relationship between Theodora and Velisarios, an unfulfilled love which is sacrificed for the sake of the people. The culmination lies in the last scene of the play where Theodora announces to him that "we have distracted each other away from our principles and duties… our paths must part" ("Ο ένας παρέσυρε τον άλλο ενάντια στις αρχές και το καθήκον του... Πρέπει να χωρίσουν οι δρόμοι μας» (p.126)).

This shift in the power and virtue of the characters from Justinian to originally secondary characters (such as Theodora or Velisarios) is a striking change in the evolution of the focus of the plays. Although it cannot be negated that (as Annita P. Panaretou notes) "the writers [from 1821 onwards] envisaged Byzantium as part of Greek continuity and identity" (1987, p. 63), which became part of the official rhetoric thanks to Paparrigopoulos and his generation of historiographers, there is an interesting shift to be observed in these plays. The idea of building a nation around a perfect leader becomes the center of Ragavis and Karageorgiadis, whereas in the latter two plays the ruler is doubted and disputed, and new power figures are placed on the pedestal. In the plays by Akritas and Sophocleous, the nation is built not around the person, but around the idea of Hellenism. How this comes to be is indeed an interesting question, and one I shall attempt to answer in my analysis.

Therefore we first examine the two plays which express national narratives through the virtues of the ruler Justinian, who is the quintessential omnipotent ruler, and whose occasional faults are justified and sanctified. Niederhauser notes that "as the national literatures developed, it was romanticism which offered models and methods" (1973, p. 350), and indeed the plays by Ragavis and Karageorgiadis note their close connections to the nation through consistent use of Romantic narrative models. Although the era of European and Greek Romanticism expired –according to Demaras- in 1880, the plays examined here use romantic features that we can identify in the French Romantic model (1982, p. 142) and are in line with the writings of Greek playwrights such as Alexandros Rizos Ragavis (Cleon's father) and Ioannis Zambelios. Moreover, both playwrights examined are expatriates, giving them access both to the theory and the works produced within the European movement. From their introductions, both authors contextualize their work clearly. Ragavis notes that his play has national significance due to its subject matter ("ως εκ του θέματος ο πραγματεύεται, κέκτηται σημασίαν τινά εθνικήν» p. vi). Karageorgiadis in his introduction refers to the "Byzantine state" («Βυζαντινόν κράτος»). Additionally, it's important to note when these first two plays were written and what where the historic events of that time: Greece in the 1880s was a new country under the rule of King George and in the process of broadening its borders (in line with the 'Megali Idea' political line). Cyprus on the other hand was under the rule

of the British Empire since 1878 (but was annexed only in 1914) and the idea of Enosis with Greece had started to spread among the Christian population of the island. The plays exemplify the romantic ideal of the strong ruler that would take the nation towards the path of salvation, without any doubt in regards to the benevolence of his rule. In my view, the development of the romantic ideal in this late time is directly connected to the late development of a national consciousness, especially for Cyprus.

On the other hand, the plays by Akritas and Sophocleous portray a different type of emerging nationalism. As we revisit the conditions in which they were written and published, we see that by 1965 (when Arkitas' *Theodora* is published) the Republic of Cyprus has been declared in 1960 and there takes place a demystification of the ideal of Enosis and of the Ethnos, and the inclusion of Cyprus as a part of it. In Akritas' *Theodora*, but even more in Sophocleous *Velisarios*, we observe the –almost complete- abandonment of the Romanic model, mainly through the intense disillusionment in the figure of the leader (as shown in their attitude towards Justinian), a tendency to reward the true hero and an openness to secondary figures to become agents of power (lower class men and women). Sophocleous notes in his introduction that his aim in writing the play is not to teach history, but to "touch upon the concept of duty" («δεν είχα σκοπό να εξιστορήσω γεγονότα (...) αλλά ν'αγγίξω την έννοια του καθήκοντος» (1993, p. ν)). He goes on to add that "lords come and go, but the homeland, our homeland, our descendants, and the descendants of our descendants, will always be" («οι άρχοντες του τόπου έρχονται και παρέρχονται, όμως η πατρίδα, η δική μας, των απογόνων μας και των απογόνων των απογόνων μας, θα υπάρχει πάντα» (1993, p.vi)), which on the one hand maintains the historic continuum of Hellenism, but on the other hand point us to the direction of observing the emergence of a nationalism centered on the Idea.

In conclusion, allow me to note that the language necessary to describe the phenomenon of shifting nationalisms is provided primarily by Eric Hobsbawm. In examining the monarch-centric basis of the first two plays, historian Edward Hallett Carr says that "the new national unit was identified with the person of the monarch" in what he tags as the "early modern epoch" in terms of the development of nationalism (1996, p. 183). Following this, we notice elements in the post-1960 plays recognizable within

the nationalism described by Hobsbawm when he mentions the transformations of nationalism in Europe in 1880-1914. This new nationalism has as an essential basis, ethnicity: within the plays, the greatest importance is given to the feeling of being a Hellene, rather to living in the Hellenic space. This feeling is what is projected in the more recent plays by Akritas and Sophocleous, exemplifying the shift between the two emerging nationalisms on the island.

Works Cited

Akrita, Louki. Θεοδώρα: Τραγωδία. Nicosia: Kipriaka Grammata Publication, 1965.

Balakrishnan, Gopal (Ed.). Mapping the Nation. London: Verso, 1996.

Bellinger, Martha Fletcher. A Short History of the Theatre. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1927.

Browning, Robert. Justinian and Theodora. London: Thames and Hudson, 1987.

Demaras, K.T. Νεοελληνικός Ρωμαντισμός (3rd edition). Εκδοτική Ερμής ΕΠΕ: Αθήνα, 1982.

Hadjipandazis, Thodoros . Το Ελληνικό Ιστορικό Δράμα από το 19ο στον 20ό αιώνα. Crete Univ. Press: Heraclio, 2006.

Hobsbawm, Eric. Nations and Nationalism since 1780: programme, myth, reality. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press, 1992

Karageorgiadou, Ioannou I. Ο Αετός ή Ιουστινιανός και Θεοδώρα: Δράμα εις πράξεις τέσσερας. Limassol: 1913.

Moorhead, John. Justinian. NY/London: Longman, 1994.

Niederhauser, Emil. "Literature and the Arts in the Movements of National Revival amongst the Peoples of Eastern Europe in the first half of the Nineteenth Century". European Studies Review, 3, No. 4 (1973). p. 350.

Panaretou, Annita. Το Βυζάντιο στη Νεοελληνική Λογοτεχνία. Athens : Domos Publications, 1987.

Ragavis, Cleon. Θεοδώρα: Ποίημα Δραματικόν εις Μέρη Πέντε. Leipzig: 1884.

Sophocleous, Sophocles. Βελισάριος: Βυζαντινό Δράμα σε τέσσερεις πράξεις. Λεμεσός: 1993.

LSE Symposium- Abstract

Antigone Heraclidou
PhD student
Institute of Commonwealth Studies, School of Advance Study, University of London

The politics of teachers' training in Cyprus, 1923-1960

In an island which since the beginning of the British administration had been trying to prove its Greek identity and aspiring to union with Greece, educational matters were inevitably influenced by political developments and were in the core of Anglo-Cypriot relations. Teachers were considered by Greek Cypriots indispensable in safeguarding and promoting national aspirations, more particularly, enosis. Therefore when through the introduction of a series of educational laws, starting in 1923, the appointments, promotions and dismissals of teachers became Government's responsibility, Greek Cypriot reaction was severe. The Education Law of 1929 is considered one of those decisions which triggered the uprising of 1931. After the uprising, aiming to introduce a British atmosphere in the island in order to curtail enosis, the Government put under its control the training of the teachers, a control hitherto enjoyed exercised by School Committees appointed within the respective communities. Two years after the education law of 1935 which gave the Government the right to decide the school curriculum, the Teachers Training College at Morphou was established.

The Morphou College, and to a lesser extent the establishment of the Mistresses Training College in 1947, became a constant bone of controversy between Greek Cypriot politicians and educationalists and the Government. The College was criticised for promoting Anglicisation and was condemned for its bi-communal character and its teaching methods, and especially its use of the English language as the medium of instruction. In addition, its establishment led to the closing down of the Greek teachers' training schools which, although educationally inadequate, were the major promoters of Greek civilisation and ideals. After the Second World War, when enosis agitation grew stronger, the issue of the training of teachers brought a still more severe rupture between Greek Cypriot educationalists and the Government. It also strained the relations between the Government and the Church. The latter had since 1923 been constantly losing its power over the education of Greek Cypriots. In the post war period while Britain was promoting constitutional changes and development programmes in Cyprus, Greek Cypriot attachment to the ideal of union did not weaken, and even became more vocal as political controversy became more acute. Against this backdrop, political and educational issues had become interwoven. The major opponents of Government's educational policy were the most ardent supporters of enosis. Despite the reactions of the press, Greek politicians, and the Church both colleges were continuously extended and they did not cease to function until 1958. Government's persistence in pressing forward its educational policy and the popularity of this approach among teachers who realised that now were financially secured and adequately trained, led to the survival of the colleges. After all, Government colleges were educationally more advanced than previous institutions concerned with pedagogical training in the island.

This presentation will examine the measures the Government took to bring elementary, and much later, secondary school teachers under its control, and will explore the rationale behind these measures.

Summary

During the first 40 years of the British administration, from 1878 until 1920, the administration of the education system was left, to the local communities and religious authorities. Both communities followed largely in theory and practice the respective Hellenic and Ottoman systems of education with roughly a third of the teachers coming from Greece. Gradually, education in general, and teachers' training in particular, was increasingly subjected to local and international developments affecting the island until the end of the British administration.

Aiming to address teachers' complaints concerning transfers and dismissals from employment and of low salaries, Governor Storrs drafted in 1923 a new educational law. Hitherto teachers were expected by the local politicians and the clergy not only to support the cause of union with Greece but also to propagate this policy in their speeches in the villages to which they were appointed. The law gave the Government the right to decide on teachers' transfers, promotions and dismissals on the recommendations of the Board of Education. Despite reactions coming from Greek Cypriot politicians, the Church and the press, the law was eventually enacted. Whatever their own views on *enosis*, the majority of teachers resented being tools in the hands of the politicians and wanted to see a sharper focus on the practical improvement of their working conditions. The Elementary Education law of 1923 was a major blow to the Greek Cypriot politicians and the senior schools teachers as well as a setback for the Greek Orthodox Church. It also opened the way to the centralization of education, with the British doing the dictating.

In early 1925 Cyprus was proclaimed a Crown Colony. Accordingly, a Greek-Cypriot petition to the new Government in Britain during 1929 met an emphatically negative response and triggered strong Greek Cypriot protests. However, although the desire for enosis was shared by the majority of the teachers, 622 still subscribed to a petition to the Government asking that their salaries should be increased and teachers to be incorporated within the civil service Therefore, the 1929 elementary education law made the Governor responsible for the appointment of the teachers with salaries graded by seniority. However, the Boards of Education would retain their right to prescribe the curriculum and choose the textbooks. The 1929 law was one of the reasons that led to the uprising of 1931 because it undermined the role of the communities on the one hand and aggravated tax burdens on the other.

The 1931 disturbances, however spontaneous, nevertheless marked a serious turn in the administration of the island towards a stern repressive policy. The fundamental aim therefore was the eradication of the enosis movement. Therefore the Elementary Educational Law of 1935 provided for the Governor to be the central authority for all matters relating to elementary education in the Colony. This meant that the Government had the power to decide for the status l of teachers, the books to be used in schools, the books and the curriculum. The Colonial Office agreed that should the Cyprus Government want to eliminate enosis propaganda in the schools and strengthen its position in the island, it was imperative to assume complete control over education and it gave the green light to this end.[1]

The additional fact that due to the lack of post-secondary educational facilities in Cyprus, anybody interested in entering the teaching profession had to continue their education in Greece or Turkey only confirmed the need for government control over post-secondary education. Accordingly, a proposal for establishing a Training Centre for Elementary School Teachers was dealt with as a priority.[2] Since the riots, the Government had been highly concerned about the training of the elementary teachers whom they considered as one of the most active agitators. If you got the teachers right, the desired sort of schooling would follow, rather than the other way round.

[1] CO 67/246/12, Minutes 22.3.32-5.12.32
[2] CO 67/255/8, Palmer to Allen, 25.1.34

Hitherto, Greek-Orthodox teachers had received their training in the Pankyprion Didaskaleion attached to the Nicosia Gymnasium while Moslem teachers received no formal training at all. Nicosia Gymnasium was under the management of the Nicosia Town School Committee. Schoolmistresses attended training classes organised by Phaneromeni High School in Nicosia until 1937 when the school closed due to lack of funds. The training in these institutions was inadequate not least because it had no link with agricultural science, despite the fact that 80% of the children attending school came from rural areas. According to the official proposals, the new Agricultural Training College, to be run by an English principal, would be a denominational boarding establishment and fees charged to cover boarding costs. The courses were to be of two years' duration and include not only the subjects of the elementary school curriculum and teaching theory and practice but also practical agriculture supervised by the Agricultural Department. Candidates were not to exceed fifty in number every year and were to be selected by examination and interview.[3] It was decided that the College should probably start admitting students in 1937 and to this aim, two teachers, one of each community, were to be sent to England for training in order to form its core staff on their return. Also, since English was to be the language of instruction the students applying for admission at the Training College at Morphou had to pass the Government Ordinary Examination. Therefore, by the end of the decade, the Cyprus Government and Colonial Office had together made some progress towards their aim of introducing a 'British atmosphere' in Cyprus, and side-lining enosis as a movement, if not eradicating the enosis idea itself. The measure of their success was that what everybody recognized was an essentially repressive system nonetheless managed to secure enough local consent and co-operation to operate with some degree of effectiveness.

In 1940 the Director of Education, James Cullen, presented the Cyprus Government Treasury with a rough plan for future educational projects. A key priority was the establishment of a Mistresses' Training College by September of 1941. To meet the immediate need the British Council paid for the extended training in England of two Greek-Cypriot schoolmistresses, with a view to their playing a key role in a training college. Meanwhile, local girls of British nationality from any recognised secondary school of not less than four grades would pass a qualifying examination and then be appointed as probationary assistants in selected elementary girls' schools for a period of one year. The successful candidates should then go to the Mistresses Training College for professional training of two years, free of charge. It was also proposed that the place normally taken in masters' studies by agriculture should be given in the case of mistresses to the teaching of domestic science, child welfare and home nursing. This would encourage schoolmistresses to "play a more effective part in the village home life".[4] With female education set to grow rapidly in future, it was all the more necessary for their teachers to be educated according to British standards, in order to help, quoting the Colonial Office, "eliminate Greek influence". [5]

A scheme of this character could not but provoke the reaction of the local educational authorities whose control over another vital aspect of their work was in jeopardy. In May 1940 the Town Committee of Greek schools in Nicosia argued that the measures taken by the Education Office would not only fail to promote education but would actually be regressive. On the one hand, this was so because the various secondary schools were all placed on the same footing regardless of their status, type, or the language of instruction. On the other hand, the Committee maintained that attendance for a period of four years (not six) was not satisfactory for future assistant Schoolmasters. Unlike the Education Office, the Committee reckoned that this policy enabled "immature young people, uneducated, ignorant and undeveloped both in mind and character"[6] to end up serving as teachers on probation. In another memorandum, this time to the Governor, the Committee complained against the multilingual, and therefore to some

[3] SA1: 1061/1935/1, Proposed Government Training College for teachers at Morphou-Objects and Advantages, August 1935 (Education Department)
[4] CO 67/310/10 Battershill to MacDonald, 11.10.40, Cullen's memorandum
[5] CO 67/310/10 Colonial Office to Governor, 6.9.40
[6] SA1: 554/1940 Town Committee of Greek schoolteachers in Nicosia to Colonial Secretary, 29.5.40

degree also multiracial, character of both colleges and condemned the fact that instruction was given in English. It therefore asked the re-establishment of Greek training schools for teachers, both men and women, linked up with classical Gymnasiums.[7] However, the Colony's Chief Secretary defended the work of the College and argued that the co-instruction of Orthodox-Christian and Moslem Cypriots was regarded as advantageous in serving to impress upon the students as students a sense of the essential unity, despite differences of language and religion of the Cypriot people" and made clear that the Government had no intention of assisting the re-establishment of the Phaneromeni Training School.[8]

From the beginning of 1940 until the municipal elections of 1943 a series of events increased political activities proving that the "enosis movement was alive and kicking".[9] Greek participation in the war would inevitably raise the prospect of a wave of pro-Hellenic, and by extension, pro enosis feelings in Cyprus.[10] During his visit to London in 1943, the Governor pointed out that "education in Cyprus was bound up with *Enosis* and the question would certainly boil after the war" making it all the more necessary that schooling remained a state responsibility, especially now that the teachers were more content under Government control.[11] Teachers' satisfaction on this matter can be seen as another element of complexity. With educational policies at the heart of the critique exercised to the colonial regime, the Government had in the teachers a source of leverage. Interestingly, as numbers prove, despite reactions coming from political and educational circles, Morphou Training College appeared to have a large appeal among secondary school graduates. Between 1939 and 1945, the number of students rose to 143 from 48 and 20% of them remained for a third year to study Agriculture.[12] The simultaneous rapid increase in the attendance of children made the enlargement of both Training schools desperately necessary. The Schoolmistresses' Training College had started functioning in 1943, with inadequate funds, in the room of a very old Turkish school. By 1947 the College, which had no boarding facilities, was put under the control of the Morphou College and conditions had generally improved, although it was not yet fully equipped and staffed.[13]

On the 23rd of October, 1946, much to Greek Cypriots' discontent, the Secretary of State informed the House of Commons that no change in the status of the island was contemplated by His Majesty's Government. He also pointed out that the British Government had invited the cooperation of the people of Cyprus in the introduction of a more liberal constitution and also announced a Ten Year Development programme.[14] Discontent also found a vent through an increasingly vocal Greek Board of Education. For the Board both the delay in enforcing compulsory education and the development of the Training Colleges at the expense of the old Greek Training Schools were unacceptable. They warned that the abolition of the Greek Teachers' Training Schools would eventually lead to an "intellectual downfall" since the Morphou College could neither satisfy the needs of teachers in quantity nor train good teachers. The Chief Secretary invited the members of the Board to discuss the matters and a full meeting was finally arranged for the 16th of February. There, he countered the accusation that the College's students were illiterate by saying that 65% of its students came from the cream of the Gymnasia and only 35% come from other schools such as the English School and the American Academies. He also rejected as unfounded the allegation that the establishment of the College had lowered the number of students finishing elementary school as in the Pancyprian Gymnasium. During the last nine years since the establishment of the College, the pupils had increased from 600 to 1,600. As to the language of instruction, the argument that the teachers would not be able to master their own language if they were taught in English was to him

[7] ibid
[8] SA1: 554/1940 Colonial Secretary to the President of Committee
[9] CO 67/314/12 Woolley to Parkinson, 17.2.42
[10] Anastasia Yiangou, *Cyprus in World War: Politics and Conflict in the Easter Mediterranean*, London: I.B. Tauris, 2010, p.54
[11] CO 67/311/19 Meeting at the Colonial Office, 10.3.43
[12] Weir, 1952 p.39
[13] Andreas P. Polydorou, *Η ανάπτυξη της δημοτικής εκπαίδευσης στην Κύπρο, 1830-1944 (The Development of Elementary Education in Cyprus, 1830-1944*) Nicosia 1995, p.130
[14] CO 67/352/1 CO to Governor, 7.2.47, CO 537/18787, Extract from official report, 23.11.46

invalid. “The students would need to study the structure of their language and not hear it spoken”, he underlined. He actually pointed out that the level of the Greek examination paper was so high that most of the candidates failed in the first instance. He could not agree with segregating Greeks from Turks since there was no friction between the two and especially since “Greek as a language of instruction would mean a separate institution, a Greek staff and a Greek Principal, in short a Greek College with unlimited opportunities for political propaganda”.[15]

In 1948, the Cyprus Government got a free grant of £80,000 under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act to cover the cost of extending the main buildings of the Teachers’ Training College in Morphou and £100,000 for the development of the Schoolmistresses’ College. This was a significant success for the Government who had managed to safeguard its control over the training of elementary teachers, a measure of great importance for the control of elementary education. This was also made possible due to the improvement of teachers’ financial status. In 1947 when with a new amendment law pensions and retirement age for teachers were brought in line with those of public officers. For the government this was a great leverage over the teaching profession comparing to local politicians and the Church.

In 1958, following a proposal made six years earlier, a new joint college for the training of men and women schoolteachers was established in Nicosia. For the first year both men and women were giving living-out allowances until the residential block of the College was finished. Before final arrangements were made however things changed again. In February 1958, when the EOKA revolt was at its peak the medium of instruction at the College became an acute political problem. The student’s body sent an ultimatum to the Government demanding the immediate change of the medium of instruction in the Greek – Cypriot section of the College and the increase of students’ allowances. When their demands were met the Turkish students were withdrawn to another building in the Turkish sector of Nicosia.[16] In 1959 the Pedagogical Academy was established in Nicosia for the training of Greek Cypriot male and female elementary teachers.

[15] CO 67/332/1 Turnbull to Creech Jones, 24.1.47
[16] P.K. Persianis, Church and State in Cyprus education, Nicosia, 1978, p.214-5

Title:
Political logics and the emergence of the policies of discrimination against the Muslim Minority of Greek Thrace

In this paper tells an untold story, exploring the emergence of a secret project intended to intervene in the power-relations in Greek Thrace, to increase control over minority groups and institutions, and even to alter the ethnic composition of the region. We do that by exploring the archive of a secret institution that operated in Thrace during the 1960's subjected to the Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs. This institution – named the 'Coordination Council of Thrace' - was constituted by high rank political, military, police and intelligence authorities and had the authority to "transfer from the central administration to Thrace, but also to listen and transfer from Thrace to the central administration".[1]

This project this institutions applied, tried for the first time since 1923 in such an organized way to disrupt the expansion of Turkish national discourse among minority members and to shift their identification from a religious-based one to a national Turkish-based one. It also opened a dreadful period in relations between the minority and the Greek state, which was marked by the measures of administrative harassment that characterized Greek policy towards the minority until the 1990s.

The policies that were developed by the Greek administration pointed in two directions at the same time. Within the principle of reciprocity, on the one hand the policies were characterized by efforts to introduce a frontier against the part of the minority that had accepted Turkish national discourse, trying to limit its operation and influence. Therefore, Kemalist teachers were restricted and disciplinary actions against them were increased, signs or teaching material in Turkish were banned, control of "Turkish" unions was increased, areas with a declared Turkish population lost its benefits and by the end, all purchases of land or buildings were banned for the "Turks". These were followed by expropriation or occupation of their lands, restrictions of their economic activity and other measures.

On the other hand, the Greek administration tried to promote alternative subjectivities and increase its links with them, albeit with little success. One of those alternatives was the traditional Islamism that had deep roots among the minority members going right back to the Ottoman past. However, during the 1960s, traditional Islamism was in deep decline so efforts were focused on the "Pomak policy". As a result, for the first time a coherent policy to construct a "Pomak identity" and to separate ethnic Pomaks from the minority was applied. Moreover, Islamic identification was promoted amongst both Turkish and Pomak speakers, treating them as one group, through the support of religion in minority education – for example, by the promotion of the Arabic alphabet, the fostering of graduates from religious schools, the building of mosques and the funding of Islamic unions.

---

[1] Original emphasis. Minister of Foreign Affairs (Averof), Confidential Order D.940-16, Athens 16 May 1962, 'Archive of Foreign and Minority Schools', G.A.K. "Kavala, F.10". In this role, the chair of the CCT had regular contact with the MFA, receiving orders and guidance or giving information. Coordination Council of Thrace, 24th session, 11 June 1962, 'Archive of Foreign and Minority Schools', G.A.K. (Kavala), F.10, p.8.

From all the policies that the Greek administration put forward in the post-war period we see a clear quantitative and qualitative shift in the years after 1965. This was both in the amount of money allocated to the various areas of its intervention and in the areas where its projects were expanded. This shift can be explained by a variety of factors that have to do not only with the development of the hegemonic battle inside Thrace but also with ethnic homogenization processes inside Turkey and Greek-Turkish relations. In the first case, the numerical boost of the minority population in Thrace and the increased influence of the Modernist camp – supported by Turkey - alarmed the Greek authorities, who responded with more exclusionary policies. At the same time, Turkish repressive policies against the Greek-Orthodox minorities were met with the application of counter-measures in Thrace and with debates about the autonomous character of the minority issue in Thrace as one of "national security".

The shift of 1964-66 and the program of land purchasing

The new feature that appears in the secret discourse of the secret council operating in Thrace is the program "of colonization of Thrace and of increasing the Greek element". The project was conceived in the autumn of 1965 and started being applied during the next period. This shift and the conception of the new project came during a period when, on one hand the Turkish government received a series of repressive measures against its Greek-Orthodox minorities, while at the same time a secret census in Thrace showed a considerable increase of the local Muslim population.

Between the summers of 1964 and 1965 in Greek-Orthodox minority schools in Istanbul any distribution of Greek books or the celebration of any religious holidays was forbidden, as was the import of any Greek newspapers. Moreover applications for building a new school were turned down, a number of directors and teachers were fired and the appointment of new teachers who had studied in Greece was stopped. Finally, with the law passed in 1967, the Greek-Orthodox Patriarchate had far less autonomy for managing its religious properties.[2]

These events caused a major disruption in the established order that had been formulated in the four-pole relation between the two states and the two respective minorities. This had major implications for the application of *reciprocity* as the regulatory pattern for the treatment of the minority in Thrace. As the chair of the Council put it in one of the meetings,

> With the reasons that might have justified our tactics up today vanishing – at least in a great extend -, and further due to reasons of national security, there is a need to draw a new line, and this is a decision by the Government.[3]

At the time when the Greek-Orthodox minority in Istanbul was significantly decreasing, a secret census in Thrace revealed that the minority population was increasing so that in some areas (like the region of Rhodope) it constituted more than half the total population. It was this rapid change in the numerical balance between

---

[2] Alexandris, "To Istoriko plaisio", 513-14.

[3] Chairman of the Coordination Council of Thrace (Koukourides), 42nd Session, 4 February 1966, 'Archive of Foreign and Minority Schools', G.A.K. (Kavala), F.10.

the two minorities (upon which the 'principle of reciprocity' was grounded) that gave the inspiration for the program of land purchases begun in the autumn of 1965.[4]

One result of this disruption was that in 1967 the secret Council directed more than half of its significantly increased budget to the "Program of land purchases" while local state services had been secretly receiving financial support for the application of the same program for the previous year. The decisions that were taken in the summer of 1966 - reflecting debates started during the previous year - aimed to "assist the Greek element" of Thrace and to drive the local Muslim population into emigrating from Thrace.

A large amount of money was allocated in the 1967 budget for individuals funded by the state to buy land owned by local Muslims. At the same time the program anticipated that in the new settlements of ethnic Greeks created after purchase, and in mixed villages were Muslims and Christians co-existed, new schools and churches would be built with funds secretly given by the Greek administration. By 1969 the program had been extended to houses for Greek teachers in minority schools and included grants for different kinds of cultural activities and associations, with the anticipation that "Greekness" would be promoted.

The areas of the Pomaks - located in the mountain areas of Xanthi and Rhodope and therefore geographically separated from the rest of the minority areas - were explicitly excluded from this project. At the same time as restrictive policies against the majority of the minority were being developed, a specific "Pomak policy" was formulated for the Pomak areas. The traditional Muslims who were cooperating with the Greek authorities, such as those in the Union of Muslim Teachers, were also excluded from any negative measure and assistance for them was maintained. Therefore, the focus of the program was the vast majority of the minority population who were regarded as 'Turks'.

The main purpose of the program was to reduce the minority population in Thrace by giving them no other option than to emigrate, while increasing the numbers of ethnic Greeks, giving them assistance to take over the economic life of the region and strengthening their patriotism. In other words, the program aimed at 'ethnic cleansing' without the use of violence. The Cyprus conflict and the existence of several thousand Greeks in Istanbul, together with the Greek-Orthodox Patriarchate should be viewed as reasons why the effort to reduce the minority population in Thrace did not use more violent means.

This effort – approved by the Prime Minister and the members of the Cabinet - included administrative measures against minority members, such as long delays in application procedures for buying new property, or for building or repairing houses, etc. At the same time local ethnic Greeks would be given state-funded loans to enable them to purchase properties owned by minority members, since the administrative measures were expected to boost sales. It was expected that these measures would increase the already high rates of emigration by minority members to Turkey or to North Europe and that their numbers in Thrace would thereby be reduced. At the same time, ethnic Greeks would 'mix' the areas with pure minority population and they would be encouraged to dominate the economic and social life of Thrace. The

[4] Coordination Council of Thrace, 41st session, 29 October 1965, 'Archive of Foreign and Minority Schools', G.A.K. (Kavala), F.10. For the decrease of the Greeks in Turkey and the Turkish measures, Aarbakke, *The Muslim Minority*, 103-107 and Alexandris, "To Istoriko plaisio", 511-513.

chairman of the CCT put it clearly when he declared that "Turks will leave when we buy their land by any necessary means".[5]

According to the program, this effort to reduce the minority population would go hand-in-hand with efforts to assist Thracian ethnic Greeks and settlers to develop their areas and dominate the economic life of the region. Therefore, at the same time that bureaucratic obstacles were raised from local ethnic Turks, they were removed for ethnic Greeks. Moreover, investment programs were developed for this reason and professionals such as merchants or shop holders were offered financial assistance to give them an advantage in competition with the local minority members. This would both reduce migration of ethnic Greeks to the countries of northern Europe and force local Muslims to leave Thrace.[6]

In practice, very little of the plan succeeded in achieving its aims, and its application can be broadly regarded as a failure. Despite the problems created during the implementation of the project, its basic features characterized Greek minority policy for Thrace over the coming decades. It could be that efforts to buy land owned by the minority members were soon abandoned, however much land was expropriated in order to build agrarian prisons and university campuses, based on the way the Turkish state expropriated land belonging to the ethnic Greeks in Imvros (Gökçeada) and Tenedos (Bozcada). At the same time all the existing negative practices and obstacles which occurred in any transaction between the local Muslims and the Greek state persisted, and tension continued to increase right up until the 1990s. We further develop these issues in the following chapter.

The emergence of a "logic of Hellenization"

The effort to drive local Muslims to emigration while promoting Christian Greeks signifies the emergence of a new *political logic* in the discourse on minority issues in Thrace. This constituted a 'logic of Hellenization', as while previously the focus of the intervention was to introduce a frontier against minority Turks and disrupt the reproduction of both their identity and influence in minority institutions, the new project introduced a new frontier, one between the Christian Greeks and the minority Turks. This new logic can be characterized as a shift from efforts to 'de-Turkify' the identification of the minority population, to efforts to 'de-Turkify' the geographical space of Thrace.

In other words, while before the emergence of the project of "land purchase", the intervention of the Greek administration in Thrace was focused both on promoting alternative identities - religious or ethnic - and increasing control, the focus afterwards shifted. Intervention now focused on assistance to the Greek Orthodox majority, together with efforts to force the minority Turks to leave Thrace.

Furthermore, this new logic signified the beginning of the abandonment of the battle over the identification of the minority and for influence over minority

---

[5] Chairman of the Coordination Council of Thrace (Koukourides), 51st Session, 27 March 1967, 'Archive of Foreign and Minority Schools', G.A.K. (Kavala), F.11.

[6] Part of this wider plan was the effort to cover all needs in schools and churches for the 'Greeks', "especially in mixed villages" as the prefect of Rhodope introduced. The CCT accepted it "taking into account the national expediency of the measure", according to its decision. Coordination Council of Thrace, 51st Session, 27 March 1967 and Coordination Council of Thrace, 57th Session, 2 March 1968, 'Archive of Foreign and Minority Schools', G.A.K. (Kavala), F.11.

institutions. Perhaps with the exception of the isolated Pomak areas, the Greek authorities indirectly accepted that their hegemonic project had *failed*. Minority Turks could neither abandon their identification with Turkism nor be excluded from running minority affairs, therefore they had to leave. The failure of this project, together with the anti-minority measures in Istanbul were the main reasons for the application of a coherent policy of discrimination against the minority through the policy of administrative harassment, a policy that would characterize Greek policy in Thrace until the early 1990s.

Another central issue was the role of the principle of reciprocity in the establishment of political frontiers in Thrace and in the policies of inclusion and exclusion. Although reciprocity was officially established as a principle to deal with the respective minorities in Greece and Turkey in 1968, it was already the principle on which intervention in Thrace was based. Except for its role in deterring Turkey from applying anti-minority measures to its Greek-Orthodox minorities, reciprocity also had the character of a political logic which aimed to introduce a frontier against Turkism in Thrace; as such it justified both inclusive and exclusive strategies towards different minority groups.

Moreover, as we have seen, the events of 1964-66 showed that the application of reciprocity in Thrace failed to deter measures of homogenization in Turkey regarding ethnic Greeks. At the same time, “reciprocity” was replaced by “counter-measures” in the terminology used by Greek officials; voices for the abandonment of reciprocity were raised within the Greek administration, while the project of land purchase showed that reciprocity was questioned as the prominent principle for dealing with minority issues in Thrace.

Immigrants and aliens in Cyprus: a first approach to British policy, 1881-1945

By
Evangelia Mathopoulou
PhD Candidate
University of Cyprus

Abstract:

Cyprus has been a destination for immigrants, such as colonists, refugees or illegal immigrants, throughout her history, mainly due to its geographical position in the Eastern Mediterranean. Thus, the island did not stay apart from the political and socio-economic developments in Europe throughout the 19th and 20th century, which inevitably provoked the waves of population movements. During the period of the British colonial rule in Cyprus, various waves of immigrants – among them a significant number of refugees- reached the island. This paper will focus on this particular period, aiming to provide a first account of the British response to these migratory flows, an aspect of the history that the existed historiography has hitherto largely neglected. It will discuss British policy towards the reception of the immigrants focusing on the assessment of the gradual developments of British immigration law in Cyprus. In this context, besides the orders and proclamations that the British administration issued throughout the period under examination, a reference will be made to the various groups of the immigrants, colonists and refugees that entered the island. Finally, British policy will be examined taking into account the external factors that formed internal migratory policy, such as the evolution of law in Great Britain, and the political upheavals of the late 19th and 20th century Europe. The survey is largely based on primary sources.

The 5th Hellenic Observatory PhD Symposium on

Contemporary Greece & Cyprus

LSE, 2 & 3 June 2011

Please mind the Context: The development of Turkish Nationalism in Cyprus under the British rule

ILIA XYPOLIA*

Abstract

In Cyprus that experienced the British imperial rule from 1878 until 1960, Greek and Turkish nationalism developed at different historical periods and at different paces. Greek Nationalism has been appeared in the island since the beginning of the 19th century while Turkish Nationalism started to develop in the Ottoman Empire at the end of 19th century and was consolidated with the establishment of the Republic of Turkey in 1923. Relations between Turkish Cypriots and the British on the one hand, and Greek Cypriots and the British on the other, were asymmetrical. During the colonial era in Cyprus, the Muslim community had undergone an enormous change in terms of national/ethnic identity and class characteristics. Turkish Cypriot nationalism developed belatedly as a militant nationalist and anti-Enosis movement.

Against this background this paper aims to explore the relationship between the emergence of the Turkish national identity and the British Colonial rule because the latter set out the political, social and ideological context wherein the Turkish national identity was shaped. In particular this paper focuses on the period between the two World Wars (1919-1939) when the transformation of the Muslims of Cyprus into Turkish Cypriots emerged. This paper will discuss educational and administrative policies implemented by the British rule that had an impact on the politics of the Muslim community of Cyprus.

Keywords: Nationalism, Imperialism, Cyprus

* Ilia Xypolia is a PhD candidate in International Relations and Politics at Keele University, UK. Her doctoral studies are funded by IKY (State Scholarship Foundation of Greece). E-mail: i.xypolia@ilpj.keele.ac.uk