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Introduction

Cyprus is the third-largest island in the Mediterranean; its geographical position, in the far eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea, historically adjoining Europe, Asia and Africa has been both a blessing and a curse. Invaders and occupiers for centuries sought to subordinate it for strategic reasons, followed by British colonial rule. In an area of 9,251 square kilometres the total population of Cyprus is around 754,800, of whom 672,800 (or 75.4%) are Greek-Cypriots (living in the Republic of Cyprus-controlled area). Upon independence from British colonial rule in 1960, Turkish-Cypriots constituted 18 per cent of the population, whilst the smaller ‘religious groups’, as referred to in the Constitution —consisting of Armenians, Latins, Maronites and ‘others’ (such as Roma)— constituted 3.2 per cent of the population. Today Turkish Cypriots are estimated to be 89,200 or 10% of the total population of the island.1

Peaceful coexistence between the island’s two communities, the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots had been short-lived. In 1963 intercommunal violence forced the majority of the Turkish Cypriots to withdraw into enclaves: over 30% of the Turkish Cypriots were forced to live in Turkish militia-controlled enclaves in isolation and squalid conditions. The economy was structured by the ethnic conflict that dominated the island since 1963 and the segregation of the two communities that penetrated economy and society deeply up until 1974, when a military coup staged by the Greek junta preceded the military invasion from Turkey a few days later. Since then, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots lived apart, separated by a barbed wire with very little contact until 2003, until the Turkish Cypriot administration decided to partially lift the ban on freedom of movement and opened up a few checkpoints around the island. For many Greek Cypriots and especially for the younger generation, this development offered the first opportunity to come into contact with Turkish Cypriots, who had for several decades lived so close and yet so far apart.

The Greek-Cypriot ‘economic ethos’ (Mavratsas, 1992), in Weberian terms propelled accumulation, growth and commerce, but was much premised on the fact that land-ownership, commerce and trade was

1. This chapter will cover mainly the southern part of the country, although there will be discussion of the position of Turkish-Cypriots in the country as a whole. In particular it concentrates on their position in the Greek-Cypriot controlled southern part of the country, where a few thousand work and visit on a regular basis.
dominated by Greek-Cypriots. The social class structure remained essentially the same as the pyramid of wealth and income did not change dramatically after independence: the church continued to be the largest land-owner and expanded its commercial activities, whilst at the same time there was a growth in the commercial classes. The recent history of Cyprus has been marked by rapid economic development since 1960 and the particularly spectacular growth in the aftermath of the 1974 catastrophe. The development of Cyprus has been structured by a number of internal and external factors. For instance, the Turkish military invasion and occupation of the north and the mass expulsion of Greek-Cypriots in 1974, by default created the preconditions for rapid (capitalistic) ‘modernisation’, in what Harvey (2004) refers to as conditions for ‘accumulation by dispossession’. In spite of the severe drop in the GDP during 1973-75 and the sharp rise in unemployment and mass poverty, cheap labour was provided by the 160,000 Greek Cypriot displaced persons, forcibly expelled from the northern part and living in government refugee camps. The conditions of the rapid development were reminiscent to the early industrialisation of Western Europe. This fact together with a concerted effort by the government, political parties and trade unions created the conditions for the development that was subsequently experienced in Cyprus (Anthias and Ayres, 1983; Christodoulou, 1992; Panayiotopoulos, 1996).

A troubled history of post-colonial identity, state and nation formation

National identity and state formation were shaped as a result of the recent troubled history, which tore the country apart: the ethnic conflict, international interventions during the cold war, and the coup and invasion which divided the country in 1974.

Cyprus became an independent Republic in 1960. The ethnic conflict of 1963-1974 brought about a coup by the Greek military junta and the paramilitary EOKA B, followed by an invasion from the Turkish army and the subsequent division of the island. Turkey still occupies 34 per cent of the territory. Thousands were displaced: 162,000 Greek-Cypriots in the southern part of the country and 80,000 Turkish-Cypriots were forced to move to the northern part of the island. Repeated attempts to resolve the Cyprus problem spanning over 40 years have not been successful so far. The election of a pro-solution left-wing President in February 2008 has given new impetus to solving the partition problem. However, after over 100 meetings, the leaders are yet to reach a final agreement.

A crucial aspect structuring national and state identity is the presence of a large number of migrants since 1990. Cyprus was transformed from a net emigration to a net immigration country. Immigration policy in Cyprus was largely formulated in the 1990s, when the government decided to abandon the restrictive policies followed until then and allow more migrant workers into the country in order to meet labour shortages. In the post EU accession era there is an increasing number of EU citizens utilising their right to move and work freely across the EU, who come to seek employment in Cyprus. Today, the total number of non-Cypriot nationals is estimated to be about 200,000 persons, including irregular or undocumented migrants from third countries.
The immigrant population has become an important component of the labour force. In October 2010, out of 376,300 employed persons, 114,425 were EU or third country nationals, comprising 30.4% of those gainfully employed. The sending countries are non-EU countries (Sri Lanka, Russia, Philippines etc) and some of the EU countries (Greece, the United Kingdom, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania etc). As of October 2010 third country nationals (TCNs) largely work in private household service (domestic workers, carers etc.) and other services. This has remained unchanged when compared to previous years, with the exception of the decline in TCN employed in construction, restaurants and the hotel sector. These sectors were among the hardest hit during the economic crisis of 2009, and although further research is needed, the decline of TCNs in construction is comparable to the decline of employment in that sector of Cypriots (Greek and Turkish) and of Europeans.

The question of tolerance/toleration is intimately connected to citizenship and economic development as construed in connection to the ever-present ‘Cyprus problem’, structured by the historical and politico-social context of the island and the wider troubled region of the Middle East. So long as the ‘Cyprus problem’ persists, the politics of ‘citizenship’, economic development and socio-cultural transformation cannot remain frozen in time, but are affected by the debates relating to the resolution of the problem. Citizenship has played a central role in political discourse, both during and following the referendum on the UN plan in April 2004. The particular construction of the RoC was such that the struggle for legitimacy was elevated to the primary struggle for control of the state. In this conflict the two communal leaderships of the Greek-Cypriots and the Turkish-Cypriots sought to materialise their ‘national aspirations’: For Greek-Cypriots the aim for enosis (union with Greece) and for the Turkish-Cypriots the goal of taksim (partition) would continue post-independence. The very concept of citizenship was not only ethnically/communally defined by the Constitution, but it was also a sharply divisive issue between the Greeks and Turks, acquiring strong ethnic and nationalistic overtones (see Tornaritis, 1982a, 1982b; Trimikliniotis, 2000 and 2010).

Ethno-communal citizenship and the nationalising of legally divided subjects

In 1960 Cyprus became an independent republic for the first time since antiquity, albeit in a limited way (see Attalides, 1979; Faustmann, 1999). The anti-colonial struggle, which started in the 1930s, led to a four-year armed campaign by the Greek-Cypriot EOKA (1955–59) for enosis (union with Greece) and the Turkish-Cypriot response for taksim (partition). The hostility and instability generated by these developments brought about a regime of ‘supervised’ independence, with three foreign ‘guarantor’ nations (UK, Turkey and Greece). The Cypriot Constitution, adopted under the Zurich-London Accord of 1959, contains a rigorous bi-communalism, whereby the two ‘communities’, Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots shared power in a consociational system. Citizenship was strictly ethno-communally divided. Beyond the two main communities (Greek and Turkish) Cyprus has three national minorities, referred to in the Constitution as ‘religious groups’: the Maronites, the Armenians and the Latins. In addition, there is a small Roma community, registered mostly as part of the Turkish-Cypriot community, which was only recognised as a minority in 2009.4

3. The 1920s saw the radicalisation of workers and the rise of the trade union movement on the left (largely Greek-Cypriot but bi-communal from its inception) and the radicalisation of the Greek-Cypriot right. By 1931 there were the first mass riots against the British which ended with the burning of the Governor’s residence, known as the Octovriana. In the 1940s, the left had risen as a mass movement and competed with the church for leadership of the anti-colonial movement (Katsiaounis, 2007).

4. Recognition as a national minority was for the first time extended to the Roma through the Third Periodic Report submitted by Cyprus under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, received on 30.04.2009, page 23. This is a deviation from previous policy, which did not recognise the Roma as a separate community; indeed the Roma are nowhere mentioned in the Constitution and were deemed to belong to the Turkish Cypriot community, due to their (presumed) common language and religion.
In 1963, following a Greek-Cypriot proposal for amendment to the Constitution, the Turkish-Cypriot political leadership withdrew or was forced to withdraw from the government (depending on whose historical version one is reading). Since then, the administration of the Republic has been carried out by the Greek-Cypriots. Inter-communal strife ensued until 1967. In 1964, the Supreme Court ruled that the functioning of the government must continue on the basis of the ‘law of necessity’ or, better yet, the ‘doctrine of necessity’, in spite of the constitutional deficiencies created by the Turkish-Cypriot leadership withdrawal from the administration. The short life of consociation did not manage to generate a strong enough inter-communal or trans-communal citizenship. This brief period of peaceful inter-communal political co-existence was tentative; we cannot therefore speak of a ‘citizenship policy’ as such, above and beyond the politics of the Cyprus conflict and the separate national aspirations of Greek- and Turkish-Cypriots, who continued to work towards enosis and taksim respectively, even after independence. Although de jure the young Republic continued to exist as a single international entity, with the collapse of the consociational power-sharing, the Republic in practice was controlled by the Greek-Cypriots. The Turkish-Cypriot leadership exercised de facto power within small enclaves throughout the territory of the Republic. This was in a sense the first de facto partition.

During this 30-year period the de facto partition meant that in effect there were two separate ‘stories’: that of the Greek-Cypriots and that of the Turkish-Cypriots. Turkish-Cypriots are entitled to citizenship of the RoC and tens of thousands obtained a Republic of Cyprus passport. Up to April 2003 there were few opportunities for ordinary Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots to meet: Greek-Cypriots did not have access to the northern territories occupied by Turkey, whilst Turkish-Cypriots were prohibited by their own administration from entering the area controlled by the Republic.

In the post-1974 period the RoC attempted to reinforce its legitimacy claiming that Turkish-Cypriot citizens enjoy full and equal rights under the Republic’s Constitution, such as general civil liberties and the rights provided by the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) as well as other human rights, save for those provisions that have resulted from (a) the ‘abandoning’ of the governmental posts in 1963–1964 and (b) the consequences of the Turkish invasion. The ‘doctrine of necessity’ was stated to apply only to the extent that it would allow for the effective functioning of the state, whilst the relevant provisions of the Constitution would be temporarily suspended, pending a political settlement. However, Turkish-Cypriot citizens of the Republic had been denied their electoral rights since 1964, a policy found by the ECHR to be in violation of the European Convention on Human Rights. A new law was passed in May 2006 which at least partially remedied this problem but the wide spectrum of the ECHR decision against Cyprus was not fully addressed by the government.

Successive governments have maintained that Turkish-Cypriots are entitled to full citizenship rights and to citizenship of the RoC. The children of Turkish Cypriots who now reside in northern Cyprus or abroad and were born after 1974 are entitled to citizenship (as with Greek-Cypriots and ‘others’) but children born to Turkish Cypriots and Turkish nationals are not automatically entitled to citizenship. The bureaucratic elements
involved are due to the non-recognition of any documentation (e.g. birth certificates) from the TRNC\(^7\) which renders the whole policy treatment of Turkish-Cypriots self-contradictory, reflecting the complexity of the Cyprus conflict and the constant contestation for legitimacy and recognition. Inevitably, ‘the discourse on recognition’ (Constantinou and Papadakis, 2002) spilled over into citizenship politics upsetting the officially declared policy of ‘rapprochement’. Ultimately, the consequences of the situation resulted in failing to properly treat ordinary Turkish-Cypriots as ‘strategic allies’, in the context of independence from the Turkish-Cypriots’ nationalistic leadership, who are perceived as ‘mere pawns of Ankara’. Even today, the RoC seems to be failing to address certain basic matters: In spite of Turkish being an official language of the Republic, its use has in RoC has been virtually abandoned, thus creating conditions of intolerance, discrimination and unconstitutionality (Trimikliniotis and Demetriou, 2008).

The post-referendum and post-accession period (2004-2011)

The year of 2004 was a watershed: the efforts to reunite the country would coincide with Cyprus’ accession to the EU, as Cyprus was called to vote in a referendum on a comprehensive plan put together by the UN after the two sides had negotiated it. The plan was approved by a large majority in the Turkish Cypriot community but was overwhelmingly rejected by the Greek Cypriots; this disparity added considerable tension and suspicion in the relations of the two communities which the two sides are yet to overcome. Following the referenda’s failure to solve the problem, Cyprus entered the EU as a divided country in a state of limbo. This has significantly shaped Cyprus’ relations with and position within the EU, as its unresolved problem and its tensions with Turkey have become a constant source of problems for successive EU presidencies.

The post accession period also saw an increase in the numbers of TCNs seeking employment or asylum in Cyprus, which in a way led Greek Cypriot society to come face to face with the new realities of cultural diversity and ‘otherness’ simultaneously with the new situation resulting from the opening up of the border between north and south of the country.

Cultural diversity challenges facing Cyprus in the last 30 years

Cyprus and periodisation

In the Cypriot context, time-wise the rise on multiculturalism, including the establishment of an institutional framework for combating discrimination and enhancing tolerance coincides with an increasing polarisation breeding intolerance. Therefore we can observe in the post-millennium period a rise in the discourse of tolerance, articulated mostly by human and labour rights supporters/groups and intellectuals; at the same time, there is a rise in intolerance and nationalism amongst powerful institutions deeply embedded within society such as mainstream centrist and right wing political parties, sectors of the

\(^7\) Hence the requirements to produce documents relating to birth of their Cypriot parents prior to 1974.
As an example of how intolerance can translate itself into policy, after about two years of media debates over what is being portrayed as exploitation of the social welfare system by ‘illegal immigrants posing as asylum seekers’, two right wing MPs have recently tabled a proposal to reduce the amount of state benefits received by asylum seekers because many receive ‘massive funds’ they said. This, in spite of UNHCR research that has shown that this is not the case and despite assurances from the Minister of Labour that the figures for the ‘massive funds’ alleged by the MPs are actually false.

The cultural diversity challenges in the post 1980s period are shaped by the historical antecedents of the ‘border society’ torn by war, the cultural effect of mass tourism and the large presence of migrants. The question of tolerance of the ‘other’ is characterised by antinomies and contradictions, which contain both a degree of tolerance as ‘philoxenia’, a popular value cherished and advertised as a ‘local tradition’, but simultaneously xenophobia and an intolerance towards the other. This ambivalence has been structured by a series of key events.

While in the international arena the 1980s marked the closing of the cold war era, in Cyprus these were the years of the consolidation of the de facto partition, as the Turkish Cypriot administration declared independence of its breakaway state, the ‘Turkish Republic in Northern Cyprus’ (TRNC). At the same time there was massive economic growth for the RoC and economic stagnation in the Turkish Cypriot community.

The 1980s was also the period where Cyprus started receiving its first wave of foreigners, mostly affluent people of Arab origin fleeing from the wars raging in the Middle East at the time (Lebanon, Kuwait, Iraq). The potential and actual contribution of this group to the national economy was recognised and utilised from the outset and thus manifestations of racism and discrimination were fragmented and few. However, in 1985 there was the first major incident of mass violence after 1974. In retaliation of an alleged rape of a Greek Cypriot by persons of Arab origin, a riot occurred in the tourist area of Limassol directed against all persons of Arab origin found in the streets. The media took a negative view of the riot and presented it as vandalism, focusing on the fact that such incidents created a bad image for Cyprus abroad – after all the Lebanese who fled to Cyprus were people of money.8

In the 1990s and early 2000, a number of key issues emerged, opening up the question of citizenship and requiring a declared and consistent policy. First, the arrival of migrant workers in the early 1990s, who today make up over 20 per cent of the total working population of the island, and then the arrival of Roma, who are classified as Turkish-Cypriots, from the poorer north in the south between 1999 and 2002, created a panic that they may well be ‘Turkish spies’, whilst the Minister of the Interior at the time alleged that they they are Cypriots who simply moved over 20 years of media debates over what is being portrayed as exploitation of the social welfare system by ‘illegal immigrants posing as asylum seekers’, two right wing MPs have recently tabled a proposal to reduce the amount of state benefits received by asylum seekers because many receive “massive funds” they said. This, in spite of UNHCR research that has shown that this is not the case and despite assurances from the Minister of Labour that the figures for the ‘massive funds’ alleged by the MPs are actually false.

The advent of migrants and the Cypriot Roma (from the northern part of the country) as well as the dynamics of EU accession, coupled with the prospects of a solution to the Cyprus problem which begun to emerge in the early 2000s brought a powerful boost to multicultural ideas in Cyprus in the new millennium. This boost was met with intense polarisation which was not contained or exhausted in discourse but spilled over into policy making.10 The system as regards immigration control and monitoring was rigid from the beginning; in
fact it had always been racially structured that assimilation was not even an option. Although the length of residence permits varied at different periods, it had always been fixed to a number of years (at the time of writing four years) leaving little possibilities for issues of integration and assimilation to apply to the vast majority of migrants. However, generally speaking Cyprus has not, in the aftermath of 9/11 developed a more stringent regime as regards security matters. Rather, these tight immigration control policies must be seen as responses to the panic and the irrational fear caused by the rising numbers of migrant workers and asylum seekers. At the same time, one needs to consider that the war in Iraq, a direct result of 9/11 has led several thousands of Iraqis to flee their homeland in search for a more secure future; some of these sought asylum in Cyprus where the communist government’s meagre handouts have been exaggerated and amplified by the media and by right wing circles.

Educational reform

In the field of education, the issue of tolerance, maltreatment of minorities and ethnic or ‘racial’ discrimination did not, for historical reasons, receive the required attention, as the field of education was deemed by the Cypriot Constitution to be a ‘communal’ affair, to be left to the ‘Communal Chambers’ of the two main communities of Cyprus, the Greek-Cypriots and the Turkish-Cypriots to regulate. The Cypriot Ministry of Education and Culture emerged after the ‘withdrawal’ of the Turkish Cypriots from the administration in 1963-64. Education nevertheless remained ‘communal’ in character for all those citizens who were deemed to be part of the Greek-Cypriot community, albeit it assumed a ‘national’ character for the Greek Cypriots (see Trimikliniotis, 2004).

The debates over the comprehensive educational reform, which has been on the table for over seven years now, and the virulent reactions to it, illustrate the polarisation that cuts across Greek-Cypriot society. The Reform, which aspires to render Cyprus’ ethnocentric educational system multicultural, was met with strong opposition by the church, right-wing, conservative and nationalist sections of teachers, parents and political parties who saw this as ‘conspiracy’ to ‘dehellenize’ education. The issue that attracted most of the controversy in the public debates is the curriculum revision and generally the way in which the lesson of history is taught at school. The history textbook which the Educational Reform sought to revise had been criticised for containing offensive references and inflammatory language. A new twist in 2010 has caused the reformists to water down their reformist agenda in the revision of history education: elections in the Turkish Cypriot community brought in a hard line nationalist who immediately upon assuming office scrapped the new (revised) history textbooks which had up until then been used in Turkish Cypriot schools and replaced them with the old style anti-Greek mould. This has led the Greek-Cypriot reformers to succumb to mounting right-wing and nationalist pressure by teachers associations and parents; this time they were criticised by those who wanted to see a serious transformation towards an open, tolerant and multi-perspective history education. At the time of writing, discussions amongst stakeholders on the future of the history textbooks continued.

11. This included the three constitutionally recognised ‘religious groups’, who opted to be part of the numerically larger Greek-Cypriot community (80%) rather than the smaller Turkish-Cypriot community (18%).

12. Indicative of the negative climate in the education sector is a circular issued by the primary school teachers’ union POED urging its members to refuse to implement the targets set by the Ministry of Education for the development of a culture of peaceful coexistence with the Turkish Cypriots, and especially the proposed measure of organising visits by Turkish Cypriot teachers and pupils. The circular had been criticised by the Equality Body. Following this, the teachers issued another circular reiterating their position against the exchange of visits with Turkish Cypriots.

Debates on nation and citizenship

A crucial development was the opening of the checkpoints which allowed many thousands of Turkish-Cypriots to visit the south, generally greeted by both Turkish-Cypriots and Roma residing in the south with relief and optimism. However, there was a tense atmosphere generated in the run-up to and aftermath of the referenda on the Annan plan to reunite the island on 24 April 2004, the rejection of which by the Greek-Cypriots has given rise to nationalist sentiment in the south (see Hadjidakimitriou, 2006). The political atmosphere has drastically changed since the presidential election in February 2008 and the new negotiations to resolve the problem. Nevertheless, as long as the there is no settlement, unease about the legal, political, socio-economic and everyday consequences of the de facto partition will remain.

The grant of RoC citizenship to children of settlers from Turkey who are married to Turkish-Cypriots has become a highly controversial issue as it brings out the conflict over the nature of the Cyprus problem. There is a misguided conflation of the internationally-condemned policy of an aggressor country, with the fact that we are also dealing with some basic rights and humanitarian issues relating to the rights of children and individuals who marry, start families and continue with their lives. The granting of citizenship rights to children and spouses of Turkish-Cypriots is an important political issue which has taken up the headlines and has brought about accusations against the government for ‘legalising the Turkish settlers’. Moreover, the condemnation of a war crime (colonisation) must not be conflated with issues regarding the conditions of sojourn and living of poor undocumented workers, exploited as cheap foreign labour (see Faiz, 2008). Finally, gender has become an important issue as regards citizenship. The position of women in the processes of nation-building and nationalism raises the crucial question of a gendered Cypriot citizenship, which one scholar referred to as ‘the one remaining bastion of male superiority in the present territorially divided state’ (Anthias, 1989: 150). This last ‘bastion’ was formally abolished with an amendment of the citizenship law in 1999 (No. 65/99), which introduced entitlement to citizenship for descendants of a Cypriot mother and a non-Cypriot father. The reluctance of Cypriot policymakers to amend the citizenship law, allegedly due to the concern about upsetting the state of affairs as it existed prior to 1974, cannot withstand close examination. After all, there have been seven amendments to the citizenship law prior to the amendment No. 65/99. It is apparent that the issue of gender equality had not been a particularly high political priority. Besides, in the patriarchal order of things, the role of Cypriot women as ‘symbolic reproducers of the nation’, particularly in the context of ‘national liberation’, as transmitters of ‘the cultural stuff’, required that potential association and reproduction of women with men outside the ethnic group must be strictly controlled (Anthias, 1989: 151).

From the research conducted over the last ten years, we can locate three types of relevant findings highlighting the problem with racial and well as other types of intolerance, including hate crimes which inform the context: (a) opinion surveys from quantitative research and opinion polls; (b) qualitative research (interviews, focus groups and ethnographic/participant observation) and (c) research papers based on policy and institutional analysis. The absence of comparable reliable data covering the period under examination makes it difficult to comment on trends. Nonetheless, relying

14. They thought that they could no longer be singled out, targeted and harassed and there was a general feeling of optimism and rapprochement (Trimikliniotis, 2003).

15. The findings of all quantitative surveys carried out in recent years all point out to the same conclusion, i.e. a general antipathy towards migrants using the frames of the connection with unemployment (European Social Survey, analysed in Gouliamos and Vryonis, 2010); religion (see Equality Body survey of 2007 on the attitudes of Greek Cypriots towards other religions available in Greek at http://www.no-discrimination.ombudsman.gov.cy/sites/default/files/ereyna-sxetika-me-diaforetikes-thriskykeykes-pepoithiseis.pdf); criminality and spread of diseases (research was conducted by the University of Nicosia and other in June 2010 on behalf of the Civil Registry and Migration Department - Ministry of Interior and was co-funded by the EU Solidarity Funds and the Cypriot government).
on various indicators and proxy data some conclusions are possible, even if they are preliminary and subject to further investigation.

**Colour as signifier of racism**

Colour remains an important signifier of racism, although not exclusively or necessarily. Research conducted in 2010 confirms that colour racism and racial abuse against blacks persists. During focus groups with asylum seekers (see Trimikliniotis and Demetriou, 2010), Africans reported having received the worst treatment of all asylum seekers, facing more overt and acute forms of discrimination, particularly from immigration officers who have no hesitation in demonstrating racist behaviour towards them. Other asylum seekers interviewed also reported having been subjected to racial abuse but the degree of regularity, humiliation and intensity does not match the stories told by the Africans. Colour and ‘race’ are not the only signifiers of racial hatred in Cyprus. There is an increasingly loud and frequent public discourse, which often avoids explicit references to ‘race’ but utilises other signifiers such as essential or inherent or hereditary characteristics which derive not from the blood or DNA but culture, language and religion, in what scholars refer to as neo-racism (Balibar and Wallerstein, 1991).

**Rise of far right violence and hatred discourse**

There is a neo-racism connected to the rise of the Far Right and discourses of hatred. Even though traditionally in Cyprus there was no typical far right / xenophobic populist or Neo-Nazi party, focusing for instance on anti-immigration populism or anti-Semitic politics, this is now beginning to change as these signifiers are regularly being articulated in the mainstream press and media. In the 2009 European Parliamentary elections, a neo-Nazi type of party called ELAM ‘Ethniko Laiko Metopo’ which translates into National Popular Front contested the elections and received 663 votes (0.22 percent); at the time it received no media coverage. The main discussion lines of ELAM produced the usual racist slogans contained in the Greek neo-Nazi and extreme Right papers and magazines, claiming that it is the only party that speaks for the “liberation of our enslaved lands, the ending of the privileges of the ‘greedy’ Turkish-Cypriots and for a Europe of Nations and traditions which belongs to the real Europeans and not to the ‘third-worldly’ [backward] illegal immigrants”. In the national parliamentary elections of 2011 ELAM received 4,354 votes, scoring 1.08% of the votes, the largest percentage amongst the parties that did not elect an MP. This, in spite the general admission that ELAM is behind several racist attacks against unsuspecting migrants and Turkish Cypriots taking place in public space under broad daylight.

The recently emerging organised racist lobby, with an anti-immigration and xenophobic agenda, has found affiliates in many mainstream political parties and in media outlets. There is a number of publications and regular media discourses about the imminent and grave ‘dangers’ from ‘Afro-asiatic’, ‘Muslim-Asiatic’ and ‘Turko-asiatic’ hordes that are ready to invade Cyprus as part of a plan orchestrated by Turkey to change the demographic character of Cyprus through illegal immigration; a leaflet was also widely circulated to this effect. Studies have shown that there are regular media discourses employing the usual racist frames comparable to those of other EU countries such as ethno-nationalistic, conflict-
criminality, welfare-chaudivist, job-stealing, ‘threat to liberal norms’, biological racism and national specific frames (Trimikliniotis, 1999; 2005a; Trimiklinioti and Demetriou, 2007). Particular individuals within various political parties, including centre-right mainstream parties, various newly-formed committees for the ‘salvation of Cyprus’ involving various public figures such as a former ECHR judge, a former military officer and politicians, as well as neo-Nazi groups argue that asylum-seekers, migrants and Turkish-Cypriots are abusing the Cypriot welfare benefit system ripping the “golden benefits” of “the Cypriot paradise” and making Cypriots “second class citizens”. They criticise the Minister of Interior for his ‘liberal’ migration policy, sometimes even going as far as labelling him as an agent who conspires to distort the population make-up and de-Hellenize Cyprus. Asylum-seekers, refugees and migrants are described as “invaders”, “a fifth column against the Greek element of free Cyprus”, claiming that “Hellenism is threatened from asylum-seekers as it is threatened by colonists/settlers in the Turkish occupied territories.” Such discourses aired regularly by the media are creating a climate which is conducive to racial hatred. Such is the influence and power of the media that when the Equality Body embarked upon the drafting of a Code of Conduct on how ethnic communities and immigrants should be portrayed in the media, the result was a watered-down non-binding set of guidelines and an extensive explanation of why ‘freedom of the press’ should not be ‘interfered with’.18


17. These term was used by the official of DESY Christos Rotsas (2010) ‘Ο Μεγάλος Αυθέντης’, Η Σημερή, 23.07.2010 http://www.sigmalive.com/simerini/analises/other/295061


19. The sample included 39 school heads and deputy heads from all over the part of the island controlled by the Cyprus Republic; 44 teachers (aged 28 – 60); two special questionnaires for 1,242 youths, between the ages 15-23; 62 non-Cypriots who were mostly students of unspecified age; 23 persons aged between 18-52 who are connected to the mass media.

20. For more on this study see Trimikliniotis & Demetriou (2009a, 2009b)

Racist predispositions and opinion surveys: Racial intolerance uncovered

The findings of a research conducted by Charakis (2005) on the anti-social behaviour of the Cypriot youth and racist tendencies provide some interesting data (Charakis and Sitas, 2004). Methodologically the research covers a large and representative sample of teachers, school heads and deputy heads, media persons and youth.19 The aim of the research was to investigate racist predispositions amongst the Greek-Cypriot youth, referred to as habitus by the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu.20 The research team constructed what they refer to as an ‘emotional map’ of the respondents’ dispositions of Greek-Cypriot youth between ‘two intractable extremes’. The study revealed that, in depicting the parameters of racist and anti-racist dispositions, 20 per cent belong to an intractable group which dismisses all forms of discrimination and who espouse a culture of equality and human rights; ten per cent “articulated deeply racist dispositions of a primordial sense based on the reduction of phenotype to genotype and dismissed all forms of ‘otherness’”. The scholars deduce from their empirical research that “whatever correlation is undertaken or frequencies studied, the two cohorts present an intractable boundary[.] all their responses emanate from an unwavering system of beliefs” (Charakis and Sitas, 2004: 152). However, what is crucial in terms of tendencies is what happens to the remaining 70 percent in the middle and how they shift from one position to the other, depending on the issue. Charakis and Sitas argue that “if we correlate respondents with ideas that were discriminatory in the broadest sense possible, the concentration of responses would move from the intractable racist [group] ... to spread all the way up to a 79 percent but stop short of the boundary [of the other group]... If we were to correlate respondents with active derogation of the cultural ‘other’ we would find that it also corresponds with ‘xenophobic’ feelings and shrink back to 30 percent ...”
Definitions of tolerance/acceptance/recognition-respect in Cyprus

Sources and manifestations of tolerance/intolerance in Cyprus

To speak of tolerance/acceptance/recognition-respect in Cyprus is to locate the three levels of analysis on the question of tolerance in their specific historical context. In Cyprus, tolerance as a value is marked by the political, ideological, institutional/constitutional and socio-cultural environment of a war-torn society.

It is difficult to disentangle the sources from the manifestations of tolerance/intolerance in Cypriot society. Yet, we can certainly speak of historical structures in society which have generated logics of postcolonial (in)tolerance: The historical legacy of the “dialectic of intolerance” (Kitromilides, 1979) is partly a legacy of colonialism. Structured around the institutional framework of Cypriot political life, today it also finds expression in ‘ethnic’ intolerance. This intolerance undermined the development of a strong ‘public opinion’ and debate in a ‘small society’, where education is more concerned with technical or professional qualifications, rather than the development of critical faculties. This intolerance has informed the social and political relation within and between the two communities; in fact it was the major characteristic of the political life in Cyprus. It did not enable Cypriots to debate and see the potential alternatives of confrontation, to the “predetermined route to disaster” as Kitromilides called it, such as the creation of a Cypriot consciousness, over and above their narrow racial or ethno-religious and linguistic-cultural identities/consciousness. As the most insightful analyses of nationalism in Cyprus point out, the central element in Greek Cypriot nationalism is that of ignoring the Turkish Cypriots (Loizos, 1974; Attalides, 1979; Papadakis, 1993). All are in line with majority thinking and the pattern of intolerance.

The postcolonial frame has produced a somewhat inchoate nationhood, which (re)produces a strange duality: on the one hand it maintains “surplus ethnicities” (i.e. recognised minorities such as the Armenians, Maronites and Latins) attached to the “main communities”, i.e. Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots (see Constantinou 2009). On the other hand these very same frames and social apparatuses reproduce different kinds of residues of ethnicities and social, cultural and political identities (Panayiotou, 1996, 1999, 2006; Constantinou, 2007) as contradictions to the hegemonic national homogenisation of society, as Balibar (1991) shows. Social and historical residues are reproduced in everydayness and often in direct or indirect or subtle challenge to the ‘official’ or hegemonic line or practice. Hence local forms and instances of tolerance, co-existence, social solidarity and self-sacrifice are constantly thrown in, in parallel or as subaltern response to the abundance of the intolerance and rigidities of officialdom. We return to this later.

We are dealing here with a very ambivalent state of being. Anthias (2007: 177) aptly refers to how “postcolonial frames leave subject positionalities where indentity politics is overstressed as a compensatory mechanism for the uncertainties and fissures in society...Cypriots are ambivalent about their value, and this produces and reflected in imagining about belonging to the Greek and Turkish nation. The concept Cypriot is divested of value, and of itself; it is an apology for not being
complete, and a form of self-hatred and denial is sometimes witnessed.“
Like many other peoples in the region, the identity of the Cypriots has
been fluid. ‘Greekness’, ‘Turkishness’, ‘Cypriotness’ and ‘Other-ness’ in
history remain hosted contested issues (see Papadakis, 1993; Philippou
and Makriyanni, 2004; Constantinou, 2007).

Migrant workers interviewed for research purposes detect the very
ambivalence within Cypriotness: a contested Cypriotness, a mixed and
hybrid experience that contains both solidarity-based, more open and
universalistic almost set of values, in a contradictory and transient sym-
biosis with exclusionary, narrow-minded and blatantly xenophobic and
racist elements. It is the former elements that reach out, as a kind of
solidarity that migrants identify as ‘basic goodness’. Migrant workers
seem to identify with what they perceive as ‘basic goodness’ of ordinary
Cypriots, which may be explained as a dimension of a collective trait that
generously reaches out as a sociability, collective generosity and hospital-
ity. It may well be a manifestation of survival of a collective memory of
a community of a historically oppressed and discriminated subalternity,
or it may genuinely be a kind of good nature’, an ethics of a “common
humanity”.

On the other hand, there exists a class-ridden shame, that many Cyp-
riots would much rather forget: the fact that not many decades ago
a lot of Cypriot women had to work as domestic workers in wealthy
houses, hence the contradictory attitude towards domestic workers–
total dependence to do the ‘mothering’-and-cleaning entangled with a
resentment and rejection of their descent, role and position in society.
This is where certain version of Cypriotness may turn into an intolerant,
exclusionary, xenophobic and racist ideology and practice.

**Are the ‘Cypriot states of exception’ breading intolerance?**

Constantinou (2008: 145-164) aptly refers to ‘the Cypriot states of
exception’ to exemplify the multiple exceptionalism that defines the
political-legal order of Cyprus, where one exception generates another.
This brings us to the heart of ‘the Cyprus problem’, which naturally
intersects with the operation of the acquis in a de facto divided country
(Trimikliniotis, 2000, 2010). The invocation of exception blurs the dis-
tinctions between legality and illegality, normality and abnormality and
opens up ‘opportunities’ for those in power to extend their discretion in
what Poulantzas referred to as authoritarian statism. In line with the do-
crine of Carl Schmitt (2005), the regimes of exception allow ‘the sover-
eign’ to decide when and how to invoke the emergency situation. In this
sense, Cyprus is a bizarre case particularly where the distinction between
the ‘exception’ and the ‘norm’ is not easy to decipher. When ‘norm’
and ‘exception’ are so intertwined and interdependent, the edges of
the ‘grey zones’, or what is assumed to be the edge, becomes the core.
Agamben (2005: 1) advocates that if current global reality is character-
ised by a generalised state of exception, then we ought to examine the
intersection between norm and exception in the specific EU context: ‘the
question of borders becomes all the more urgent’. The reference here
is to the ‘edges’ of the law and politics where there is an ‘ambiguous,
uncertain, borderline fringe, at the intersection between the legal and
the political’: Agamben here quotes Fontana (1999: 16). The analytical
insight into the ambiguity and uncertainty of the no-man’s land between
the public law and political fact and between the judicial order and life, must move beyond the philosophical and the abstract to the specific legal and political context if it is to have a bearing on the socio-legal and political reality that is currently reshaping the EU.

The turbulent political history inevitably shaped the social life of Cyprus and as such the question of ethnic/racial intolerance and discrimination during the period of independence up until 1974 is best viewed in this light. It is not surprising that the political question and widespread ethnic violence has overwhelmed the research agenda leaving little research interest for issues such as intolerance. In the case of Cyprus, the questions of tolerance, racism, racial discrimination, structural or ideological, must be linked to the long-drawn ethnic conflict, what Azar (1986) termed as “protracted social conflict”. The ‘Cyprus problem’ must be connected to the attitudes, practices and discourses in the daily life of ordinary persons, not just today, but also viewed in a historical perspective.

It is essential to view racial intolerance in Cyprus within the nationalist/ethnic conflict in a historical perspective in order to examine: (a) the links in the discourse of intolerance, racism and nationalism, and particularly to view how these are articulated in the political arena; (b) the way in which the discourses and ideologies of exclusionary nationalism develop over time, particularly how continuities and ruptures of belonging and exclusion materialise in specific contexts; and (c) whether there is process of ‘transformation’ of nationalism into racism and vice-a-versa.

If one is to understand ethno-racial and social intolerance in Cyprus, one must appreciate the fine linguistic and cultural issues relating to the meaning of the key terms and the extent to which they are considered to be morally, politically and socially deplorable or repugnant. The concept of φυλή (Greek for “race”) is not redundant in public discourses not even in the so-called ‘politically correct’ media world. In Cyprus there is little sense of political correctness in the media language and society at large. The term “race” can be and is being used without the inverted commas in spite of the fact that Cyprus has signed and ratified all the UN and other international instruments which reject the theories of race and consider the term discredited (see National Report of the RoC on the Conclusions of the European and World Conference against Racism, 2002).

The issue of ethno-racial intolerance towards migrant workers was up until very recently dismissed as ‘isolated incidents’ by the authorities, a matter that attracted serious criticisms of institutional racism or at least government inaction. The racism debate with migrants at the receiving end and Greek-Cypriots as the perpetrators did not ‘fit in’ the national story of victimisation of Greek-Cypriots. Of course not all Greek-Cypriots are perpetrators and not all migrants are victims, but the power structure puts migrants at the receiving end.

A careful reading of the successive ECRI reports on Cyprus may lead to the conclusion that what we have is institutional racism, underlying the whole legal and administrative system. The Reports fall short of using the term ‘institutional racism’, but a careful reading reveals a resemblance with the kind of structural practices associated with the what Lord Macpherson called ‘institutional racism’ (Macpherson, 1999).
Alternatives to the intolerant nation: the potential for reconciliation

Following the Greek-Cypriot ‘No’ and the Turkish-Cypriot ‘Yes’ in the 2004 referenda, and their aftermath, it is possible but not necessarily certain that Cypriots will be able to shake off their ‘idealised’ view of the self and the demonised view of the ‘other’ (See Trimikliniotis, 2006 2007). Some have begun to get rid of the distorted view of each other allowing viewing each other beyond the ‘ethnic lenses’. The opening of the crossings contributed to the replacement of totalising discourses about the ‘other’ by individualising discourses. Moreover, the discovery of mass graves on both sides have opened up crucial questions in the public domain about the violence and intolerance of the past. Many publications and media stories about past mistakes, crimes and atrocities committed by both sides, as well as stories of self-sacrifice, cross-ethnic solidarity and support are challenging the dominant historical narrative about the barbaric and demonised ‘other’. No community can claim to have ‘clean hands’, opening up the potential for de-communalising and ‘disaggregating collective victimhood’. This is not an easy process as social subjects often organise their collective existence and justify their political perceptions precisely ‘around loss and sorrow’, which are powerful conservative forces. There is an effort ‘to energetically retain the reasons which perpetuate these or even reinvent new ones as they fantasise that only in this way they can justify their existence’ (Gavriilides, 2006). In Cyprus, ‘memory’ is organised and subordinated to the ‘national cause’ of the two opposing dominant nationalisms. Even the tragic issue of the missing persons has been used and abused by the two sides in a praxis of political ‘mnisikanein’, as Paul Sant Cassia (2005) has brilliantly shown: ‘mnisikakein’ is the Greek word for the practice of not letting go of the past evil one has suffered and is associated with a craving for revenge breeding intolerance. It is well-documented that memory is politically organised. The role of the state via education attempts to organise collective memory according its own interests and political expedience (Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1990; Papadakis, 1998).

A study directed by Sitas on the prospects of reconciliation, co-existence and forgiveness in Cyprus (see Sitas et al, 2007) revealed that the only ‘hard variables’ that were found to be significant were: class/stratification; ethnicity; gender; age; religion and refugee-status. In terms of the ‘softer’ and ‘experiential variables’ – what seemed very significant were consumptions of cultural, media-linked and symbolic goods; educational experiences; civic involvement; contact with and exposure to cultural ‘others’ and traumatic experiences of war and violence. The study argues that the distinction between ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ variables is important in sociological work. The ‘hard’ variables denote those situations that people can do very little about, i.e. they are born in or are defined by them. The ‘soft’ variables are experiential and involve degrees of choice, personality and social character. Most G/C and T/C especially those who have been affected directly by the conflict, think that there are “openings” and that there are cracks in the cement of the current status quo:

- “that substantive dialogue is possible between members and institutions and associations of civil society;
- there is an open-ness to some form of co-existence;
- there is an open-ness towards forgiving;
- there is a convergence about social norms;
- there is an open-ness to more economic co-operation;
- there is an open-ness towards a solution.”

---


22. The study was conducted in 2005-2006 with qualitative and quantifiable themes consolidated into an open-ended and exploratory research schedule. It involved in-depth interviews which focused on the experiences, historical and contemporary, of two generations – 50 year olds who were in the prime of their youth in the early 1970s and their “children” who were born after 1974. The study consisted of 170 interviews with 100 persons aged 50 years; 50 of the generation of their children. Using the principle of “complementarity” and “proportionality”, an equal number of Greek and Turkish Cypriots, of Men and Women and of Refugees/Non-Refugees were interviewed. For more on the notion on reconciliation in Cyprus and general see Kadir, 2007; 2008; Sitas and Trimikliniotis, 2007.
The point is to realise this potential, but this is a subject to counteracting the dialectic of intolerance, racism and the various states of exception operating in this small troubled country.
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