Арети Демостенус

Раздвоени култури или раздвоени општества? Случајот на Кипар

Introduction

The problem of structuring heterogeneous societies in a region cannot be solved without the correct historical understanding. Although important, the question of national security is not the only aspect of the problem.\(^1\) Another aspect of the conflict, however, is more significant, because it involves the main controversy of our days: This is the challenge for a creative new form of coexistence in countries with a heterogeneous population with different values, national, ethnic, linguistic, religious or racial. In Cyprus there has been coexistence not only during the English period but also during the Ottoman rule. In the pages to follow we will study in short the extent and kind of achieved coexistence although some people may argue that this coexistence existed under a rule, especially under a foreign one. This is quite correct; nevertheless it does not diminish its historical value. It is a matter of research that even for a long time there have been joint rebellions by both Christian and Muslim Cypriots\(^2\) against Turkish rulers in Cyprus. This is a witness of their common feelings and goals. One such rebellion happened in 1764, when the Turkish head of Government, çıl Osman, decided to have Archbishop Paisios and other regional personalities (including Muslims) killed. The citizens of Nicosia, Muslims and Christians alike, stormed the pal-
билат убиени архиепископот Пайсеј, заедно со други регионални личности (вклучувајќи и муслимани). Жителите на Никозија, како муслимани така и христијани, се втурнаа кон палатата и го убија шефот на Владата и осумнаесетмина негови чувари. Заради убиството на чил Осман беше воведен голем данок и во 1765 година (една година подоцна) чалил Ага го предводеше протестот против тогашните владетели. Тие што протестираа беа христијани, муслимани и тоа и тоа (canvas-cottons).

Историските истражувања го потврдуваат соживотот на Кипар

Една од основните задачи на историчарите е да обезбедат информации за важноста на испитувањето на минатото без да ги повторуваат грешките, и секако не пред да сфатат дека одлучките се донесуваат согласно историската и психологијата позадина на народите. За да го открие обемот и видот соживотот меѓу кипарските заедници, историчарот мора да ја користи историјата како основен алат затоа што историјата е дисциплина којашто се занимава со случувања од минатото. Уште повеќе, тоа е основниот извор на историското размишување. Ова е процесот за широкото и длабоко разбиранје на историјата којашто ѝ има улога на алатка за разбиране на тековните случувања и предвидување на можностите и веројатностите. Иако многумина го сметаат за непријател на мировниот процес, историското размишување може да биде позитивен придонес во решавање на конфликтите. Зошто? Многу години, христијаните, муслиманите и другите живелеле мирно на Кипар. Еден од проблемите, секако, е што мирот често е прикриван со историографијата со тоа што се нагласува војната и националните победи над

ace and killed the head of Government and eighteen of his guard. A severe tax was imposed for the murder of çil Osman and in 1765 (one year later) çalil Aga led the protest against the rulers of that day. The protesters were Christians, Muslims, and “canvas-cottons.”

Historical research supports peaceful coexistence in Cyprus

One of the main tasks of historians is to provide information on the importance of examining the past without repeating mistakes and of course not before realising that decisions are made according to peoples’ historical and psychological background. To find out the extent and kind of coexistence among the Cypriot communities the historian has to use history as a main tool, because history is the discipline, which deals with events of the past. Moreover, it is the main source of historical thinking. This is the process for a wide and deep understanding of history, which will act as a tool for comprehending current developments and predicting prospective possibilities and probabilities. Though considered by many people as an enemy to the peace process, historical thinking can make a positive contribution towards conflict resolution. Why? For many years Christians, Muslims and others have been living peacefully in Cyprus. One of the problems is indeed that peace is often hidden by historiography through emphasis on wars and national victories over neighbouring countries rather than on long periods of peaceful coexistence. Moreover, children at school do not learn much about the value of coexistence.
At the beginning of the new millennium Nicosia was, and still is, the only divided capital in the world. Recently the UN, under the initiative of Secretary General Coffi Anan, proposed a plan for the solution of Cyprus problem but the Greek majority rejected it mainly due to security and financial reasons. In April 2003 checkpoint restrictions were lifted by Rauf Denktas so that Greeks and Turks could travel to any part of the island. Hundreds of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots visited the previously restricted other side and met old friends. The feelings expressed dissolved the myth that coexistence is not possible.

Factors which promoted symbiosis over the centuries

In order to evaluate the importance of coexistence between Muslims and Christians in Cyprus for the current political developments let us make a quick reference to the important factors which promoted symbiosis over the centuries on the island. These factors are: Cyprus’ Economy and Mixed Labour, the Church under its Ethnarchy role, and the Mixed Marriages.

1. Cyprus’ Economy and Mixed Labour

According to the manuscripts of the Archbishopric’s Archive in Nicosia, the peaceful and creative coexistence and cooperation among Muslims, Orthodox Christians
Christians and other Christian minorities in Cyprus there has been an old and noble tradition. There were no separate economies in Cyprus during the Ottoman period, the British rule, and even after Cyprus’ independence. Christians and Muslims conducted business together and there was no prejudice when it came to one employing the other. According to aforementioned documents this cooperation existed in daily life, in property matters, and at work, for example in mines and in agriculture. Register XLII (of the year 1733), Register XLVI (of 1773) and Register LIII (of 1867) record cases of olive trees, which though planted on Muslim Cypriot property belonged to Christian Cypriots or to the village church. Register LXVIII (of 1892-93) cites expenses of the Archbishop of Cyprus as well as of the famous monastery of Saint Neophytos in Pafos. Here we find a large number of Muslims who worked together with Christians on the farms and gardens of this monastery on equal payment. Register XII reports the distribution of goods (wheat, barley, corn etc.) to Christian and Muslim Cypriots in exchange for sowing. It is worth noting that the distribution is effected exclusively on the extent of land ownership and not on religious adherence. Register CVII (of 1911-1923) records cases of tenants who rent Church property. Tenants are Muslims or Christians or Muslims and Christians together. For example, in Arediou village, Savvas Chatzipanagi, Loizos Petri and Ismael Imbrahim rented Vardalis’ flour-mill which belonged to the Church. This kind of cooperation indicates friendship, trust, shared feelings of justice and social order as well as acceptance of the religious beliefs of the participants, elements, which, according to the documents, seemed to exist in Cyprus. Ronald Jennings refers also to many examples of Mixed Labour between “Dimmi” and Muslims in Cyprus. In his famous book “Christians and Muslims in Ottoman Cyprus and the Mediterranean World, 1571-1640” we find testimonies of collaboration and registers concerning cases of disputes on financial matters.
2. The Church

The Church under its Ethnarchy role is another important factor which promoted coexistence between Muslims and Christians in Cyprus. The Orthodox Church acting as ethnarchy (leader of the nation), was a force recognised by the Ottoman rulers in Cyprus. The latter empowered the Church to exercise leadership of the nation (millet). The “re-establishment” of the Orthodox Church as an independent organisation in 1571 was an important event in the history of Cyprus. Under the guidance of Archbishop Timotheos the Orthodox Church soon redeemed the monasteries annexed or seized by the Turks during the expedition and bought and freely disposed of all kinds of property. In 1589 the Greeks of Larnaka bought back from the Turks the famous church of Saint Lazaros, which the latter had taken at the conquest. From that early year we have the first testimony about the Church’s role in the running of the taxation system: John Villamont states that “each district has its sub-commissary for the Turks while the parish priest represents the Christians.” We speak about a “re-establishment” of the Orthodox Church because this Church had a basic and important role for the Cypriot Christians since the early years of Christianity. Hence, from the point of view of the Greek Orthodox population, nothing changed in the status and character of the Church.
It remained the depository of the national values under foreign rule, and its head kept all the attributes of millet-bashI, national chief. The Church has enjoyed, from early times, the privilege of autocephaly. This privilege was acquired during the reign of Emperor Zeno. The Archbishop’s ethnarchic role in the 17th–18th centuries is reflected, for example, in the visit of Germanos II (1690-1705) to Constantinople on behalf of the râya at a time when the Church and the people of the island suffered a great deal. The Archbishop was the representative of the Cypriot Christians and as such he had to speak with the Sultan about the disorder existing in his country. It is also important in this regard that the family life of the Christian population was governed by the Canon Law of the Orthodox Church. Judges were bishops or priests having authority in marriages and divorce disputes. The role of the Orthodox Church as the leader of the nation (ethnarchy) became even stronger through the Khatti Sheriff of Gülhane (or Khatti Khumayun) reforms promulgated by Sultan Abdul Mejid (19th century). The acquired privileges of the communities were confirmed by the so called Law of Tanzimat. It is a very important enactment because it granted autonomy in the administration of communal affairs to all Christians and other non-Muslim communities living in the Ottoman Empire. British rule in Cyprus was more liberal than Ottoman rule, and this offered wider opportunities for political activity on behalf of the Church, despite the serious encroachments on its civil jurisdiction and privileges. The restrictions imposed by British rule gave rise to an attitude of resistance and defiance, which the Church assimilated to the national cause. Despite a number of drawbacks and disabilities, the Church succeeded in keeping intact the ethnarchic character of its policy, reinvigorated by ill-advised persecutions of its hierarchy by the British government after the abortive rising of the Greek population in 1931. The treaty establishing the independent Republic
and unsuccessful, the church successfully defended its ethnic character on its own initiative when it had a chance to reinforce its old privileged status, supported by the unswerving policy of the British government following its failed rebellion in 1931. The Act of Union for the establishment of an independent Republic of Cyprus afforded an occasion for the Church to reaffirm its old privileged status by means of protective clauses incorporated in the constitution of the new state. Thus the present status of the head of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus as an ethnarch and political chief has been, so to speak, devolved upon him by history.

3. Mixed Marriages

The last factor promoting coexistence is that of Mixed Marriages. Interesting in this regard are the social relations between Cypriot Muslims and Christians in daily life during Ottoman rule: Over time, the proportion of Muslim Cypriots increased. Richard Pococke, who visited the island in 1738, wrote that two thirds of the population was Christian. It is thus evident that the remaining one third was Muslim. According to the same author, a few Maronites and Armenians lived in poverty in Cyprus. Richard Pococke also says that often, Muslim men married Christian women and then husband and wife observed the Christian period of Lent. The point here, is that Islamic Law (Sarî’a) prohibits mixed marriages of Muslim women to Christian men. In contrast, Muslim men are free to marry “kitâbîya women” (Jewish and Christian), because as patriarchs they are responsible for educating their children in the Islamic tradition presenting no danger to the family’s religious beliefs. Many Turkish Cypriots are descended from such fami-

 и неуспеси, црквата успеа да го одржи недопрен карактерот на етнарх што го имала нејзината политика, поткрепена од непромислените гонења на нејзините великодостојни од страна на британската влада по неуспешниот бунт на грчкото население во 1931 година. Спогодбата за основање на независна Република Кипар ја даде можност на црквата да го потврди својот стар привилигиран статус, преку заштитни клаузи вклучени во конституирането на новата држава. Така, може да се каже дека сегашниот статус на поглаварот на православната црква на Кипар како етнарх и политички поглавар му припаднал со историјата.

3. Мешани бракови

Последниот фактор кој промовира соживот се мешаните бракови. Во овој поглед, интересен се социјалните односи помеѓу кипарските муслимани и христијани во секојдневниот живот во времето на отоманската власт: со текот на времето се зголемил срамот на муслуманските Кипрани. Ричард Пококе (Richard Pococke), којшто го посетил островот во 1738 година, напишал дека две третини од населението е христијанско. Така, јасно е дека преостанатата третина биле муслимани. Според истиот автор, на Кипар, во сиромашија, живееле малкумина маронити и Ерменци. Ричард Пококе исто така вели дека муслимани често се женеле за христијанки и во тој случај и мажот и жената го почитувале велигденскиот пост. Поетата е дека исламскиот закон (шеријаштот) забранува мешани бракови на муслимани и христијани. Од друга страна, муслиманите слободно можат да се женат за „кишабиски жени“ (Еврејки и христијанки) затоа што како глава на семејството тие се задолжени
своите деца да ги образуваат во духот на исламската традиција, а нивните жени се интегрираат во нивното муслиманско семејство, не претставуваат опасност за религиозните верувања на семејството. Многумина кипарски Турци потекнуваат од такви семејства (татко муслиман – мајка християнка). Битен момент е што иако двајцата сопруги го почитуваат велигденскиот пост, децата биле воспитувани како муслимани. И двета случаи на мешани бракови со доказ за пријателските општествени односи помеѓу двете групи население. Вилијам Тарнер (William Turner), којшто го посетил Кипар во 1815 година, ги запишал своите искуства: „Има многу муслиманси на островот коишто се регистрирани како муслиман, но кои тајно се християни. Тие го почитуваат постот и дури пијат и вино и јадат свинско без каење – што е неприфатливо однесување за муслимански верници. Тие непрекинето се женат за островските Грки-ки (како християни) бидејќи нивната религија (исламот) дозволува мажите да се оженат за немуслимански жени, но забранува Турчинките да се мажат за немуслиман“.26 Се поставува прашањето како се склучувале овие мешани бракови, бидејќи бракот може да се склучи само според религиозните закони и на секоја од заедниците.27 Муслиманот обично се покрстувал за да може да се венча со християнка во православна црква, но веднаш по прославата исповедале ислям. Имало и случаи во кои християнки прифаќале склучување на бракот по муслиманскиот закон. Во двета случаи еден од сопружниците ги „жртвувал“ барањата на својот религијски закон за да се венча со другиот. Иако овој факт може според строгиот религијски закон да се оценува како „невернички“ чин, од социолошка гледна точка укажува на вековното почитување и добrite односи помеѓу муслиманите и христијаните на Кипар. Фактот што припадниците и на двете заедници од различна

lies (father Muslim - mother Christian). The important thing is that, although married couples observed Lent, their children were brought up as Muslims. Both cases of mixed marriages evidence the friendly social relations between both population groups. William Turner, who visited Cyprus in 1815, wrote down his experiences: “There are many Muslims on the island who are registered as Muslims but who are Christians secretly. They observe Lent and also even drink wine and eat pork without remorse - outrageous behaviour for devout Muslims. They marry uninhibitedly to the island’s Greek women, because their religion (Islam) allows men to marry non-Muslim women yet prohibits Turkish women from marrying non-Muslim men.”26 The question arising is how these mixed marriages were celebrated, as there was only the possibility to celebrate a marriage according to the religious law of each community.27 The Muslim man was usually baptised in order to have his marriage with a Christian woman celebrated in the Orthodox Church but soon after the celebration professed to being Islamic. There were also cases in which the Christian woman accepted the celebration of her marriage according to Muslim Law. In both cases one of the spouses “sacrificed” his/her religious law demands for the sake of getting married to the other. Although this fact could be regarded as an “unfaithful” act by strict religious law, from a sociological point of view it shows the respect and the good relations of Muslim and Christians for centuries in Cyprus. The fact that members of the two communities of different nationality and religion participated in common celebrations and feasts and even married each other constitutes strong evidence of the soundness and sincerity of feelings, which formed the basis for peaceful coexistence.28
A careful examination of the history of Cyprus especially under Ottoman and English rule shows that the basis for a peaceful settlement of the political problem exists. The daily friendship and good collaboration of the inhabitants of the island which existed not only in past could lay the foundations for a present form of coexistence as well. Current political developments need these experiences of symbiosis in order to enable correct political decision making and acceptance of it by the citizens, Turkish or Greek Cypriots. Let us see the main political development of the last two years. In April 2003 checkpoint restrictions were lifted by the Turkish leader Rauf Denktas; this enabled Greeks and Turks to visit any part of the island. In April 2004 a referendum took place across the island: 25% of Turkish Cypriots voted against the Anan Plan, while on the Greek side 76% were against it. In May 2004 Cyprus’ accession to the European Union became a reality. After these events the question which arises is: Cyprus is still divided; what can help in order to achieve coexistence? In what extent can historical thinking and historical coexistence make a positive contribution?
Formation of the two Cypriot divided societies

Although during centuries Muslim and Christians, Turks and Greeks, formed a mixed population all over the island, the attempt of Archbishop Makarios III, in 1963, to modify the Constitution led to clashes. As a consequence Turkish Cypriots were asked to move from mixed villages to Turkish villages and to live away from the Greeks. The first separation of the population took then place. In 1974, a Greek sponsored junta attempt to seize the government was met by military intervention from Turkey, which soon controlled almost 40% of the island. While for the Greeks this was an invasion for the Turks it was an operation towards peace "baris Müdahalesi." Thus, the division of the island, and that of Cyprus’ society as well, became a reality. Thirty years Turks and Greeks had no communication at all, except that of the internet. The educational system has been exposed to propaganda. No common language was practiced. This division showed that coexistence is really been hidden by historiography!

The Anan Plan was an effort to establish a type of democracy for all Cypriots in this divided society. However, it has not been so easy to persuade the majority to approve this plan. Cyprus is not the only country facing these kinds of problems. We have to learn from the others, we have to rethink history and adapt it in the modern modes of conflict management in ethnically divided societies. How can we do this?

According to Sammy Smooha, the actual form of liberal democracy is republican, rather than individual. It emerged in the West after centuries of brutal policies of...
homogenization and assimilation of the resident population through the labor market, public education, mass media, freedom of movement and association, and other means of undermining ethnic diversity. Nation-states imposed a single language and a single culture.\textsuperscript{29} Along with this predominant, liberal-republican form of the democratic nation-state, there is, in the West, another noteworthy form, known as consociational democracy. Found in only several countries – Switzerland, Belgium and Canada – consociational democracies recognize group differences and extend collective rights in addition to individual rights. Smooha notes that consociational democracies allow the intergenerational preservation of cultural communities and function according to the principles of co-nation between majority, minority rights, ethnic autonomy for the minority, proportionality in resource-allocation, power-sharing, veto power that enables the minority to block any decision detrimental to its vital interests, and politics of accommodation, compromise and indecision. For years consociational democracy was ignored until it was conceptualised as an alternative model by Arend Lijphart.\textsuperscript{30} The history of Cyprus experienced coexistence as presented above. It has many positive elements, which can contribute towards establishing a multicultural consociational democracy. The question which comes up is “why multicultural”? One has to keep in mind that Cyprus today is multicultural. Thirty years divided and separated, occupied and away from each other, Turks and Greeks developed their own way of thinking and organizing their communities. The influence by common history, the centuries of symbiosis and collaboration mark this under development “new way of thinking”. All are Cypriots and this is the common denominator, they have the Cypriot culture, which is nearly the same regarding amusement, cooking, family structure, etc. Religion has never been a problem on the island; the Church as Ethnarchy unified and sup-
заедници. Влијанието од заедничката история, вековната симбиоза и соработка се обележа на овој „нов начин на размислување“ којшто е сè уште во развој. Сите се Кипрани и ова е заеднички именител, нивната култура е кипарска, речиси иста во однос на забавувањето, готвењето, семејната структура, итн. Религијата никогаш не била проблем на островот; црквата како етнархија ги соедини и поддржа сите кои живеат на островот. Сепак, по инвазијата многу цркви беа уништени и нови доселеници од Турција го населија северниот дел од островот; повеќето нови доселеници се луѓе кои имаат посилна вера во исламот од кипарските Турци. Сите тие укажуваат на неколку основни разлики во животот коишто ја вклучуваат разликата на јазикот и поскоро говорат за мултикултурно, отколку за моно-културно кипарско општетство.  

Кипар е членка на Европската Унија. И Кипар и Европа па се мултикултурни. Мултикултурализмот предизвикува отвореност, толеранција, междукултурно оплодување, граѓански и малцински права и политика на идентитет; добива различни форми и значења во различни земји. Навистина интересно во оваа смисла е интервјуто на психоаналитичарот Вамик Волкан (Vamik Volkan), кипарски Турчин кој живее во САД, што го направи Симон Бахчели (Simon Bahceli) за прашањата на кипарскиот проблем и идентитетот на Кипраните. Тој смета дека најголемиот проблем за турските Кипрани е проблемот на идентитет. „Не сме Турци, но не сме дел од Турција“. Немаме некој вистински назив, и крајниот резултат е чувството на болка. Волкан вели дека оваа збунетост е производ на 30 години ембарго и изолација. Тој додава дека големината на проблемот може да се разбере во контекст на фактот дека турските Кипрани, гласајќи „за“ планот на Аnan, беа подготвени да ги загубат своите домови и земјата што ја поседувале 30 години, во за-

Cyprus is a member of the European Union. Cyprus and Europe are both multicultural. Multiculturalism invokes openness, tolerance, intercultural fertilization, civil and minority rights, and the politics of identity; it takes different forms and meanings in different countries. Very interesting in this regard is the interview of a Turkish Cypriot psychoanalyst living in the United States, Vamik Volkan, given to Simon Bahceli regarding the Cyprus problem and the identity of the Cypriots. He thinks that the biggest problem for the Turkish Cypriots is the problem of identity. “We are Turks, but not part of Turkey. We have no real title, and the end result is a feeling of hurt.” Volkan says this confusion is a product of 30 years of embargoes and isolation. He adds the magnitude of the problem can be understood in the context of the fact that Turkish Cypriots, in voting “yes” to the Anan Plan, were willing to lose their homes and lands of the last 30 years in exchange for an identity. “There is no Greek Cypriot identity without considering the Turks,” he says, explaining “there was fantastic cooperation between...
Identities

mena za identitet. „Ne postoi identitet na grčki Kipranin bez da se zemat predvid Turcite“, veli toj, objasnuvaјki, „имаше fantastična соработка помеђу турските и грчките заедници пред Грчката војна за независност и модерниот грчки идентитет заснован врз гворициране на востанието, кој бил формиран потоа“.

Vo радвоените општества исто така во голема мера е значаен проблемот на несигурност. Во кипарскиот случај ова е една од причините за грчкото мношинство да гласа против Планот Анан. Поместувањето од војна во мир повлекува голем степен на несигурност. Јаков Бар-Симан-Тов (Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov) тврди дека првата причина за несигурност е недостигот на информации и искуство во однос на двете настанати ситуации и условите на поместување од војна во мир. Додека претходно непријателските страни беа сигурни во однос на војната, тие се помалку сигурни во однос на мирот, особено кога немаат такво искуство во нивните односи. Втората причина за несигурноста е недостигот на општо познавање потребно за проценување на очекуваните резултати од мировните односи. Перед референдумот за планот на Анан, на Кипар многумина протестираа дека имаат малку информации за тоа што ќе се случи по признањето на Планот, додека пак други тврдеа дека не се сигURNи дали оваа нова институција, „федералната влада на Кипар“ ќе може да ги обезбеди правата на сите граѓани на ист начин. Од друга страна, никој не тврдеше дека Грците и Турците немаат мировно искуство во нивниот однос, а тоа се должеше на долготраjnatата симбиоза на двете заедници. Миротворството е секогаш ризична работа. Сепак, како што вели Јаков Бар-Симан-Тов, поради добrite односи кои двете главни заедници ги имале со години, во нашиот случај работите не се чинат како многу компликувани.

Turkish and Greek communities before the Greek War of Independence and the subsequent, modern Greek identity based on the glorification of that uprising.”

The problem of uncertainty is also quite important in divided societies. In the case of Cyprus this was one of the reasons for the Greek majority to vote against the Anan Plan. A shift from war to peace often entails a high level of uncertainty. Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov argues that the first cause of uncertainty is the lack of information and experience concerning both the situation at hand and the conditions of shifting from war to peace. Whereas formerly the rival sides were certain about war, they are less certain about peace, especially when they have had no experience of peace in their relationship. The second cause of uncertainty is the lack of general knowledge needed for assessing the expected outcomes of peace relations.33 Before the referendum on the Anan Plan in Cyprus many people protested that they had little information on what was going to happen after accepting the Plan whereas others claimed they were not sure whether this new institution, “the federal government of Cyprus” would be able to secure the rights of all citizens in the same way. On the other hand nobody claimed that Greeks and Turks had no experience of peace in their relationship, due to the long symbiosis of the two communities. Peacemaking is always a risk-taking affair. However, as Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov put it, in our case things seem not to be very complicated, because of the good relations the two main communities have had over the centuries.
Notes:

1. Background: Independence from the UK was approved in 1960 with constitutional guarantees by the Greek Cypriot majority to the Turkish Cypriot minority. It is important to note here that in the constitution of 1960 there was no reference to a “majority/minority community” but to “Turkish/Greek community.” In 1974, a Greek sponsored junta attempt to seize the government was met by military intervention from Turkey, which soon controlled almost 40% of the island. In 1983, the Turkish-held area declared itself the “Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus,” but only Turkey recognizes it. UN led direct talks between the two sides to reach a comprehensive settlement to the division of the island began in January 2002. See http://www.greatestcities.com/Middle_East/Cyprus.html

2. The national censuses conducted under British rule spoke of Mohammedan or Moslem inhabitants or Christian inhabitants of Cyprus, and not of “Turkish Cypriots.” Towards the end of the British rule, however, the terms “Greek Cypriots” and “Turkish Cypriots” were usual. See A. Pavlides, “Tourcocyprioi” (Turkish Cypriots), Megale Kypriake Egyklopedia, XIII, Nicosia 1990, 113f. I use the term Muslim/Christian in order to highlight the role of religion on coexistence in Cyprus. In addition, the communities are called according to their religious adherence and not according to their ethnic difference.


4. As Jenkins notes “history is a shifting, problematic discourse, ostensibly about an aspect of the world, the past, that is produced by a group of present-minded workers...
who go about their work in mutually recognisable ways that are epistemologically, methodologically, ideologically and practically positioned.” Keith Jenkins, *Re-thinking History* (London: Redwood Books, 1942), 26. Another related question is “what is the status of truth in the discourses of history and why do we need truth?” In our time truth is a self-referencing figure of speech, incapable of accessing the phenomenal world: word and object for this reason, remain separate. To quote Foucault “truth is produced by virtue of multiple forms each society has as ‘general politics’ of truth.” M. Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* (New York: Pantheon, 1981), 131.


6. In Greek Katastichon. The secretarial materials which have survived in the Archbishopric’s Archive include very important Registers such as the Megas Kodex (Great Codex) and the Ktematicos Kodex (Property Codex), and a large amount of other documents of great significance. These Registers include categories of documents such as: Registers of yearly revenues of the Sea, from churches and monasteries of the dioceses such as Reg. XXVIII (1821-1857), Registers of ecclesiastic property in whole kazas or villages or towns such as Reg. XLII (1733-1744), Reg. XLVI (1777-1779), Reg. XLV (1772-1833) also including some records of Marriage Licenses etc., Registers of Expenses such as Reg. XXXIV, Registers of rents such as Reg. XI, and others. Though a small section of this Archive has already been used in philological and historical treatises as testimony, its vast majority remains unpublished, and much has still to be done before its satisfactory utilisation in research.

8. Register LXVIII, 4, 16, 20, 26, 30.

9. This Register has no date. From the way it is written it seems to date back to the end of 18th century.

10. Register XII, 21, 22, 26, 36, 60, 62, 80, 92.


12. It would be beyond the scope and purposes of this article to refer to all Registers of this famous Archive.

13. They belonged to the Islamic State as “protected” non-Muslim citizens. They are followers of a “by revelation religion,” mainly Christianity and Judaism. Due to their origin their children acquired their parents’ legal status. Even in case of marriage of one “immî” to an alien woman, the latter acquired her husband’s status. Initially the status of “immî” was enacted under a treaty between Christian and Judaic communities and Muslims according to which the latter were obliged to have under their protection (imma) the “immî”, who should pay tribute - gizya (Turkish: “cizye”) in order to have residence in the Islamic state and protection from hostile attacks without serving in the Islamic army. See Bat Ye’or, The Dhimmi, Jews and Christians under Islam (London: Associated University Presses, 2001), 52-59: H. Löschner, Staatsangehörigkeit und Islam (Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1971), 22f.: K. A.El-Fadl, “Islamic Law and Muslim Minorities: The Juristic Discourse on Muslim Minorities from the second/eighth to the eleventh/seventeenth Centuries,” Islamic Law and Society 1 (1994), Nr. 2, 141-143: H. Kruse, Das Staatsangehörigkeitsrecht der arabischen Staaten (Frankfurt a.M., 1955), 13.

15. Ethnarchy is a Greek compound word consisting of the Greek words “ethnos” (nation) and “archo” (to act as a leader).


17. The power of the Orthodox Church was reduced owing to the dominating role of the Latin Church during Venetian rule.


19. During the reign of Emperor Zeno the autocephaly (juridical independancy) of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus was disputed by the Patriarch of Antiochia. Though Archbishop Anthemios defended his Church’s independency, there was no official recognition by the Emperor. At that time assistance came from a most strange and unexpected event. A cave was found, in which there was a chest containing the remains of the Apostle Barnabas, with a copy of St. Matthew’s Gospel in Barnabas’ own handwriting, where it had been placed by Mark. Even the most sceptical could
no longer doubt that the Church of Cyprus was equally as apostolic as that of Antioch, and, therefore, of equal rank. Overjoyed at the discovery Anthemios set off at once with the precious relics to Constantinople, where he reported the occurrence, and requested the Emperor’s protection against the Patriarch’s tyranny. Zeno, due to this discovery, confirmed the autocephaly of Cypriot Church and conferred upon the Cypriot natives certain privileges, which have been most jealously guarded ever since. Among others they received the right of signing in red ink, a mark of distinction otherwise only enjoyed by the Emperors, wearing a purple cloak at the festivals of the Church, and carrying an imperial sceptre in place of the ordinary pastoral stall. See J. Hackett, A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus (New York: Burt Franklin, 1972), 23ff.


22. See Excerpta Cypria, cit., 269.


24. Koran 5, 5.


27. Only in the 20th century do we have the first civil legislation regarding mixed marriages in Cyprus. See G. Serghides, cit., 29ff.


31. The “campaign” for multiculturalism has mainly developed in Western democratic societies, where the central question has been: How is it possible to respond to the demands by minority groups for equality and the preservation of their cultural uniqueness, while giving primacy to the
Divided Cultures or Divided Societies?


32. He was born in Cyprus in 1934 but moved to the US in the 1960s. He is emeritus professor of psychiatry and founder of the Centre for the Study of Mind and Human Interaction (CSMHI) at the University of Virginia. He does not analyse individuals – he analyses peoples in a lifelong study on what makes them do stupid things in the name of their countries, tribes or blood. The interview was published in the Sunday Mail, July 25, Nicosia 2004, 6.