# Constructive Imperialism, Experts and Crisis in Colonial Cyprus

# Constructive Imperialism, Experts and Crisis in Colonial Cyprus

By

Serkan Karas

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

## Chapter 2

## Chapter 4

## Chapter 5

# LIST OF MAPS

## Chapter 2

# LIST OF PLANS

## Chapter 3

## Chapter 4

# Chapter 5

# LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS

## Chapter 3

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To begin with, I am much indebted to my parents, Fatma and Hüseyin, for their support. They have backed me unconditionally in all my educational and professional decisions, which also led to the writing of this book.

Much of the research in this book took place during the years of crisis that began in 2008. That's why I owe much to people who motivated me to keep on track in sometimes rather very difficult years. I thank to my cousin Eylem and her partner Ismail for bearing with me and giving me a room whenever I needed. I also especially thank my good friends Zafer Tandogdu and Anastasia Kopsautopoulou, for just being themselves.

I also thank Kostas Gavroglou, Stathis Arapostathis, Michalis Michael, Vincent Lagendijk, Erik van der Vleuten, Per Högselius, Nikos Moudouros, Graeme Gooday, Grigoris Ioannou, Nikos Trimikliniotis and Paul Strong for their intellectual and practical contributions into my research.

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AKEL    (Ανορθωτικό Κόμμα Εργαζόμενου Λαού/ Progressive Party of Working People)
CA    (Crown Agents)
CE    (Consulting Engineers)
CGR    (Cyprus Government Railway)
CO    (Colonial Office)
CS    (Chief Secretary or Colonial Secretary)
EAC    (Electricity Authority of Cyprus)
EOKA    (Εθνική Οργάνωσις Κυπρίων Αγωνιστών/ National Organisation of Cypriot Fighters))
HC    (High Commissioner)
LDF    (Locust Destruction Fund)
LTS    (Large Technical Systems)
PEO    (Παγκύπρια Εργατική Ομοσπονδία / Pancyprian Federation of Labour)
SoS    (Secretary of State for the Colonies)
STS    (Science, Technology and Society)
TMT    (Türk Mukavemet Teşkilatı/ Turkish Resistance Organisation)

# INTRODUCTION

For a long time, the historiography of Cyprus had been overwhelmed by accounts of political events, national leaders, Greek–Turkish nationalisms and international relations. Much of this effort had been an attempt to give a meaning to the contemporary political condition, i.e. the de facto dichotomy of the island. Despite older generations' professional denial of history's utilisation for non-academic ends, the effect of their product did not fall short in serving political ends. History was expected either to deconstruct or consolidate the official nationalistic narratives of the island's peoples and the status quo. Only since the late 2000s has a new dynamic emerged in the field, thanks to a new generation of historians equipped with a diverse set of analytical tools, perspectives and archival sources. Within this generation, the colonial period has so far attracted a special interest, which does not come as a surprise. The professional territory of only a handful of scholars, and much popular speculation, the colonial period had remained and still remains mostly underexplored, still waiting to be socially and academically appreciated for its radical legacy in today's society, culture and politics. Amongst the period's main scholars, we can roughly discriminate two generations of historical works that are systematic in approach rather than mostly self-serving case studies. Prior to the new generation, the colonial period had been marked by a handful of classic works which are still used as reference sources.[1] Chronologically, Georghallides's works on the 1914–1931 period had long stood as a unique instance of systematic reading of the colonial history. The analytical extent and the use of genuine historical data had for some time influenced the Cyprus historiography. Nevertheless, his historical approach remained mainly within the Greek Cypriot national perspective, while his account of historical change was attributed mainly to the struggles between the local political elites, as representatives of Turkish and Greek nationalisms, and the British colonial administrators. Economic grievances and nationalist

---

[1] I am not going to refer to the work of Hill despite it being a much-used reference book. Besides its function as reference book, especially for British colonial archives, the book is valuable for representing the official British account of the island's colonial rule. George Hill, *A History of Cyprus. Vol. 4: The Ottoman Province, the British Colony, 1571-1948* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

interest had been the key tools for this reading.[2] Rolandos Katsiaounis's emblematic work *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century* [3] represents a methodological turn from the analyses of high politics to social history, unravelling the bios of the labouring and peasant classes. In this arduous work, the reader finds an analysis of social classes and hierarchies; the socio-economic toll of the British-introduced modernisation of the basic state functions upon labouring classes, and the social backlash against the traditional institutions during the last decades of the 19th century. His contribution to the historiography of Cyprus is essentially the systematic unearthing of the structural socio-political and economic crisis of the early-British colonial period.[4] In relation to this crisis, Rebecca Bryant's anthropological study of the nationalisms in Cyprus can also be considered a key historical work besides its main focus on the anthropology of nationalisms in Cyprus. *Imagining the Modern* painstakingly presents us with the construction of Greek and Turkish nationalisms within the island as products of the modernisation project initiated by the British colonial rule. The book focuses on the ways of (re)producing visions of freedom, especially through the makings of communal education and politics. For the historian, the historiographical significance of the book lies in its localisation of the colonial experience, which also gives agency to the local actors in the production of political authorities and hierarchies.[5]

        In the last decade or so a new wave of historiography has been emerging, creating a further impetus towards the study of the colonial period in particular. While there is a rise in the number of case studies, there has been only a handful of comprehensive studies trying to tackle certain themes

---

[2] George Georgallides. S, *A Political and Administrative History of Cyprus, 1918-1926: With a Survey of the Foundations of British Rule* (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre, 1979); George Georghallides. S., *Cyprus and the Governorship of Sir Ronald Storrs: The Causes of the 1931 Crisis* (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre, 1985).

[3] Rolandos Katsiaounis, *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century.* Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus 24. (Nicosia: Scientific Research Centre of Cyprus, 1996b)

[4] Katsiaounis' second book also remains a rare work on the critical episode of the late colonial period when the last political attempt of the British administration to reproduce consent from the political elite of the G/C and T/C communities on the prolongation of the colonial regime following the Second World War. Rolandos Katsiaounis, *Η διασκεπτική 1946-1948: με ανασκόπηση της περιόδου 1878-1945* [The Consultative Assembly 1946-1948 with a review of the period 1878-1948] (Cyprus Research Centre, 2000).

[5] Rebecca Bryant, *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004).

of the colonial period. Thus, the historiography of colonial Cyprus has begun timidly to acquire stories of institutions, cultures and a variety of socio-political actors as central units of analysis. While the aforementioned classic writings remain essential, a new cadre of historians, mainly of Greek Cypriot origin, are producing these new understandings of colonial Cyprus. Andrekos Varnava's contributions to the early colonial period of Cyprus have been considerable gain for the field. His first flagship work, *The Inconsequential Possession,* helped to demystify many myths and beliefs about Cyprus's occupation and possession by the British. He did so by contrasting the imperial imaginations and expectations about Cyprus's potential as a geopolitical asset with the socio-economic and geographic realities of Cyprus's locality. The book successfully illustrates the rather swift way Cyprus became an inconsequential possession, a pawn in the hands of the British Empire. While *The Inconsequential Possession* is occupied with a period that has already attracted some scholars' attention, as referred to above, his next two books set sail into the less familiar waters of the Great War period.[6] *Serving the Empire* reveals a forgotten episode of Cypriot history and its actors: the Cypriot volunteer muleteers and mules who took part in the war effort of the British Empire in the Great War. The book delivers a fresh look at the social context, which saw the most significant participation from a colony in proportion to its population (at one point 25% of the male population). Its historiographical contribution lies not only in documenting the relations and co-existence of Christian and Muslim muleteers (and mules) in the circumstance of the war. The book ascertains that this experience did not possess a space in the public consciousness, either as a result of poor appreciation of the Cypriot war efforts by the British or the inconvenience of a common struggle of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots for the respective nationalist narratives dominating the communities.[7] In his latest book, Varnava deepens the analysis of the Great War period and further explores its afterlife within Cypriot society. The reader finds a broad analysis of multiple social, political and economic forces in action within the society which, in an innovative way, is modelled along broader class lines.[8] Alexis Rappas's *Cyprus in the 1930s: British Colonial Rule and the Roots of the Cyprus Conflict* comes as a gift to the

---

[6] Andrekos Varnava, *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009).

[7] Andrekos Varnava, *Serving the Empire in the Great War: The Cypriot Mule Corps, Imperial Loyalty and Silenced Memory*, *Serving the Empire in the Great War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017).

[8] Andrekos Varnava, *British Cyprus and the Long Great War, 1914-1925: Empire, Loyalties and Democratic Deficit* (London: Routledge, 2019).

Cyprus historiography of the interwar period, which was traditionally recalled as the "Palmerocracy", i.e. the Palmerian Dictatorship. The book focuses on the aftermath of the 1931 riots and British efforts to eradicate enosis and enosis-like nationalisms. Rappas reveals in detail the Palmerian campaign of social and political engineering with an emphasis on education, the strengthening of the administration through delegation of power to districts and sustaining a vigorous police state. Rappas successfully demonstrates to the reader another chapter of the British colonial practices in the island, i.e. social engineering schemes, which throughout the 82 years of their presence relied on practices both repetitive and either locally distinct, innovative or informed from abroad. The reader also finds a convincing interpretation of the surge of nationalists, but also communists, in the immediate post-war period.[9]

The above works have been unique in their robust and systematic study of the politics, society and economics in particular periods of colonial Cyprus. There are also other historians who touched upon the colonial history from a thematic or institutional approach with a Greek Cypriot, sometimes national, perspective.[10] Amongst these, Yiannos Katsourides' *The History of the Communist Party in Cyprus: Colonialism, Class and the Cypriot Left* is a rare example in Cypriot colonial historiography that tells the history of a significant institution, the Communist Party of Cyprus, and also avoids official Greek nationalist narratives. The book's main concern is the party's long process of foundation, formation and organisation under colonial rule. However, the book does not detail the party's entanglement

---

[9] Alexis Rappas, *Cyprus in the Thirties: British Colonial Rule and the Roots of the Cyprus Conflict* (London: I.B.Tauris, 2014).

[10] Antigone Heraclidou's *Imperial Control in Cyprus: Education and Political Manipulation in the British Empire* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2017) focuses exclusively on the impact of the British educational reforms and policies upon Greek Cypriot nationalist politics and identity in the post-1931 period. Within a total absence of Turkish Cypriots, the book goes into detail to analyse and describe the many ways the enosis movement was (re)produced in the structures of Greek Cypriot education. Despite the overwhelming nationalist perspective, the book can be a reference for some of the unravelled aspects of education and political relations concerning the enosis movement. Anastasia Yiangou's *Cyprus in World War II: Politics and Conflict in the Eastern Mediterranean* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2012) falls into the same category of Greek nationalist historiography. Bearing in mind the obvious pro-enosis stance of the writer, the book can be treated as an account of party politics and enosis movements as it took place in the World War II period.

with various social networks, classes and political elites while it attempts to analyse the cultures produced within the party.[11]

The book you are holding places itself in this new wave of colonial historiography of Cyprus. As such, I want to propose a new perspective in understanding for the particulars of British–Cypriot encounters. Therefore, the motivation behind this book is mainly concerned with giving a meaning to the colonial experience and revealing some of its legacies. It aspires to tell a history of Cyprus by locating technology, here as infrastructures, in the epicentre of its analysis. However, the reader should not expect stories that are interested in the detailed documentation of technical aspects of infrastructures, as if they have been built in a social void and are free of values, visions and ideologies. The reader will also not find engineers speaking of rational technical choices and universal reason. I am interested in telling the stories of British colonialism and governance in Cyprus in times of socio-political and economic crisis that have been mostly lacking the material dimension. Therefore, the book will not only be about electric networks, harbour designs and railway lines, but also British imperial politics, colonial governance and local networks of power. The reader is invited to an account of the history where the material (i.e. technology) and social (i.e. politics, power and colonialism) cannot be treated as distinct and separate domains. In this account, a variety of political actors design, debate, contest and construct technologies (here, infrastructures of energy and transportation) either in a strategic manner or because of contingent development of events, with an aim to (re)define relations of political power and thus reproduce the colonial regime in early and late colonial Cyprus. While doing so, the book is also seeking to affiliate itself with new approaches in the understanding of state, power and modernity.[12] I believe that colonial Cyprus offers a modest setting and complexity to test such out of the ordinary conceptualisations concerning the foundational elements of today's societies. Accordingly, as I will show below, the book applies a specifically designed framework of analytical tools and categories in order

---

[11] Yiannos Katsourides, *The Greek Cypriot Nationalist Right in the Era of British Colonialism: Emergence, Mobilisation and Transformations of Right-Wing Party Politics* (Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2017).
[12] See Patrick Carroll, *Science, Culture, and Modern State Formation* (University of California Press, 2006); Mitchell, Timothy, *Carbon Democracy: Political Power in the Age of Oil*, 2nd Revised edition edition (London: Verso Books, 2013); Timothy Mitchell, *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*, First edition (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Sheila Jasanoff, *States of Knowledge: The Co-Production of Science and the Social Order* (London: Routledge, 2004).

to speak to various audiences ranging from historians of Cyprus and technology to political scientists.

## Materiality and Colonial Governance

By focusing on technologies through their design, construction and enactment part and parcel to the (re)production of colonial governance in Cyprus, I suggest employing technopolitics as a privileged viewpoint for the history of Cyprus in the late 19th and mid-20th century. Unearthing the co-construction of infrastructures and the colonial setting in the island, I can stress the roles and agencies of imperial politicians/administrators (e.g. Joseph Chamberlain), institutions (e.g. Colonial Office, Crown Agents), local political authorities, engineers and local communities. Thus, historical reconstruction gains complexity, plurality of agents and, I believe, a more nuanced completeness. Strategically, I focus on the times of crisis for British colonialism in Cyprus in two periods, 1898–1905 and 1943–1959. To this end, I propose a concept, critical episodes, which emphasises the importance of studying instances when a technopolitical system's integrity has been structurally challenged, transformed or reconfigured, whether in the course of short-term events or long-term processes. It is in these instances the actors **perceive crisis** and begin to frame the reasons and methods for its resolution according to their interests, visions and ideologies. These are favourable instances for the historian who seeks to locate and analyse interconnected processes of infrastructure making and (re)production of the political structures in terms of state and networks of power.

Being a historian of technology, I use conceptual frameworks and analytical tools from the new historiography of colonial/postcolonial studies of science and technology. I follow approaches that place emphasis on the of the ways in which the design characteristics of technological infrastructures were shaped in the dynamic context of imperial, colonial and local politics.[13] Consequently, my broad historiographic agenda is to focus

---

[13] See Sandra Harding. *The Postcolonial Science and Technology Studies Reader* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011); Warwick Anderson, 'From Subjugated Knowledge to Conjugated Subjects: Science and Globalisation, or Postcolonial Studies of Science?', *Postcolonial Studies*, 12.4 (2009), 389–400; Suzanne Moon. "Place, Voice, Interdisciplinarity: Understanding Technology in the Colony and Postcolony", *History and Technology,* 26(3) (2010): 189–201. Anderson`s postcolonial critique of STS theories can also be found in Anderson, Warwick, "Pramoedya's Chickens: Postcolonial Studies of Technoscience". In Hackett, Edward J., Olga Amsterdamska, Michael Lynch, and Judy Wajcman. *The Handbook*

on how technical issues translated into politics and political agendas, and vice versa. Theoretically, I owe much to the emerging literature on technopolitics, which has been profoundly inspired by the early works of Timothy Mitchell and Gabrielle Hecht. Within the historiography of technology, a significant volume of research has been interested in the question of how politically, socially and culturally biased human choices have given shape and pace to technological design and development.[14] Furthermore, historians' insights into the construction of technology, whether through political, social or cultural biases, have been highly refined. Despite this, there had been a missing element in the analytical gaze: a co-constructive attention to the role of technology in the construction of politics itself. In this book, I try to show that, through such a gaze, the history of technology can relate to, enrich and/or contest mainstream political history by offering a sounder analytical equilibrium between the human and material aspects of our societies.

Technopolitics refers to the hybridity of power, politics and technology. Gabrielle Hecht[15] defines it as the "strategic practice of designing

---

*of Science and Technology Studies*. 3rd ed. (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2007), 181-204.

[14] Thomas Parke Hughes. *Networks of Power: Electrification in Western Society, 1880–1930* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983); Erik van der Vleuten and Arne Kaijser, eds. *Networking Europe: Transnational Infrastructures and the Shaping of Europe, 1850–2000* (USA, Science History Publications, 2006); Vincent Lagendijk. *Electrifying Europe: The Power of Europe in the Construction of Electricity Networks*. 1st edn (Amsterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers, 2014); David E. Nye, *Electrifying America: Social Meanings of a New Technology, 1880–1940*. (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1992); Frank Schipper and Johan Schot. "Infrastructural Europeanism, or the Project of Building Europe on Infrastructures: An Introduction", *History and Technology,* 27(3) (2011): 245–64; Arne Kaijser and Marika Hedin, eds. *Nordic Energy Systems: Historical Perspectives and Current Issues* (Canton, MA: Science History Publications, 1995).

[15] In her most renowned work, Hecht focuses on the history of French nuclear power during the 1950s and 1960s. She avoids answering questions like what was French about the French nuclear programme, and rather chooses to tell us the relation between definitions of Frenchness and engineering choices. Engineering choices were part of a struggle to define Frenchness in times of diminishing French global influence and a humbled national pride. Technical prowess was a solution for regaining national pride in a peaceful way. Hecht narrates a story in which engineers tied nuclear technology and national identity into the fabric of reactor design and management; workers strengthened these links in labour unionism and workplace culture; neighbours perceived these as symbols of changes occurring in their local social economy. The foundational question answered in the book is what kind of a picture emerges if all aspects of the life of a technology are studied. See Introduction

or using technology to enact political goals".[16] The way Hecht uses this term does not imply that such practices are politics by another name. She notes that the material, artefactual forms of technologies matter fundamentally to their success and shape the ways these hybrid systems "act upon the world".[17] On the other hand, Timothy Mitchell[18] offers another definition for "technopolitics", placing emphasis on the unpredictable power effects of technological designs and assemblages, i.e. "the unintentional effects of the (re)distribution of agency that they enacted".[19] Mitchell likens technopolitics to an alloy whose ingredients are "both human and nonhuman, both intentional and not, and in which the intentional or the human is always somewhat overrun by the unintended". He claims that the particularity of the way this amalgamation[20] between things and ideas is done causes the perception of the "realm of intentions" to prevail.[21]

---

and Conclusion, Gabrielle Hecht, *The Radiance of France: Nuclear Power and National Identity after World War II* (New edition, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009).

[16] Agatha C. Hughes, Michael Thad Allen and Gabrielle Hecht, *Technologies of Power: Essays in Honour of Thomas Parke Hughes and Agatha Chipley Hughes*. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001)*,* 14.

[17] Hughes, Allen and Hecht, *Technologies of Power,* 14; Gabrielle Hecht, ed., *Entangled Geographies: Empire and Technopolitics in the Global Cold War*. 1st edn. (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2011), 3.

[18] This rich book explores the transition of Egypt that was experienced through construction projects affecting the Nile, irrigation schemes, agriculture technologies and warfare. Mitchell's is a work of political theory, involving themes like social calculation, agency, abstraction, violence, law, capitalism and expertise. See Mitchell, *Rule of Experts*.

[19] Hecht, *Entangled Geographies,* 3.

[20] "The world out of which technopolitics emerged was an unresolved and prior combination of reason, force, imagination, and resources. Ideas and technology did not precede this mixture as pure forms of thought brought to bear upon the messy world of reality. They emerged from the mixture and were manufactured in the processes themselves." Mitchell, *Rule of Experts,* 52.

[21] Mitchell, *Rule of Experts,* 43. Technopolitics, as a notion, remains more fluid rather than coined and rigid. Even Gabrielle Hecht, in "The Power of Nuclear Things", uses it more flexibly than its initial coinage as politically strategic design. While trying to understand patterns in the shaping of nuclear networks, nuclearity and markets in relation to Africa, Hecht employs the notion more expansively, as "distribution of power in material things and symbolic circulations". See Gabrielle Hecht, "The Power of Nuclear Things." *Technology and Culture,* 51 (1) (2010): 1–30; Gabrielle Hecht, *Being Nuclear Africans and the Global Uranium Trade* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012).

Thus, throughout the book, I will handle technologies as designs and assemblages of humans and non-humans brought together during periods of crisis for the colonial governance. Though I seek to bring the material into our reading of this history, it would still carry an abstract feeling if I do not name or point to agents or actors. Thus, I need to ask questions such as: how did these assemblages come together? Who was responsible or in a position to initiate processes of design, enactment, contestation and construction? Whose actions and debates should I follow? The answer to these questions is not only methodological but also part of the book's aim since they lead us to point to the "colonialist", "the Cypriot", etc. – flesh-and-blood people. Throughout the book, I will focus on debates and discussions around infrastructures and designs tracing ideologies, political and economic interests and visions. It is in these processes that I will find the actions and words of "system builders" – a terminology adopted from the Large Technical Systems literature. So, who are these "system builders"? These are "privileged actors" who hold advantageous positions in the design and decision-taking process; they are the ones who possess more power than those belonging to various established networks of power, mostly local. In a hierarchical society, and especially in a colonised one, there are strong hierarchies of power to influence decision-taking but this does not mean a top-down imposition of the decision by the "privileged", whose perceptions and intentions about the world are often confronted with social reality and nature, and forced to be negotiated.

In the first instance, people staffing the colonial and imperial cadres – e.g. the Cyprus administration, Colonial Office, Treasury or the British Parliament – are the obvious privileged actors. However, postcolonial studies have since taught us to study the provincialisation of the "universal" reason, the description of "alternative modernities" That is to say, the technological and scientific assemblages are materialised in local contexts. The global is produced in a locality; transnational processes of displacement and reconfiguration, fragmentation and hybridity are multi-sited, where the "centre" is just another node in the network. Furthermore, this book is not concerned with technology as "an instrument of power relations" or "politics by other means" but rather a cultural space of historical materialisation of various forms of interaction and exchange.[22] Now the historians of the colonial are interested not only in the ways the technology was appropriated and sabotaged in order to favour various colonial groups, but also, more fundamentally, in the ways technology and power were co-produced, each

---

[22] Warwick Anderson, "Introduction: Postcolonial Technoscience." *Social Studies of Science*, 32 (5/6) (2002): 651–652; David Arnold, "Europe, Technology, and Colonialism in the 20th Century." *History and Technology*, 21 (1) (2005): 87.

shaping the other in important ways. Technological controversies or discourses around new technologies offer not only more analytical depth but also reveal local actors and most importantly local networks of power. In short, this book is not only about the British actors but also Cypriots – e.g. metropolitan petite bourgeoisie, leaders of nationalist movements, members of the Legislative Council – who debated, consented and/or contested, and thus actively shaped, the various infrastructural schemes of the British colonial establishment in the island. The final category of privileged actors are the so-called experts who are mainly engineers either working privately, contracted or employed by the Cyprus administration or the British government. Experts are mostly out of the public eye, which is why they can also escape the historian's gaze. Though while they are often hidden from the public eye, the actions and ideas of experts are highly performative. However, expert involvement in decision-making processes can shape not only policies but also structures of power. Experts mainly shape decisions in a performative manner through their perception of problems and solutions – they frame the problems and design the solutions accordingly. Besides being a highly value-laden process, the framing of problems and design of solutions directly play a role in the legitimisation of aspect of politics, ideologies, and visions. Furthermore, in addition to the legitimisation of other actors' politics, experts' authority resulting from the strong social belief and acceptance of their technocratic ideals can be utilised by other actors to impose their positions on others. Last, the agency of the expert can also be that of a mediator, where they can translate values, ideas and intentions within technologies that they are called upon to design and construct. As in the cases in this book, the expertise is mostly called upon as practical knowledge for decision-making processes to design the best course of action in solving problems. While it provides legitimisation to certain choices, in many cases it becomes part of the political power games between competing or conflicting sides.[23]

---

[23] Hecht, Radiance of France ; Mitchell, *Rule of Experts;* Martin Kohlrausch and Helmuth Trischler, *Building Europe on Expertise: Innovators, Organizers, Networkers* (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2014); , Harry M. Collins and Trevor Pinch, *The Golem: What You Should Know About Science* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Brian Wynne, 'Misunderstood Misunderstanding: Social Identities and Public Uptake of Science', *Public Understanding of Science*, 1.3 (1992), 281–304; Sheila Jasanoff, *Designs on Nature: Science and Democracy in Europe and the United States* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005); Reiner Grundmann, 'The Problem of Expertise in Knowledge Societies', *Minerva*, 55.1 (2017), 25–48; Reiner Grundmann and Nico Stehr, *The Power of Scientific*

## The book

This book analyses four cases of infrastructure development projects that had been imagined as remedies for the British administration's crisis of governance and consent in Cyprus. There are two periods when the British administration sought intensively to (re)produce the conditions for the continuance of the colonialist governance structure through large-scale developmental infrastructure projects. These cases will show how governing Cyprus comprised not only legislative and regulatory measures but also setting materially (i.e. infrastructures) appropriate political, economic and security regimes. In addition to Chapter 1, within each chapter the reader will find references to the historical context, which helps us to elaborate on certain threads between the actions and ideas of the actors and the particularities of the four case studies. This will also serve as an aid to the reader who is not familiar with the history and historiography of colonial Cyprus. Thus, the reader can have a sense of the basic characteristics of the British rule and regime; policies of the British Empire for the colonies; political, economic and social episodes; influential figures of power and wealth on the island; and important issues concerning daily life. Chapter 2 is concerned with the construction of the first and only railway on the island in the framework of the Colonial and Development Welfare Act 1899. The history of the making of this railway has two parts. First, it is concerned with the making of the Famagusta–Nicosia line. The reader may find an informative part that traces back old discussions on constructing a railway in Cyprus. Subsequently they are informed about Joseph Chamberlain's legacy in the colonial development policy and the choice of Cyprus as part of its enterprise. The railway comes into the picture as a part of a certain perception regarding economic and agricultural development. The second part of the chapter is concerned with the construction of the railway in which the issue of the Larnaca Branch becomes the main theme of friction. By focusing on the debates regarding the inclusion/exclusion of Larnaca in the railway project and the improvements at Larnaca Harbour, we see how the complexities of the Larnacan locality become central to the success of the British developmental imaginaries. Chapter 3 is connected to the previous one, as the Famagusta Harbour and Larnaca Harbour improvements, and the prospective construction of the railway, were conceived as part of the same developmental vision of the colonial rule. The chapter introduces a series of proposals, projects and thoughts on Famagusta Harbour that date back to

---

*Knowledge: From Research to Public Policy* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

the first days of British colonialism in the island. It then analyses the decision-making process leading to the construction of Famagusta Harbour as a joint project with the Famagusta–Nicosia–Karavostassi railway comprising the two main pillars of the British developmental vision. A substantial part of this chapter focuses on the story of the Larnaca Harbour improvements, which emerges as the most critical issue for the regular functioning of the colonial structure. The main body of the chapter explores a series of negotiations involving the Larnacan network of power and influence, engineers, high-level administrators of the Cyprus government and the Colonial Office. The electrification of Cyprus is the main theme of Chapter 4. The period covered in this chapter dates back to the post-war and decolonisation period of the island (1945–late 1950s). The first part of this chapter traces past ideas about electrification projects, which led to the island-wide Grid Scheme of the post-war period. The reader will discover the particularities of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1945 and the Cyprus ten-year development programme. The second part of this chapter reveals the design process of the Grid and the course of events leading to its materialisation. The last part of the chapter brings the locality to centre stage and analyses the reactions to the proposed design, organisation and construction of the Grid. The final chapter is about the non-making of a project in the same post-war, decolonisation period, i.e. the Famagusta Harbour development. It follows strategic political changes around the island as they were connected to the proposals and debates regarding the Famagusta Harbour development. The reader will find here aspects of the history of the gradual transformation of Famagusta Harbour into a naval and military base, alongside proposals designed to integrate British imperial visions about Cyprus into the Harbour's design.

# CHAPTER 1

# TRANSITION PERIODS IN CYPRUS: CRISIS OF THE BRITISH COLONIAL RULE

## Part 1. From the First Years of British Rule to the 20ᵗʰ Century

### 1.1 Political and Administrative Structure of British Rule

With the coming of British colonialism in Cyprus the way the state mechanism was organised changed significantly, as had many other aspects of politics, economy and society.[1] The changes beyond the juridical system, which were transferring the Cypriots from the *millet* system to the modern bourgeoisie common law, were equally radical. One can say that there is a common understanding that, in many respects, these years were marked by the "transition to modernity".

### 1.2 Governance in Cyprus

The British were intending to rule Cyprus not so much by force but with the consent of its people. Even though it was not the rule, this was generally a dogma in the British colonial policy for those regions that they could apply it to.[2] In this line, Cyprus was given a constitution in 1882 that was in the

---

[1] The Cyprus Convention, which passed the island to British control, foresaw a payment of a certain amount to the Ottoman Sultan. This was the infamous "Tribute". The terms stated that Britain would pay an amount from the excess of Cyprus revenue over expenditure. The amount was approximately £92,000. In fact, the Sultan never saw this money because it was being canalised to the British and French bondholders of the Turkish Loan of 1855. In 1878 it was calculated to cost 10s. for every man, woman and child in Cyprus. George Hill, *A History of Cyprus* (Cambridge University Press, 2010), 464–467.

[2] This dogma considered ruling a colony with violent oppression as inefficient and not useful. What was important for them was to assimilate local leaders into the logic and morals of their colonialists, to accept their leadership for the sake of "progress",

framework of the liberal policies of Gladstonian Britain.[3] However, in reality the constitution did not offer a relatively more democratic and liberal administration of the island's matters. The constitution established two institutions, the Executive Council and the Legislative Council.[4] The Legislative Council gave the government the character of a representative parliamentary system. In the Legislative Council there were Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot elected members (nine Christians/non-Muslims and three Muslims) and six official members who were British civil servants appointed by the Governor himself. This setting created an arithmetic equality in the Council between Greek Cypriot and British-Turkish Cypriot votes, which was only unbalanced by the vote of the Governor, who had the right of the decisive vote. Even though the Cypriots were voting against or in favour of a law, the number of the British votes could easily overrule their will. Even in the case of a law passing by Cypriot votes (when for instance a British officer was absent), the Governor could seek refuge at the Colonial Office,[5] which could pass any decision by issuing an Order-in-Council. This

---

collect taxes from their compatriots for this matter and so on. Gradually the representatives/leaders of the colonised people were given more power and rights to administer the country's inner politics and issues. John Darwin, *The End of the British Empire: The Historical Debate*. 1st edition (Oxford, UK; Cambridge, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2006), 91.

[3] The acquisition of Cyprus was a policy of the Conservative government of Benjamin Disraeli. This had been opposed by the Liberals of William Ewart Gladstone, whose government in 1881 would be influential in giving Cyprus a legislative body.

[4] See Andrekos Varnava, & Michalis N. Michael, *The Archbishops of Cyprus in the Modern Age: The Changing Role of the Archbishop-Ethnarch, Their Identities and Politics* (Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013).

[5] Direct rule of the colonies was not something practical and possible because of the enormous distances and long communications time. The governance of the colonies was the job of governors. The Colonial Office's role was to supervise the colonies but especially their finances. The staff of the Office comprised members of the Home Civil Service. A new official was appointed as Assistant Principal, posted to one of the geographic divisions. Their work was to make the first comment on the incoming despatches from the colonies and forward them to their seniors. These new appointees were passing enough time at a certain division to acquire experience and knowledge about a certain group of colonies. Colonial Office officials acted in the name of the Secretary of State and not in their own. The post of Secretary of State for the Colonies was usually not a weighty one within the Cabinet in comparison to Treasury or Foreign Affairs. However, there had been names that pushed their own ideas and projects. The post was answerable to the Prime Minister and Houses of Parliament. A governor's appointment was difficult if the Secretary of State did not approve politically. Gavin Ure, *Governors, Politics and the Colonial Office: Public*

also indicates much about the relation of the London government with the Governor, who only answered to the Colonial Office. The Executive Council was made up of appointed British and Cypriot members and functioned as an advisory organ to the Governor.[6]

The government consisted of several departments for its basic administrative functions. The Secretariat was the central administrative department that co-ordinated and controlled all the other departments. Under the Secretariat there were Receiver-General, Customs and Excise, Public Works, Survey and Land Registration, Forests, Police and Prisons, Postal and Medical departments, and the office of the King's Advocate, who was the legal advisor to the government. For governing the six districts in the island there was one British District Commissioner for each district (with local helpers), who was responsible for the implementation of the official policies and reporting problems to the Chief Secretary and to relevant departments.[7]

In short, such an administrative structure did not give the Cypriots any substantial political authority in the island's matters, but did integrate them into the framework that the British wanted to use in order to rule the island. The British, as a method, were allocating some posts of secondary importance in power to Cypriots. This was already a method that had been tried in other colonies. It was thanks to these arrangements that people from higher social strata, unrelated to ethnicity, began to take political and bureaucratic posts. Only in policing was there a bias towards the Turkish Cypriots, who were the majority in the service despite of being only 20 per cent of the whole population.[8] One last point that must be noted about the Cyprus government is the stance of the British colonial officers. Holland and Markides define their general behaviour as follows:

> *British officials sought to keep their heads down, concentrate on administration, and identify by trial and error a working equilibrium between 'British', 'Greek', and 'Turkish' identities and loyalties.*[9]

---

Policy in Hong Kong, 1918–58 (Aberdeen, HK: Hong Kong University Press, 2012), 22–24.

[6] Katsiaounis, *Η Διασκεπτική 1946-1948*, 18–19.

[7] George S. Georghallides, *A Political and Administrative History of Cyprus 1918–1926 with a Survey of the foundations of British Rule* (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre, 1979), 37.

[8] Katsiaounis, *Η Διασκεπτική 1946-1948,* 18.

[9] Robert Holland & Diana Markides, *The British and the Hellenes: Struggles for Mastery in the Eastern Mediterranean 1850–1960.* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 172.

## 1.3 Local Networks of Power and Privilege

For many decades the political elite of the Greek Cypriot/Orthodox Christian community remained occupied by a class of bourgeoisie made up of merchants, money-lenders and professionals, and the clergy. The latter, which meant the Cyprus Autocephalous Orthodox Church, would, later on in the history of the island, develop into a political institution that dominated and led the political life of the whole Greek Cypriot community. These two classes exercised a terrific influence on the community, and were surviving through their economic, social and spiritual monopoly over the farming folk. The Church,[10] which had become the representative of the Greek Cypriot/Orthodox Christian community during Ottoman times, controlled the education system and every aspect of spirituality of the traditionally conservative Orthodox rural people. The capitalists who were also representing the Greek Cypriots at the Council were also generally money-lenders. Because of their economic power over farmers, these money-lenders had an effective control over them that was giving birth to a corporatist and paternalistic relationship between the voter and the candidate.[11]

These classes of power in both communities and British officialdom were the decisive factors in shaping the island's political, economic and social life. If we sum up, it can be said that in the first 40 years of the occupation the British were not able to build relations with the farmers, who were thus left to elect whoever they were told to do so. Only during and after World War II did farmers and workers manage to create a different politics of their own.[12]

## 1.4 The Consequences of the British-introduced Modernity

The island of Cyprus entered the 20th century in transition. The British reforms in administration, taxation and justice were the main factors transforming the society from a typical Ottoman one into a more modern

---

[10] For a detailed account of the Church and its Bishops See Varnava & Michalis, *The Archbishops of Cyprus in the Modern Age*
[11] *Katsiaounis Η Διασκεπτική 1946-1948,* 20. See also Michael, N., Michalis, "From the Ottoman *Medis-i idare* to the British Legislative Council". In *Religious Communities and Modern Statehood: The Ottoman and Post-Ottoman World at the Age of Nationalism and Colonialism, ed.* Michalis N. Michael, Tasos Anastasiades, & Chantal Verdeil, 105-130. (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2015).
[12] Katsiaounis, *Η Διασκεπτική 1946-1948*, 21.