



Archived by Flinders University

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: •  
Varnava, A. (2020). Greek Cypriot 'Volunteers' in the Greek  
Army, 1897-1922: Querying Loyalties and Identity. *Journal  
of Modern Greek Studies*, 38(2), 473-500. [https://  
doi.org/10.1353/mgs.2020.0029](https://doi.org/10.1353/mgs.2020.0029)

which has been published in final form at  
<https://doi.org/10.1353/mgs.2020.0029>

Published by: Johns Hopkins University Press

## **Greek Cypriot “Volunteers” in the Greek Army, 1914–1922:**

### **Querying Loyalties and Identity**

*Andrekos Varnava*

#### Abstract

*Traditional historiography has claimed that, from 1897 to 1922, Greek Cypriots served in droves in the Greek army, thus exhibiting their loyalty to their alleged motherland. But the number of Greek Cypriot volunteers in the Greek army from 1912 to 1922 was minuscule, especially compared to the numbers serving in the British army from 1916 to 1920. Additionally, many Cypriots with Greek citizenship avoided and/or refused to enlist in the Greek army when called up during the Great War, while other Greek Cypriots (who had British Cypriot national status) were seemingly kidnapped in Egypt, Greece, and parts of Greek-occupied Anatolia, and were forced to serve during the 1919–1922 Greco-Turkish War. More men served as auxiliaries in the British forces during the Great War and many preferred to be protected by the British from serving in the Greek forces from 1919 to 1922. These preferences have implications for the traditional nationalist narratives surrounding the formation of Greek ethno-national identity and universal anti-colonialism in pursuit of énōsis (unification of Cyprus with Greece) in Cyprus.*

In August 1921, Sir Harry Lamb, the British vice-consul at Smyrna, detailed to Lord Granville, the British ambassador in Athens, a story of Greek authorities kidnapping a Cypriot Orthodox

Christian in Egypt and shipping him to the front in Asia Minor, with the result that the man ended up in the hospital with serious wounds. This was not the first nor the last such example offered to Granville by various British representatives. Granville called this act a “gross irregularity and abuse of capitulatory privileges.”<sup>1</sup> According to Lamb, the continuation of this kidnapping practice, which the Greek authorities insisted was “volunteerism,” “deceives no one.”<sup>2</sup>

Yet many Cypriots, who were poor peasants and laborers and interested primarily in improving their economic circumstances, did volunteer (some opportunistically, but others because there were limited job prospects) to serve in both the British and Greek armies during and after the Great War when the pay offered was good. It is difficult to determine the nature of their loyalty, since their primary motivation was financial. Nevertheless, more Cypriots were willing to serve as auxiliaries in the British army than to fight for a Greater Greece in the Greek army after the Great War, although the money they were offered to fight in the Greek army was greater. Unlike some in the growing middle classes—who had greater access to education and among whom nationalism and political ideologies of conservatism, liberalism, socialism, and communism had started to penetrate—the majority of the lower and lower-middle classes remained focused on their survival and their economic and social advancement, but they were willing to join the war efforts of the British and Greeks if it meant good wages.

This article contributes to the historiographies of Cypriots at war and the Greek war efforts between 1912 and 1922, as well as to the history of Greek Cypriot identity-formation on the island. The evidence presented accords with the modernist or constructionist theories of identity-formation as postulated by Gellner (1983) and Anderson (1983), which have previously been applied to the Ottoman and former Ottoman world, most notably by Nicholas Doumanis. In

his pioneering study of Christians and Muslims in Anatolia, Doumanis demonstrated that their peaceful integrated world began to crumble following the influx of Muslim refugees from the Balkan Wars and their stories of Christian violence, which resulted in most Orthodox Christians and Muslims looking to Greek and Turkish nationalisms and nation-states as their only security (Doumanis 2013). The case of Cyprus is somewhat different, since Muslim refugees did not come to the island then, but there are similarities, since after the Greco-Turkish War of 1921 there was a small settlement of Anatolian Orthodox Christians who brought their own harrowing stories of Muslim violence (Varnava 2020, 141–144). Historians Rolandos Katsiaounis (1996) and myself (2009, 2013, 2017a), and the anthropologist Rebecca Bryant (2004) have previously shown through empirical evidence how the constructionist theory applies to late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century Cyprus. I have shown that, at least until 1912, Greek nationalism had not spread to the masses, yet there is a historiography, which perpetuates Greek nationalist discourses, that argues that the Greek Cypriots were as one in their support of *énōsis* (union of Cyprus with Greece) from the time of the Greek Revolution of 1821 (Koumoulides 1974) or at least since the arrival of the British (Georghallides 1979; Papapolyviou 1996, 1997, 1999, 2010; Holland and Markides 2006; Heraclidou 2017). This article attempts to counter these nationalist discourses, particularly those put forward by Petros Papapolyviou regarding the importance of Greek Cypriots serving in the Greek army between 1897 and 1922. Over the course of several books, Papapolyviou has argued that Greek Cypriot nationalism and desire for *énōsis* was widespread across all classes of Greek Cypriot society and was reflected in their mass enlistment in the Greek forces in wars against the Ottomans/Turks in 1897, 1912–1913 and 1919–1922 (1996, 1997, 1999, 2010). This article shows that money was the primary motivation for Cypriots' enlistment in these wars, that far more Greek Cypriots served in the British forces

in the Great War than in the Greek army during all of these wars put together, that Greek Cypriots who acquired Greek citizenship by enlisting in the Greek forces in 1897 and 1912–1913 refused mobilization orders during the Great War, and that British Cypriots who came forward in 1920 to serve in the Greek forces were motivated by the money they were offered. This article further demonstrates that others in Greece, Greek occupied territories, and Egypt after the war were forced to fight against their will in the Greek army in Anatolia, which indicates that many were opposed to serving for what their so-called representatives referred to as their motherland. Consequently, Greek Cypriots were at least as loyal to the British as they were to the various Greek causes, and arguably more so.

Both the sources used in this article and the methodology adopted in analyzing them are important. As a British possession, Cyprus was administered by the Colonial Office and thus the official records for this period are, as Ann Laura Stoler has argued, an act of colonialism. Scholars therefore should treat the colonial archive as an archive that must be supplemented, especially by local records, to create a new composite colonial archive in which the subjective knowledge created by the colonial authorities is balanced by other evidence (Stoler 2002, 2010). The colonial archive needs to be subjected to a different critical scrutiny, both against and with the grain. The majority of the sources analyzed in this article are colonial records, whether generated in Cyprus (State Archives [SA1] or Foreign and Commonwealth Office files, later moved to London [FCO]) or in London and its overseas consulates (Colonial Office [CO] and Foreign Office [FO]), and the role of British colonial and foreign policy agendas in the creation of these records must be acknowledged. It must also be acknowledged that the Cypriot appeals to the British authorities, although influenced by the unbalanced relationship between colonizer and colonized, were nevertheless genuine and written in their own hands and language, and that

translations were expertly produced (and therefore correctly understood by the British). These appeals are pivotal to understanding the desire of Cypriots, especially those who were forcibly taken by the Greek authorities to serve in their armed forces in 1921, to be considered as Cypriot British nationals. Additionally, local newspapers are used here to document how, during the Great War, Greek government mobilization orders aimed at Cypriots who had automatically become Greek subjects after serving in the Balkan Wars were unsuccessful, and how the Greek Cypriot nationalist elites never concealed the motivations behind their efforts at recruitment in 1921. Newspapers published the monetary benefits promised to each recruit, and to the recruiters as well.

It is also important to understand the changes in Cypriot nationality under British rule down to the end of this period under consideration. Between the start of the British occupation in 1878 and the British annexation of Cyprus in 1914, Cypriots were in an anomalous situation regarding their nationality and protection by Britain: outside the Ottoman Empire they were afforded British protection overseas as so-called “Natives of Cyprus,” but within the Ottoman Empire they had no such protection, although the Ottomans were forced to accept their British passports when they wanted to use the Ottoman Empire as a point of departure for travel.<sup>3</sup> After the British annexation in 1914, the British considered all Cypriots with British national status (for an explanation of who this included, see Varnava and Smith 2019) to have British protection anywhere in the world, including within the Ottoman Empire. This policy change fell afoul of both the Ottoman and Turkish nationalist authorities until the annexation was recognized in the Treaty of Lausanne; it also met with disapproval from the Greek authorities, who claimed that the Cypriot Orthodox Christians were Greeks by race.

## *Cypriots serving in the Great War*

Cypriots served in various armies as both combatants and auxiliaries. The discussion in this section cannot be exhaustive, since, for example, little is known about the hundreds of Cypriots who served in the British merchant navy, seventy-two of whom received Mercantile Marine Medals and the British War Medal (BT351/1). Cypriots also served in the Ottoman army, although nothing about them has been found in the Ottoman archives in Istanbul. They also served in the Greek army, although in nowhere near the numbers that have been claimed.

### *1. Cypriot Mule Corps*

The service of Cypriots in the Cypriot Mule Corps is now well understood, and what follows is a summary that is necessary because this constituted the most significant form of Cypriot military service, a fact acknowledged even by the Cypriot government at the time. The British formation of the Cypriot Mule Corps in Summer 1916 marked the first formation of a military corps in Cyprus under British rule. The corps' primary purpose was to support the British army units serving in Macedonia, although some muleteers followed British units to Egypt, and some went to Constantinople after the armistice as part of the Allied forces occupying that city. The Cypriot mule corps had a staggering enlistment of over 12,000 Cypriots from every religious group: Orthodox Christians, Muslims, and Maronites enlisted and served together, and got along well, with no disturbances reported among them (Varnava 2014, 2017a, 2017c, 2017d).

Stopping emigration of able-bodied men of military age was the key to reaching the numbers demanded. Cypriots had started to emigrate to non-traditional destinations from about 1912 (Varnava and Smith 2019). Sir John Clauson, the High Commissioner of Cyprus, issued a

proclamation on 19 October 1916 prohibiting the emigration from Cyprus of men fit for military service. This prohibition worked wonders in propelling men to volunteer, and recruitment of men into the Cypriot Mule Corps overtook the initial focus on procuring mules, a point reflected by the operation's name change in July 1917 from the "Mule Purchasing Commission" to the "Muleteer Recruiting and Supply Purchasing Staff." Over 12,000 men served at one time or another, meaning that at least a quarter of the male population in Cyprus aged 18–35 had at some point served in the Cypriot Mule Corps (Varnava 2016, 2017a, 2017d).

Cypriots from all backgrounds served. 90.4% of the recruits were Eastern Orthodox Christians, 8.4% were Muslims, and 0.77% were Maronite Christians, with smaller numbers of Armenians and others. According to the 1911 census, Eastern Orthodox Christians constituted 78.2% of the population, Muslims 20.6%, and Maronites 0.4%. It would be easy to assume that the comparatively lower rate of enlistment among Cypriot Muslims was the result of loyalties to the Ottoman Empire, but more satisfactory explanations exist. First, not all Cypriots who came forward to serve were accepted, so it is impossible to know how many Muslims and Christians actually wanted to enlist. Second, the statistics show that 58% of those who enlisted came from a village with fewer than 900 inhabitants (according to the 1911 Census) and a further 15% came from larger villages of between 900 and 1,999 inhabitants, which indicates that an overwhelming majority (three-quarters) of those enlisted came from rural areas. Given that Muslims were more likely than Christians to live in urban as opposed to rural areas, it is no surprise that Muslims constituted a smaller percentage of the recruits than of the population at large (Varnava 2017d, 87–89).

Politically, the Greek and Turkish Cypriot political elites did not participate in recruitment and never made political capital of the massive enlistment during or after the war, as



Indian and West Indian political elites did (Tinker 1968; Jeffrey 1981; Smith 2004; Singha 2007). The Cypriot Muslim leaders certainly referred constantly to the loyalty of their community, yet they never referred to the loyal service of Muslims in the mule corps. The Greek Cypriot leaders claimed that the broader Cypriot Orthodox population was loyal to the British, even though this undermined their claim to *énōsis*, yet they did not refer to the mule corps either (Varnava 2017d, 87 and 210–230).

The Cypriot Mule Corps was mainly composed of the peasant and laboring classes, whose members generally did not feel any strong political attachment to the ideologies of their elites—*énōsis* and identification with Greece, or old Ottomanism or Young Turk ideas and identification with Turkey. Their primary concerns were survival and economic advancement, and thus the British, in their recruitment efforts, emphasized the high wages offered and played to a widespread desire to emigrate (which they now restricted). What recruits wanted most was to pay off debts and support their families (Varnava 2017d, 101–103 and 180–199). They were willing to serve the British in order to generate income, although they had limited options for economic security or advancement given the restrictions on emigration. The start of a cooperative movement had not resolved the credit shortage for peasants (Varnava and Clarke, 2014), and they now had an opportunity to earn a stable income. Although opportunities for manual work remained steady during the war—workers were needed to construct roads, cut trees, and transport goods (Lucas 1926, 20–21)—there were not enough of these jobs to go around, especially in more isolated districts such as Kyrenia and Paphos. Driving mules for the British in Salonica offered Cypriots the opportunity for a stable, well-paying job (Varnava 2017a).

There was much enthusiasm among those enlisting and pride among the recruits' families; there was also pride among the recruits themselves after they returned. The newspaper *Elefthería* (*Ελευθερία*) reported in October 1916 and February 1917 on the enthusiasm of those leaving to serve, even if it falsely claimed that they were excited because they would be fighting the Bulgarians (advertisements for recruits stated that they would not be fighting).<sup>4</sup> Upon returning to Cyprus, muleteers were proud to wear their uniforms (until the British decided to keep the uniforms and issue muleteers a sum with which to buy new clothes).<sup>5</sup> Haji Ioannis Haji Protopapa from Leonariso, Famagusta, was one of many muleteers to complain that they had wages owed; nevertheless, he declared his pride in having served:

It is unjust for me, Honourable Sir, to lose so many days wages as it was owing to poverty that I had to expatriate myself. In truth I feel proud of having served the glorious British army.<sup>6</sup>

After the war, members of the Cypriot Mule Corps also received medals at well-attended ceremonies, and many who had emigrated requested that they receive them as well, both because they felt proud to have served and for the sake of social acceptance in their adopted countries—in order to join ex-servicemen's clubs, for example, or to make them more attractive to employers (Varnava 2017d, 199–201).

*Cypriots in Allied armed forces (excluding Greek ones)* Cypriot migrants to the UK, France, and various parts of the British Empire, such as Canada and Australia, served as combatants in the Great War. Just how many served is uncertain, but in the Cypriot colonial archives and newspapers several of the enlistees are reported as dead or as distinguished for heroic conduct.

Several Cypriots died serving in the British army as soldiers, although many more (177) had died serving in the Cypriot Mule Corps (Varnava 2017d, 153–154). Two Cypriots died in the Palestine Campaign in the offensive against Jerusalem. In December 1917, the War Office and King George V expressed their sympathies to Gabriel Papadopoulos, whose son, Private Nicholas G. Papadopoulos, was killed in action on 1 December 1917 while serving in the 4th Hants Regiment (Hampshire) in the Palestine Campaign (No. 202642).<sup>7</sup> Gabriel Papadopoulos, from Pentakomo, Limassol, told George V that he was very proud of his son's service and loyalty towards the British Empire:

It is with a heart beating from emotion and joy that I accept Your Majesties' expression of sympathy with me in the loss by a glorious death of my beloved soldier son Nicholas G. Papadopoulos who fell while fighting by the side of English soldiers.<sup>8</sup>

Although saddened by the loss of his eldest son, who had been educated in English and French and who would have helped provide for the family, he still felt "a great joy" because his son had "immortalised his name with those of many other heroes who fought under the glorious colours of Liberal England." Under these circumstances, he considered himself "a happy father" and prayed that God would grant Britain and its allies victory.<sup>9</sup>

A second soldier, Nicholas Panayides, also died in the Palestine Campaign while serving in the 2nd Battalion Hants Regiment (Hampshire); Panayides (no. 31596) died on 13 December 1917 of gunshot wounds to the abdomen. Almost ten years later, his parents, having fallen on hard times, petitioned Governor Ronald Storrs for compensation, since they were poor and had four unmarried daughters whom they could not marry off because of their financial situation.

Panayides had left Cyprus in 1914 to work in France and had subsequently enlisted in the Hampshire Regiment. As with the Papadopoulos case, his family's claim was rejected.<sup>10</sup>

The families of other soldiers who died serving in the British army were more successful in receiving financial support. Aristodemos George Pavlides, a private in the 9th Battalion East Lancashire Regiment, died from bronchopneumonia at the 63rd General Hospital, Salonica, on 20 October 1918. Before enlisting, he had worked for Messrs MacAndrews and Forbes, a licorice company with branches in Greece and Asia Minor. His father, George K. Pavlides, was a teacher in Alexandretta until 1914, but under new laws in Cyprus he could not work, and had been dependent on his son. The father therefore requested a pension because his family was living with his brother, the editor of the newspaper *Fonē tēs Kýprou* (*Φωνή της Κύπρου*).<sup>11</sup> Pavlides was granted a pension, backdated to 25 November 1918.<sup>12</sup> Another soldier, Andreas George Hajieliias, died while serving in the 7th Border Regiment, and his father George was granted three shillings sixpence weekly from 25 February 1920 to 24 October 1921.<sup>13</sup> Another case was that of George Koukoulis, killed in action on 30 August 1918 while serving in the 1st Battalion, Rifle Brigade. His father Kyriakos Nicola Koukoulis died on 19 July 1920; his mother was poor, and had five other children, but it is unclear if she received a pension.<sup>14</sup>

It is also possible to trace Cypriots serving in the British army through claims for separation allowances. There were at least five men with the 10th Battalion Hampshire Regiment who had families that claimed this allowance.<sup>15</sup>

There was also a proposal to establish a "Cypriot Legion" in the British army, which the British authorities rejected (Varnava 2015). Upon the annexation of Cyprus, a local newspaper reported on an offer to volunteer for the British army from certain Cypriots who had served in the Greek army during the Balkan Wars, but High Commissioner Hamilton Goold-Adams

responded that this was unnecessary.<sup>16</sup> Perhaps some of these men went to Alexandria to enlist, but it is unclear if they succeeded.<sup>17</sup> From Alexandria emanated the proposal to form a Cypriot unit in the British army. In March 1915, Lord Kitchener, the War Secretary, received this offer from Nearchos Physsenzides, a Cypriot and former Greek soldier who practiced law in Alexandria (Koudounaris 2001, 396–397). Physsenzides bragged to Kitchener that 10,000 Greek Cypriots, mostly veterans of the Balkan Wars, were “burning with the desire of going and proving [themselves] on the battlefields, side by side with Your Glorious Armies and those of Noble France” (for more detail on this proposal, see Varnava 2015).<sup>18</sup> Clauson poured cold water on this proposal, telling Harcourt, the Liberal Colonial Secretary, that Physsenzides was a “moderate man of ordinary ability,” who grossly exaggerated the number of Cypriot Orthodox who had served in the Balkan Wars: these, Clauson said, numbered a mere 1,500, less than three percent of the population of military age, and half of them had remained in Greece.<sup>19</sup> Politically, Clauson argued that recruitment would be “conducted entirely under the Greek flag in a manner offensive to the loyal Moslem British subjects,” its motive would be *énōsis*, and it would have “no military value.”<sup>20</sup> The Army Council agreed and rejected the proposal.<sup>21</sup>

#### *Cypriots serving in the Greek army*

Comparatively few Cypriots served in the Greek army during the Great War. In October 1915, in accordance with a royal mobilization order, the Greek consul in Cyprus (Paraskevopoulos) published a notice in some newspapers calling to the Greek colors several classes of men in Cyprus, including reservists. These included Cypriots who had served in the Balkan Wars, because by Greek law they had become Greek citizens upon enlistment.<sup>22</sup> The newspaper *Kypriakós Fýlax* (*Κυπριακός Φύλαξ*) expected 3,000 Cypriots to come forward to fight in

Constantine's army against the "barbaric" Turks and Bulgarians, although Greece was neutral. The paper listed Cypriot offices in the Greek army, such as Colonel L. Lapathiotis, of the artillery, and Captain Nearchos Physsenzides and Lieutenant Ioannis Tsangarides, who was to lead the new unit.<sup>23</sup> The Cypriot authorities refused to issue British passports to any likely recruits and did not want the Greek consul to claim them as Greek subjects.<sup>24</sup> In any event, nobody came forward. So, in February 1916, the Greek consul published another royal mobilization order.<sup>25</sup> But again, there was no response. In September, the consul published yet another order, this time giving Greek subjects six months from 9 July 1916 to take an oath to serve under the Greek colors.<sup>26</sup>

The politics behind the British rejection of a Greek Cypriot British legion was reflected in the rebuff of Venizelos's proposal to recruit Greek Cypriots into his forces in Summer 1916, which coincided with the successful formation of the Cypriot Mule Corps. On 16 October 1916, Elliot, the British ambassador to Athens, informed the Foreign Office that Venizelos's government wanted to recruit volunteers freely in Cyprus and also to apply its mobilization decrees to Egypt, believing that it could "raise four regiments of infantry in those countries."<sup>27</sup> Clearly, Venizelos was identifying the Cypriot Orthodox Christians as Greeks and implying a sense of ownership over them. Clauson quickly declared that this was a terrible idea, not least because of the need to enlist muleteers.<sup>28</sup> He was adamant that "no more than a few Cypriot volunteers would join" and that Whitehall should not encourage relations between the Greek-speaking Cypriots, who were British subjects, and the Venizelist government, because this "may be politically embarrassing" for the Cypriot government and would offer no military advantages.<sup>29</sup> The Colonial and Foreign offices agreed, with the Foreign Office permitting free recruitment in Egypt, but not the application of any mobilization decree, and no recruitment at all

in Cyprus. The imperatives of recruiting muleteers, preventing the spread of Greek nationalism, and averting any clash between Christians and Muslims in Cyprus outweighed the British alliance with Venizelos.<sup>30</sup> Only Cypriots in Egypt could enlist for the Venizelist army, but few did. A committee in Alexandria provided support for the families of Cypriots who did enlist; Archbishop Kyrillos III contributed a mere £50.<sup>31</sup>

Ultimately, few Cypriots served in the Greek armed forces. In December 1917, the District Commissioner of Larnaca informed the Chief Secretary of the Cypriot government that

no Greek reservists have left from Larnaca up to date . . . very few will leave from this town or District because the largest majority of the Greek subjects in this town on being called . . . refused to go, some saying that they were Cypriot born and consequently British subjects, others said they would only go if forced to do so by the British Authorities in Cyprus.<sup>32</sup>

Nevertheless, the Greek authorities persisted with regular calls for Greek citizens to present themselves for military service and the circulation of updated lists of individuals whom they claimed were liable for service.<sup>33</sup> The newspapers, meanwhile, hardly mentioned Cypriots in the Greek armed forces. In August 1917, *Sálpinx* (Σάλπιγξ) informed its readers about Harilaos N. Chrysanthou, an enthusiastic soldier and supporter of Venizelos.<sup>34</sup> Such reporting betrayed the false claims by other newspapers that 1,000 Cypriots were serving in Venizelos's forces.<sup>35</sup> In September 1918, *Elefthería* published a letter by Neophytos Diamantopoulos—originally from Kiti, Larnaca, and now serving in the Greek army—which revealed his impatience to march on the Bulgarians and his pride in fighting for “his fatherland.”<sup>36</sup> In 1918 and 1919, the Greek authorities issued personal military orders to individuals and sent junior officers of Cypriot

descent to ensure compliance.<sup>37</sup> But most refused these orders, including Nicholas Mavroyiannis and John Vassiliou, who had comfortable jobs in the Railway Department; their Greek-born fathers opposed their going.<sup>38</sup>

### *Cypriots “enlisting” in the Greco-Turkish War of 1919–1922*

After the Great War, Greek authorities, acting through the local Greek Cypriot elites, first started to encourage Cypriots to enlist in the Greek army in preparation for the summer offensive of 1920 (aimed at extending the Greek zone around Smyrna/Izmir over all of Western and most of Northwestern Anatolia). Malcolm Stevenson, the High Commissioner of Cyprus after Clauson’s untimely death, first learned of the efforts to induce Cypriots to volunteer for the Greek army in May 1920. The police reported that on 25 April, Theophanis Theodotou and Bishop Makarios of Kyrenia, the two firebrand pro-*énōsis* leaders, visited Morphou to enroll volunteers for the Greek army. Brewster Surridge, the local commandant of police, reported that although a mere twenty had been recruited the practice was continuing and Makarios had promised to go to Greece with them.<sup>39</sup> The Chief Commandant of Police wanted the King’s Advocate (the principal British government lawyer) to offer legal advice on issuing a general order prohibiting such recruiting because

Cyprus is a British Colony and it is most undesirable that British subjects should be recruited in Cyprus for service in the Greek army or indeed to proceed abroad for that purpose.<sup>40</sup>



The King's Advocate was able to use the precedent of the Balkan War, in which Goold-Adams had issued a general order prohibiting recruiting.<sup>41</sup>

By this time, the Greek authorities had become involved (wanting to bolster their numbers for their summer offensive in Anatolia) and were using the local newspapers for their recruiting efforts. The newspapers were only too ready to oblige and to exaggerate the reality driving the desire of Cypriots to serve. On 5 June, Agesilaos Artemis, the Greek consul in Cyprus, published in *Fonē tēs Kýprou* a telegram from the Greek Foreign Ministry calling for "voluntary enlistment" of Cypriots into the Greek army to fight in the "new provinces." The telegram announced that those enlisting would receive, in addition to the usual salary, a bonus of 100, 120, or 200 drachmas, depending on the length of their service. On 19 June 1920, *Elefthería* claimed that more than two thousand men had come from across the island to enlist at the consulate in Larnaca. The newspaper published a letter from Artemis stating that he had "no order whatsoever to respond to the[se] noble and patriotic sentiments," and urging those who wanted to enlist to go to Athens.<sup>42</sup> On 23 June, *Kypriakós Fýlax* stated that the Cypriots had answered the call, with 2,158 in Nicosia, 1,000 in Paphos, 947 in Famagusta, 850 in Limassol, 600 in Larnaca, and 390 in Kyrenia coming forward to volunteer.<sup>43</sup> Then, on 29 June, *Elefthería* announced that Athens would accept the volunteers.<sup>44</sup>

The Cypriot newspapers implied that there was a popular rush to enlist, when in reality the men were motivated by the excellent wages that were being offered. *Fonē tēs Kýprou* published details of the bill passed in the Greek parliament to enroll volunteers to take the place of those whose cohorts would be released from service. Those enrolled could choose to serve for three, six, or twelve months in the "new provinces." The key point was the pay. In addition to their usual pay, each man would receive a monthly bonus of 150 drachmas and therefore a sum

total of 220–240 drachmas per month. This was well above the generous wages offered by the British to the muleteers. The newspaper article did not point this out, although it did mention that the income to be earned was greater than any that could possibly be made by emigrating to the US and working there. In general, the paper took the nationalistic line that Cypriot youth could now “perform a very high honourable duty towards the fatherland” and contribute to the “aggrandizement of the Empire and the greatness of Greece.”<sup>45</sup> Of course the same was not said about the Cypriots enlisting in the British forces during the Great War. A few days later, on 2 July, *Néon Éthnos* (*Νέον Έθνος*) published a telegram from the Greek Foreign Minister, Nikolaos Politis, to Artemis, clarifying that the new law allowed for the enlistment of volunteers from outside Greece who were of the “Greek race” and between twenty and forty years of age. They could be enrolled for three, six, or twelve months, and, in addition to the usual pay and coverage of incidentals (food and clothing), those serving three months would receive 100 drachmas upon enlistment, those serving six months would receive 125 drachmas, and those serving for twelve months would receive 150 drachmas. Furthermore, upon release, those serving three months would receive another bonus of 150 drachmas, those serving six months would receive 300 drachmas, and those serving for a year would receive 500 drachmas.<sup>46</sup> With this kind of money on offer, it is no wonder that *Foné tēs Kýprou* described those “volunteering” as showing “indescribable enthusiasm.” Artemis, meanwhile, had abandoned his own work to travel by train and motor across the island in order to enlist men. Thus far, 4,550 had been enlisted: 1400 in Nicosia, 800 in Varosha, 1,000 in Paphos, 600 in Limassol, 450 in Larnaca, and 300 in Kyrenia.<sup>47</sup> Although this was well short of the number that served in the Cypriot Mule Corps, it was a staggering number to be reached so quickly, and it can only be explained by the extraordinary amounts of money offered.

Beyond the monetary benefits, there are two secondary ways of accounting for the number of volunteers: the motivation of the educated classes to encourage volunteers, because they had been promised employment in the “new provinces,” and the pressure from the Cypriot Orthodox Church. Athens had asked Artemis to inform the educated classes that it would accept applications for judicial positions in Thrace and Ionia, paying 1,500 drachmas a month for judges in the higher courts and 750 drachmas a month for the lower courts. To maximize their employability, applicants were encouraged to show their patriotic credentials by helping out with recruitment.<sup>48</sup> Then, there was the pressure from the Orthodox Church, whose Bishop of Paphos, Iacovos, published a call to arms in the newspapers on the order of Archbishop Kyrillos, who was then in London.<sup>49</sup> In the tradition of propaganda calling men to arms, Iacovos tugged on the heartstrings of Greek Cypriot men by claiming that this was a holy war to “liberate” lands that were “most Hellenic” from the “age-long slavery” of the Turks, who were now driven by the most “wicked and cruel men, the so called nationalists of Turkey.” He then asked:

Is it not therefore incumbent upon you, oh men of Cyprus, that most Hellenic land now about to emerge from the protection of the great ally and succour of Greece, to come over in this present time and help her in the Greek fight?<sup>50</sup>

After this emotional appeal, Iacovos ordered all priests to instruct men to enlist.<sup>51</sup>

It was not until 29 June 1920 that Stevenson wired Milner that Artemis had informed him that he had received orders from Athens to enroll volunteers in Cyprus for the Greek battalions and wanted to know if the Cypriot government agreed. Stevenson did not know if a formal request had been made to the Foreign Office, but noted that “the susceptibilities of Moslems in Cyprus would in my opinion be gravely offended by such recruiting, which might thus have

undesirable results.” Stevenson would only allow for the recruitment of those who were registered as Greek subjects.<sup>52</sup> He observed that the terms being offered “were very attractive and in consequence considerable numbers of Cypriots have come forward” and noted that a newspaper had claimed that Artemis had telegraphed Athens to send a ship. The British government had to immediately stop this “unjustifiable” action because “there is little reason to doubt that the movement is partly political and aims at showing the unity of Cyprus and Greece in purpose and sentiment.”<sup>53</sup>

The police informed Stevenson that in Nicosia Artemis had called for Cypriot recruits for the Greek army, had published the conditions and pay scales: they claimed that up to 6,000 men had come forward. Artemis, meanwhile, awaited Stevenson’s permission before requesting a ship from Greece to transport the men.<sup>54</sup> That permission was not forthcoming, for on 8 July the Colonial Office informed Stevenson that it approved his decision to reject the recruitment of Cypriots and that Athens had been asked to cancel any orders given to the consul relating to the recruitment of British subjects.<sup>55</sup> Stevenson told Artemis that “the enrolment of volunteers other than registered Greek subjects cannot be approved.”<sup>56</sup> The response from Artemis was curt: he claimed that Athens was

well aware that no enrolment can take place in Cyprus. It had simply sought through me an appeal to all Greeks asking for their help in response to which appeal about ten thousand presented themselves at the Consulate desiring to proceed to Greece for enrolment.<sup>57</sup>

Artemis was of course being mischievous, since the Greeks he referred to were all British Cypriots; his efforts to recruit them reflected his government's implied sense of possession over this population.

By now, the Foreign Office had become involved. On 7 July Lord Curzon, the Foreign Secretary, approved Stevenson's proposed action.<sup>58</sup> Two days later, Curzon received a "very urgent" cable from Granville, the British Minister in Athens, informing him that Venizelos was going to ask Lloyd George to consent to Greece's sending British ships to take 8,000 Cypriot volunteers who desired to join the Greek army for the duration of the present campaign.<sup>59</sup> A member of the Colonial Office minuted that the

FO motto is evidently "let not the right hand know what the left doth." How far M.

Venizelos may have got the consent of the Prime Minister to all these proceedings we do not know. But I think that unless the PM has given a pledge we should stick to our previous position.

This is exactly what the Colonial Office did.<sup>60</sup>

Granville subsequently clarified, on 10 July, that the Greek government had not given any instructions to recruit Cypriot volunteers and that, in seeking British authorization, it was merely acting upon information it had that numerous Cypriots wanted to join the Greek army.<sup>61</sup> The source of this information was Greek Cypriot pro-*énōsis* supporters in the "Cyprus deputation" in London. On 17 July 1920, the deputation wrote to Milner alleging that Cyprus,

true to her duty and policy to support the allied and Greek war of liberation, hastened on this occasion too to offer her small help by sending 8,000 Greek Cypriots, who, up to Monday last, enlisted as volunteers for service in the Greek Army.

The deputation protested against the prohibition on Cypriots volunteering, but received no satisfaction from the Colonial Office: “to permit British Subjects to be recruited for service in the foreign forces would be an infringement of well-recognised international usage.”<sup>62</sup>

The matter upset leading British advocates of *énōsis*, including T. P. O’Connor, the Radical Irish Liberal, and Arthur Crosfield, a former Liberal MP and a wealthy soap manufacturer. O’Connor asked Leo Amery, the under-secretary for the colonies, whether it was true that the Cypriot government had forbidden 8,000 Cypriot volunteers from joining the Greek army and, if so, why. Amery replied that it was “contrary to well established usage to allow British subjects to be recruited in British territory for service in the army of a foreign power,” and that there was no objection to recruiting Greek subjects.<sup>63</sup> Then, in November, Crosfield weighed in, criticizing Stevenson’s administration and referring to the claims in an Athenian newspaper that in the government had permitted Cypriot volunteers to serve in the Greek army the 1890s and now were barring them. Crosfield took the complaints at face value, criticizing Stevenson’s administration and expressing the fear that “something very like provocative stupidity may tend to inflame Greek opinion in Cyprus.”<sup>64</sup> Stevenson discounted Crosfield’s claims, as the few Cypriots who had served in the 1890s and in the Balkan Wars had traveled to Greece, unbeknownst to the government, to serve in the Greek colors.<sup>65</sup>

The prohibition obviously angered the Greek Cypriot pro-*énōsis* agitators. Announced on 15 July, it garnered the first negative response the next day in the newspaper *Alétheia* (*Αλήθεια*) in Limassol, which claimed that 8,000 Cypriots had volunteered and that this reflected a “grand

movement so indicative of Cypriot patriotism.” The volunteers were, however, allegedly prevented from departing by the government prohibition, which provoked “universal surprise.”<sup>66</sup>

*Foné tēs Kýprou* was more matter-of-fact on 18 July 1920, and on 24 July it published a letter from Artemis thanking the Cypriot men who had volunteered.<sup>67</sup>

Despite clear government policy, the Greek Cypriot political elites in the island and Cypriots in Egypt continued to lobby the government to change its policy. On 9 March 1921, the Christian members of the Legislative Council, led by Theodotou, and referring to another general mobilization order from the Greek government, urged the government to allow for the recruitment of Cypriot volunteers for service in the Greek army.<sup>68</sup> About six weeks later, Physsenzides resurfaced to propose the opening of Cypriot recruitment for the Greek army, because Greece, the so-called fatherland of the Cypriots and a British ally, now needed them.<sup>69</sup> The British government rejected the proposal and was unwilling to change policy. It also became more hostile to Greece after December 1920, when Constantine returned to the throne.<sup>70</sup>

Unable to recruit in Cyprus, with Cypriots unwilling to go to Greece or Egypt to enlist, and with the war becoming desperate after the Greek loss at the Second Battle of İnönü on 1 April, the Greek authorities unsurprisingly resorted to forcing Cypriots they found in Athens, Smyrna, Alexandria, and likely elsewhere, into military service.

The first cases of this were reported in Athens. On 7 May 1921, Granville informed the Greek Foreign Ministry that Lelos Georgiades and Telemachos Pandelides had been visited by an officer charged with pursuing deserters and defaulters and told that their British Cypriot papers needed translating into Greek or else he would send them to the front. The British asked the Greek Foreign Ministry to investigate the relevant procedures to ensure that British Cypriot subjects would not be harassed again.<sup>71</sup> The Greek Foreign Ministry responded that the two men

had duly been arrested because they had not translated their papers and that the government had every right to arrest them.<sup>72</sup> Granville protested to Georgios Baltatzis, Politis's replacement, telling him that British subjects, Cypriots or otherwise, should not need to possess Greek translations of their identification papers and should not be arrested. He asked him to issue instructions to ensure that this did not reoccur.<sup>73</sup> But on 6 September 1921 Granville informed him of another case, that of Nearchos Christodoulides, who had served in the Cypriot Mule Corps.<sup>74</sup> On 31 August, while working as a carpenter in Athens, Christodoulides was arrested. His certificate of British Cypriot citizenship was seized and he was forcibly enrolled in the Greek army and sent to the front, leaving behind a wife and child, who now became destitute. Granville protested against this action, insisting on Christodoulides's immediate return to his home and "substantial compensation" for the period during which he had been unable to maintain his dependents.<sup>75</sup> By October, Granville was fed up. On 7 October he informed Curzon that he had protested to the Greek War Minister, Nikolaos Theotokis, against "the inexcusable behaviour of the military authorities at Athens in seizing foreign subjects, confiscating their proofs of nationality and forcibly enrolling them in the Greek Army." Granville referred specifically to Maltese, Cypriots, and Dodecanesians (who were under Italian protection). Theotokis directed Granville to his circular to all military, police, and consular authorities on 22 September to the effect that Dodecanesians and Cypriots were not liable to mobilization, so long as they had not acquired Greek citizenship.<sup>76</sup> A month passed before Granville reported that Christodoulides had been released, but his British Cypriot nationality certificate had not been returned. Granville was livid, demanding



that the Greek Government should address to me a formal expression of regret at the unwarrantable action of their military and Consular Authorities and a definite assurance that there shall be no further cases of the sort.<sup>77</sup>

The statement of regret was received 14 November 1921.<sup>78</sup>

By November 1921 the matter of forcing Cypriots to serve in the Greek armed forces had escalated, with cases reported in Smyrna and Alexandria. On 25 August 1921 Granville informed Baltatzis about Triphon Iraklis, who was lying seriously wounded in a Greek military hospital in Smyrna after having served unwillingly during the Battle of Sakarya (Battle of the Sangarios). Sir Harry Lamb, the British vice-consul at Smyrna, detailed the story, which Granville believed

constitute[d] an act of gross irregularity and abuse of capitulary privileges on the part of the Royal Hellenic Consulate-General at Alexandria in arresting a British subject in territory under British protection without affording him an opportunity of producing his British papers and in shipping him to Smyrna, there incorporating him in the Greek army and sending him to the front.<sup>79</sup>

Iraklis had informed Lamb that he had served in the Cypriot Mule Corps from 1916 to May 1920, when he was demobilized in Constantinople and had returned to Cyprus.<sup>80</sup> He had then gone to Alexandria in December 1920 to look for work, and had stayed with his cousin Nicolas Demiros, who owned a café at 22 Kinēma Street. After three months, in March 1921, he was accosted in Anastas Street by an Italian who was employed as a secret agent by the Greek consulate and who identified Iraklis as Georgios Mihail of Smyrna, a member of the cohort of 1920, which had been recently called up for military service. Iraklis denied this and went with

the man to the Greek consulate to clarify the matter. There he was arrested and denied the opportunity to produce his papers, which he had left in his room. Within twenty-four hours he was on a Greek steamer for Piraeus, and thence was shipped to Smyrna, where he was sent to the front. The order for his conveyance from Alexandria was signed by the second secretary of the consulate, Eleftherios Haros.<sup>81</sup>

In one case, a Cypriot complained to Curzon because the British authorities had not helped him to escape being kidnapped by the Greek authorities to serve in their forces. On 23 September 1921, Stavros George Hatzakos, a Cypriot British subject who had served in the Cypriot Mule Corps as a chief foreman with the 34th Reserve Park, protested to Curzon against the Greek government's alleged kidnapping of him. He claimed that the new Greek government "not only does not inscribe us (Cypriots) as British subjects, and mobilises us, but also throws us into prisons and keeps our papers." This had occurred in Smyrna. Hatzakos had settled in Balia seventeen months earlier, after being demobilized from the Cypriot Mule Corps. Almost immediately he was harassed about joining the Greek army. Fleeing to Athens, he left his family behind in Balia. Meanwhile, the authorities in Athens accused him of being a Bolshevik, which he denied. He appealed to Curzon to redress these various wrongs by allowing him to return to Balia, ensuring that his papers were respected, and compensating him for the five months he had spent away from his family. He also asked Curzon to ensure that British consuls intervened to prevent such persecution of British subjects in the future; he was especially upset at the inaction of the consul at Piraeus.<sup>82</sup> Lamb informed Granville that he had encountered Hatzakos in April 1921. Hatzakos had then been working for the Balia-Karaidin Mining Company, a French concern, where he was a strike leader and Bolshevik agitator, when the Greek authorities deported him at the request of the French. He claimed British protection, but the Greek

authorities had confiscated his papers, so Lamb refused to help him beyond offering to send him to Cyprus so as to confirm his claim. Hatzakos returned with a British passport, but the Greek authorities refused to allow him to disembark and warned Lamb that, if he did, he would be court-martialed as a dangerous agitator. Lamb had decided to do nothing in Smyrna, and Hatzakos was forced to go to Piraeus, where his case could be examined.<sup>83</sup> Granville told Curzon that Hatzakos had first applied to the consulate in Athens on 17 September and had been informed that the consulate could do nothing as he had been expelled for being a public nuisance. Lamb's letter confirmed this.<sup>84</sup>

In Smyrna, Lamb continued to experience difficulties. On 1 November, he informed Sir Horace Rumbold, the British High Commissioner in Constantinople, that he had successfully secured the release of Ottoman Greek subjects and Cypriots not registered as British subjects from enforced military service, but this was becoming harder to do. None of them had volunteered for service, as was falsely claimed by the Greek government:

The pretence that the Greek population of Asia Minor (and Cypriots) has to any appreciable extent "volunteered" for service in the army deceives no one who is resident here, though no doubt many have been forced, or otherwise induced, to sign documents to that effect.<sup>85</sup>

On 10 December 1921, Lamb informed the Egyptian authorities that another Cypriot had sought refuge at the consulate in Smyrna after having been forced into the Greek army. Ioannis Michael, the son of a farmer, Solomon Michael Palias (Lakkotripi), from Morphou, escaped while being boarded onto a train for Afion Kara Hissar. He had not been present in Cyprus at the time of the annexation and when he left he was only given a temporary pass. He worked in Cairo at the

confectionary shop owned by his uncle, Solon Kyriakides, and was only in Alexandria temporarily when two canvassers of the Greek consulate seized him in a street leading from Atarini Square and placed him on a Greek ship for Piraeus, where he was forced into the Greek army on 6 July. At the front he deserted, was recaptured, and deserted again. Lamb demanded his discharge and wanted General Edmund Allenby, the high commissioner in Egypt, to prevent this sort of thing from reoccurring.<sup>86</sup>

It was not until December, after the expression of regret from the Greek authorities in the previous month, that Stevenson remarked to Winston Churchill, the new Colonial Secretary, on the Greeks' interference with British Cypriots. He revealed that the Greek authorities in Alexandria had kidnapped two Cypriots, shipped them to Greece under guard, and forced them to join the Greek army to fight in Anatolia. These individuals were only known to him because they had escaped to the British consulate in Smyrna. Phydias Platridis and Victor George Vernardakis, both from Limassol, were being cared for at the consulate in Smyrna at the expense of the Cypriot government after having endured harrowing experiences of kidnapping and forced military service by a Greek press gang in Egypt. Platridis, employed by Messrs. Cavourides and Paleos, confectioners of "campo Cesare," Alexandria, was seized in August 1921 near the shop where he worked, taken to the Greek consulate, and shipped to Piraeus. After six weeks of harsh detention in Athens and training at Eudemish, he was returned to Smyrna for preparation to go to the front. It was then that he escaped to the British consulate. Vernardakis, the son of a shoemaker from Limassol, had served in the Cypriot Mule Corps (nos. 4650 & 12202) as an interpreter (RASC No. 855, attached to 22 Division). He had left Cyprus in May for Alexandria en route to Durban, South Africa, but was kidnapped in August from a Karagioz theatre near the Cairo railway station by a Greek press gang. The police investigation could not trace him

because he had only been in Alexandria for four days, but they had evidence of the press gang, including three raids it had made at the Karagioz theatre. The press gang had issued Vernardakis a false passport under another name, Christos Pieroglou of Smyrna, and had shipped him to Pireaus and thence to Smyrna, where he was put on a ship for Moudania. The ship, however, ran aground, and once back in Smyrna he escaped to the consulate. Lamb asked Allenby to look into Greek recruitment methods in Alexandria.<sup>87</sup>

The Greek authorities challenged the idea that they forced Cypriots to enlist. As to Iraklis and Vernardakis, the British authorities complained vocally to the Greek Interior Minister, particularly about the manner in which the men had been seized: force had been used on Iraklis when he went to the consulate to prove his identity, while a press gang had seized Vernardakis in a public place.<sup>88</sup> The Greek consulate in Alexandria denied using violence and questioned the stories of the two Cypriots, claiming that both had volunteered and given false names. If they were telling the truth, why had they not gone to the British consulate?<sup>89</sup> The British authorities decided that pushing Athens for indemnities was useless, yet Lamb wanted it known that he rejected the Greek denial. Iraklis had been subjected to “close and repeated interrogation and his story remained unshaken.” And, like Vernardakis, he could not have escaped to go to the British consulate because he was being held at the Greek one. As for the enthusiasm of Cypriots to volunteer, Lamb would have found this amusing had it not been so tragic, because he was

unfortunately brought into daily contact with the methods of recruiting in vogue in the Greek army. I have seen no sign of the “enthusiasm” to which Mr. Leotsakos [who had reported to Athens on these cases ascribes “Michail Georgiou’s” [the false name given to Iraklis] voluntary enlistment. There was, I was aware, a good deal of volunteering amongst Cypriots demobilised at Constantinople, after a fat time in the Macedonian

Transport Corps (i.e. Cypriot Mule Corps) or Black Sea Labour Battalion, during the summer of 1920; I have heard of no such case since the commencement of operations at the front, though I have received very numerous appeals from the earlier volunteers for my intervention to secure their release, which, I may remark, they are unable to obtain by their own efforts at the expiration of the period for which they volunteered because, by operation of an ingenious Greek law, a volunteer for service in the Greek army acquires “ipso facto” Hellenic nationality and at the end of his period of voluntary service “passes into the reserve of his class” and becomes liable to compulsory service whenever and for so long as that class remains at arms. Needless to say that Cypriot and other foreign volunteers are not informed of this law when they present themselves as volunteers.<sup>90</sup>

Possibly there was some truth to both sides of this story, albeit more to the British and Cypriot versions. There was no doubt that a press gang was working out of the Greek consulate in Alexandria and kidnapping Cypriots, yet there was also evidence that some Cypriots had volunteered in Alexandria and only changed their minds once they had arrived at the front or when the reality that they would be sent to the front had set in. This may have been the case with Phidias Platrites, who told Alban, the British consul-general at Alexandria, that he had told recruiters that he was of “Greek race” and that only later understood the ramifications and informed his officer that he was a British subject, at which point he was allowed to go to the British consulate.<sup>91</sup>

The correspondence between the British Consulate in Smyrna and the Greek, Cypriot, and Egyptian authorities shows that numerous other Cypriots had also suffered the same fate but had not managed to escape their ordeal.<sup>92</sup> The Colonial Office was not favorably impressed: “The Greek Consul at Alexandria appears to act in a very odd way by arresting anyone who is

claimed to be a Greek and shipping him off.”<sup>93</sup> The Greek government had since apologized and undertaken to not interfere with British subjects, but the Colonial Office wondered how they could prevent the issuing of false identities. In the end, all that the British government could do was obtain an assurance from the Greek authorities that they would not interfere with anyone who was a British subject.<sup>94</sup> It was not until 5 May 1922 that the British government finally reissued the “the Cyprus Neutrality Order in Council, 1881,” which prohibited “recruiting for the Military or Naval Service of any State.”<sup>95</sup>

### *Conclusion*

This article has shown that, although the situation is complicated, the constructionist theory applies to the case of Cyprus even as late as the Great War and its aftermath. Although many of the island’s educated elites had adopted a Greek nationalist awareness and desired (with varying degrees of assertiveness) *énōsis*, a majority of the rest of the population did not have such an awareness or desire, as reflected in the service of so few in the Greek armed forces and even the rejection by some of the opportunity to do so. A small number (in comparison to those who served in the British forces from 1916) served in the Balkan Wars: these were mainly men who had settled in the towns and had become inculcated with nationalist ideas. Yet they too seemed to refuse to comply with mobilization orders to serve in the Greek forces (under either Royalist or Venizelist governments) during the Great War. The majority of the Cypriot population, consisting mainly of peasants and laborers, were not Greek subjects (at least according to Greek law), and they were keen to take advantage of opportunities afforded by the Great War and the wars that followed from it primarily because of the monetary advantages associated with serving

(i.e. the promise of a stable and relatively high income): they were, by and large, unmotivated by political or ideological considerations. In the case of the Cypriot Mule Corps, these men were one step above indentured overseas laborers, but they were allowed the opportunity to return to the island after one year. Those who came forward to enlist for the Greek army (but were prevented from doing so by the British authorities), were motivated by the money offered. After the war, many who had emigrated in order to improve their situations were opposed to serving in the Greek army and relied on their British Cypriot nationality to protect them from having to serve. This did not matter to the desperate Greek authorities who resorted to kidnapping Cypriots. Only those who managed to escape and find their way to a British consulate could reveal their harrowing stories and claim their rightful national status. These men clearly did not identify with Greece, and wanted to remain British Cypriot nationals.

Cypriot historiography, with its strong concern to legitimize the *énōsis* policy, has failed to appreciate the complexity of national identity in Cyprus and the feelings of the majority of the population—truly the silent majority. Beyond the elite and growing middle classes, especially in urban areas, there was no movement for *énōsis*, nor a movement opposed to British rule. The evidence suggests that identification with the British Empire and with Greece were both tenuous and that the majority of the population was primarily interested in how they might best improve their living conditions and those of their families. The findings in this article accord with those of Doumanis concerning the Orthodox Christians of Anatolia, indeed it extends the chronologies further in the case of Cypriots, down to at least 1920, when we continue to see the majority of Cypriots not identifying with Greece or Greek national identity.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY, SOUTH AUSTRALIA

DE MONTFORT UNIVERSITY, LEICESTER, UK



## NOTES

The following abbreviations are used in the notes:

NAUK = National Archives, UK, London

CO = Colonial Office

FCO = Foreign and Commonwealth Office

FO = Foreign Office

WO = War Office

SAC = State Archives, Cyprus, Nicosia

SA1 = Secretariat Archive 1

<sup>1</sup>NAUK, CO67/205/45201, Granville to Baltazzi, 25 August 1921, enclosing Lamb to Granville, 16 August 1921.

<sup>2</sup>CO67/205/57679, Lamb to Rumbold, 1 November 1921.

<sup>3</sup>FO78/5181, Lord Salisbury to Lord Lyons, 31 October 1878; Salisbury to Layard, 31 October 1878; Salisbury to Lascelles, 11 November 1878; Lascelles to Salisbury, 17 November 1878; Layard to Lascelles, 20 November 1878; Salisbury to Lascelles, 20 November 1878.

<sup>4</sup>*Elefthería*, 7 October 1916, 3; *Elefthería*, 24 February 1917, 3.

<sup>5</sup>SAC, SA1/722/1916, Stevenson to Dutton, 7 September 1917; Lethbridge to Stevenson, 10 September 1917; WO95/4791, WDSA, Long, DSTS, 4 January 1918.

<sup>6</sup>SA1/978/1916, Haji Ioannis Haji Protopapa, to CSC, 22 November 1918.

<sup>7</sup>SA1/980/1916, telegram, WO, to Gabriel Papadopoulos, 22 December 1917; No. 1 Infantry Record Office, Exeter, to Gabriel Papadopoulos, 14 December 1917; WO372/15/105094.

<sup>8</sup>SA1/980/1916, Papadopoulos to George V, 21 January 1918.

<sup>9</sup>SA1/980/1916, Papadopoulos to George V, 21 January 1918.

<sup>10</sup>SA1/980/1916, Harikleia Theodorou to Storrs, 26 April 1928; M. A. Constantinides, Mudir, to District Commissioner Nicosia, 5 May 1928; SA1/980/1916, District Commissioner Nicosia to Chief Secretary, 7 May 1928.

<sup>11</sup>SA1/558/1919, Ministry of Pensions to Stevenson, 31 May 1919; Chief Secretary to Ministry of Pensions, 9 July 1919; Ministry of Pensions to Stevenson, 13 October 1919; District Medical Officer, Kyrenia, Christos Teresopoulos, report on Eirini G. Pavlides, 17 November 1919; District Commissioner Nicosia, report on George Pavlides, 15 November 1919.

<sup>12</sup>SA1/558/1919, Superintendent of Pensions to Treasurer, 12 February 1920; Director General of Awards to Stevenson, 5 March 1923; Pavlides to Minister of Pensions, 14 December 1923; Director General of Awards to Stevenson, 16 January 1924; Pavlides to Minister of Pensions, 12 July 1924; Chief Secretary to Pavlides, 30 December 1924.

<sup>13</sup>SA1/558/1919, Director General of Awards to Stevenson, 20 April 1920; Ministry of Pensions to Treasurer, 27 October 1920; George Hajielias to Chief Secretary, 28 January 1921.

<sup>14</sup>SA1/558/1919, Finance Secretary, WO, to Crown Agents, 21 February 1920.

<sup>15</sup>SA1/558/1919, Granville to Clauson, 15 December 1918; Pantia Michaelidou to Chief Secretary, 7 November 1919; Director of Recruiting to Michaelides, 1 October 1915; Army of the Black Sea to 3rd Echelon British Section, Alexandria, 15 January 1920; Command

Paymaster, Egypt, to Chief Secretary, 16 February 1920; Michaelides to Chief Secretary, 13 February 1920; Chief Paymaster, Army of the Black Sea, to Chief Secretary, 28 October 1919; Chief Paymaster, Black Sea to Chief Secretary, 23 February 1920.

<sup>16</sup>*Elefthería*, 31 October 1914, 2.

<sup>17</sup>*Elefthería*, 5 December 1914, 2.

<sup>18</sup>CO67/179/14488, Physsenzides to Kitchener, 4 March 1915.

<sup>19</sup>Papapolyviou (1997, 228) accepts Clauson's estimate. See also *Census 1911*, 9. **Census 1911 isn't referenced anywhere else—can more information be provided?** This is a document and I was told to not list official documents in the bibliography. If you want to list it, this is the full reference: *Cyprus Census: Report and General Abstracts of the Census of 1911 Taken on the 2<sup>nd</sup> April 1911*, prepared by, Superintendent of the Census, London, 1912.

<sup>20</sup>CO67/176/16873, telegram, Clauson to Harcourt, 10 April 1915.

<sup>21</sup>CO67/179/2485, WO to Physsenzides, 19 April 1915.

<sup>22</sup>FCO141/2364, *Néon Éthnos*, 26 October 1915; *Kypriakós Fýlax*, 26 October 1915.

<sup>23</sup>*Kypriakós Fýlax*, 24 October 1914, 3.

<sup>24</sup>SA1/1267/1915, Island Provost Marshal to Chief Secretary, 19 October 1915.

<sup>25</sup>FCO141/2364, *Énōsis* (Ένωσις), 4 February 1916.

<sup>26</sup>FCO141/2364, *Foné tēs Kýprou*, 16 September 1916; secret, District Commissionership, Larnaca to Chief Secretary, undated, containing oath and a list of Greek subjects in Larnaca.

<sup>27</sup>FO371/2627/206917, telegram, Elliot to FO, 16 October 1916; CO67/182/50071, immediate and confidential, FO to CO, 19 October 1916; CO to Clauson, 21 October 1916.

<sup>28</sup>FO371/2627/213385, telegram, Clauson to Bonar Law, 22 October 1916; SA1/1406/20, measures taken in the war; *Gazette* 1252, 25 October 1916; *Gazette* 1337, 26 July 1918.

<sup>29</sup>CO67/182/50595, telegram, Clauson to CO, 22 October 1916.

<sup>30</sup>FO371/2627/213385, various minutes, 25 October 1916; FO371/2627/222099, telegram, FO to Elliot, 17 November 1916.

<sup>31</sup>FCO141/2364, *Foné tēs Kýprou*, 19 January 1917.

<sup>32</sup>SA1/1267/1915, District Commissioner of Larnaca to Chief Secretary, 19 December 1917.

<sup>33</sup>FCO141/2364, *Foné tēs Kýprou*, 21 February 1918; *Elefthería*, 22 June 1918; SA1/1267/1915, *Ēchō tēs Kýprou (Hχώ της Κύπρου)*, 21 February 1918; Lukach Memorandum, 26 February 1918.

<sup>34</sup>*Sálpinx*, 8 August 1917, 5.

<sup>35</sup>*Alétheia*, 18 August 1917, 4; *Kypriakós Fýlax*, 21 August 1917, 3.

<sup>36</sup>*Elefthería*, 21 September 1918, 2.

<sup>37</sup>FCO141/2364, *Foné tēs Kýprou*, 27 April 1918; SA1/1267/1915, Lukach, District Commissioner, Famagusta to Chief Secretary, return of Greek reservists left for Egypt, March 1918; Baxendale, District Commissioner, Larnaca, return of Greek reservists left for Egypt, Larnaca, March 1918; Baxendale to Chief Secretary, return of Greek reservists left for Egypt, Larnaca, 30 June 1918; Lukach to chief Secretary, return of Greek reservists left for Egypt, July 1918; Lukach to Chief Secretary, return of Greek reservists left for Egypt, Famagusta, September 1918; Lukach to Chief Secretary, return of Greek reservists left for Egypt, Famagusta, January 1919; Bolton, District Commissioner, Limassol to Chief Secretary, 4 February 1919; Chief Secretary to Georgios Haralambous, 26 July 1919; Chief Secretary to Nikolaos Angeli Ioannou, Rizokarpasso, 31 July 1919; Chief Secretary to Ioannis Michaelides, Limassol, 4 August 1919.

<sup>38</sup>SA1/1267/1915, Vassiliou to General Railway Manager, 25 February 1918; General Railway Manager to Chief Secretary, 27 February 1918; Chief Secretary to General Railway Manager, 28 February 1918; General Railway Manager to Chief Secretary, 9 March 1918.

<sup>39</sup>FCO141/2387, Chief Commandant Police to Chief Secretary, 2 May 1920, enclosing Surridge note, 2 May 1920.

<sup>40</sup>FCO141/2387, Chief Commandant Police to Chief Secretary, 2 May 1920.

<sup>41</sup>FCO141/2387, Hart-Davis note, 15 May 1920; notes between Hart-Davis and Russell, 15 June 1920.

<sup>42</sup>FCO141/2387, *Elefthería*, 19 June 1920, from *Foné tēs Kýprou*, 5 June 1920.

<sup>43</sup>*Kypriakós Fýlax*, 23 June 1920.

<sup>44</sup>FCO141/2387, *Elefthería*, 29 June 1920.

<sup>45</sup>FCO141/2387, *Foné tēs Kýprou*, 30 June 1920.

<sup>46</sup>FCO141/2387, *Néon Éthnos*, 2 July 1920.

<sup>47</sup>FCO141/2387, *Foné tēs Kýprou*, 3 July 1920.

<sup>48</sup>FCO141/2387, *Néon Éthnos*, 2 July 1920.

<sup>49</sup>FCO141/2387, telegram, Kyrillos to Iacovos, 25 June 1920.

<sup>50</sup>FCO141/2387, Iacovos letter in *Harmonía (Αρμονία)*, 10 July 1920.

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>52</sup>CO67/198/32080, telegram, Stevenson to Milner, 29 June 1920; FCO141/2387, Artemis to Stevenson, 27 June 1920.

<sup>53</sup>CO67/198/32699, telegram, Stevenson to Milner, 4 July 1920.

<sup>54</sup>FCO141/2387, CCP to CS, 6 July 1920.

<sup>55</sup>FCO141/2387, Milner to Stevenson, 8 July 1920.

<sup>56</sup>FCO141/2387, CS to Artemis, 9 July 1920.

<sup>57</sup>FCO141/2387, Artemis to Chief Secretary, 14 July 1920.

<sup>58</sup>CO67/200/33415, FO to CO, 7 July 1920.

<sup>59</sup>CO67/200/33991, FO to CO, 10 July 1920, including, very urgent, telegram, Granville to FO, 7 July 1920.

<sup>60</sup>CO67/200/33991, minute, undated; CO to FO, 14 July 1920.

<sup>61</sup>CO67/200/34783, telegram, Granville to FO, 10 July 1920.

<sup>62</sup>CO67/201/35475, Cyprus deputation to Milner, 17 July 1920; CO to Cyprus deputation, 27 July 1920.

<sup>63</sup>FCO141/2387, extract from parliamentary debates, 27 July 1920.

<sup>64</sup>CO67/201/62051, Crosfield to Milner, 10 November 1920, enclosure extracts from Lanitis to Crosfield, 5 October 1920.

<sup>65</sup>CO67/201/57835, Stevenson note, 17 November 1920.

<sup>66</sup>FCO141/2387, *Alētheia*, 16 July 1920.

<sup>67</sup>FCO141/2387, *Fonē tēs Kýprou*, 18 July 1920; *Fonē tēs Kýprou*, 24 July 1920.

<sup>68</sup>FCO141/2387, Theophanis et al., to Stevenson, 9 March 1921.

<sup>69</sup>FCO141/2387, Physsenzides to Stevenson, 20 April 1920.

<sup>70</sup>FCO141/2387, Chief Secretary to Theodotou et al., 11 March 1921.

<sup>71</sup>CO67/205/43709, Granville to Greek Foreign Ministry, 7 May 1921.

<sup>72</sup>CO67/205/43709, Greek Foreign Ministry to British Legation, Athens, 7 July 1921.

<sup>73</sup>CO67/205/43709, Granville to Baltazzi, 28 July 1921.

<sup>74</sup>WO405/1. Given the lack of information about Christodoulides's place of origin, it is impossible to tell whether he is the Nearchos Christodoulou, no. 9963, from Evrihou, Nicosia, or no. 12728, from Kritou Marottou, Paphos.

<sup>75</sup>CO67/205/47192, Granville to Baltazzi, 6 September 1921.

<sup>76</sup>CO67/205/52622, Granville to Curzon, 7 October 1921.

<sup>77</sup>CO67/205/58574, Granville to Curzon, 5 November 1921.

<sup>78</sup>CO67/205/61952, Greek Foreign Ministry to Granville, 14 November 1921.

<sup>79</sup>CO67/205/45201, Granville to Baltazzi, 25 August 1921, enclosing letter from Lamb to Granville, 16 August 1921.

<sup>80</sup>Triphonas Iraklis served twice in the Cypriot Mule Corps, first under no. 5916 and second under no. 10287. His record shows that he was from Kilani, Limassol, and that he deserted during his second term of service, though no date is given.

<sup>81</sup>CO67/205/45201, Granville to Baltazzi, 25 August 1921, enclosing letter from Lamb to Granville, 16 August 1921.

<sup>82</sup>CO67/205/57437, Hatzakos to Curzon, 23 September 1921.

<sup>83</sup>CO67/205/57437, Lamb to Granville, 24 October 1921.

<sup>84</sup>CO67/205/57437, Granville to Curzon, 2 November 1921.

<sup>85</sup>CO67/205/57679, Lamb to Rumbold, 1 November 1921.

<sup>86</sup>FCO141/453/6, 13691, Lamb to Allenby, 10 December 1921.

<sup>87</sup>FCO141/453/6, Lamb to Allenby, 11 October 1921; acting consul, Port Said, to Allenby, 13 October 1921; Egyptian Interior Ministry to The Chancery, 12 December 1921; CO67/204/62276, confidential, Stevenson to Churchill, 6 December 1921; Lamb to Allenby, 18

November 1921; Lamb to Stevenson, 18 November 1921; Lamb to Stevenson, 12 October 1921; Stevenson to Lamb, 25 October 1921; telegram, Lamb to Stevenson, 26 October 1921; telegram, Stevenson to Lamb, 27 October 1921; Lamb to Stevenson, 14 November 1921; Stevenson to Lamb, 25 November 1921.

<sup>88</sup>FCO141/453/6, First Secretary, Cairo, to Egyptian Interior Ministry, 26 October 1921.

<sup>89</sup>FCO141/453/6, note to Furness, 3 January 1922; FCO141/453/6, Allenby to Consul-General, Smyrna, 7 February 1922; FCO141/453/6, Allenby to Consul-General, Alexandria, 17 February 1922.

<sup>90</sup>FCO141/453/6, Lamb to High Commissioner Egypt, 22 February 1922.

<sup>91</sup>FCO141/453/6, 13691, First Secretary, Cairo, to Lamb, 21 March 1922.

<sup>92</sup>FCO141/453/6, acting consul, Port Said, to High Commissioner Egypt, 13 October 1921; CO67/204/62276, confidential, Stevenson to Churchill, 6 December 1921; Lamb to High Commissioner Egypt, 18 November 1921; Lamb to Stevenson, 18 November 1921; Lamb to Stevenson, 12 October 1921; Stevenson to Lamb, 25 October 1921; telegram, Lamb to Stevenson, 26 October 1921; telegram, Stevenson to Lamb, 27 October 1921; Lamb to Stevenson, 14 November 1921; Stevenson to Lamb, 25 November 1921.

<sup>93</sup>CO67/204/62276, minute, 6 December 1921.

<sup>94</sup>CO67/204/62276, confidential, Churchill to Stevenson, 20 December 1921.

<sup>95</sup>FCO141/2387, Notice: The Cyprus Neutrality Order in Council, 1881, 5 May 1922.

#### REFERENCES CITED



- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Bryant, Rebecca. 2004. *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Doumanis, Nicholas. 2013. *Before the Nation: Muslim-Christian Coexistence and Its Destruction in Late-Ottoman Anatolia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- General Staff, War Office. 1913. *Military Report and General Information Concerning the Island of Cyprus*. London: HMSO.
- Georghallides, George S. 1979. *A Political and Administrative History of Cyprus 1918–26*. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Heraclidou, Antigone. 2014. “Cyprus’s Non-Military Contribution to the Allied War Effort during World War I.” *The Round Table* 103 (2): 193–200.
- . 2017. *Imperial Control in Cyprus: Education and Political Manipulation in the British Empire*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Holland, Robert, and Diana Markides. 2006. *The British and the Hellenes: Struggles for Mastery in the Eastern Mediterranean 1850–1960*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jeffrey, Keith. 1981. ““An English Barrack in the Oriental Seas’? India in the Aftermath of the First World War.” *Modern Asian Studies* 15 (3): 369–386.
- Katsiaounis, Rolandos. 1996. *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.

- Koudounaris, Aristidis. 2001. *Βιογραφικόν Λεξικόν Κυπρίων, 1800–1920* [*Biographical lexicon of Cypriots, 1800–1920*]. Nicosia: Pieridis Foundation Editions.
- Koumoulides, J.T.A. 1974. *Cyprus and the War of Greek Independence 1821–1829*. London: Zeno.
- Lucas, Sir Charles, ed. 1926. *The Empire at War*. Vol. V. Oxford: Oxford University Press (for the Royal Colonial Institute).
- Papapolyviou, Petros, ed. 1996. *Εμμανουήλ Μ. Εμμανουήλ, Ημερολόγιον ή Πολεμικάί Σελίδες: Το ημερολόγιο ενός Κύπριου εθελοντή του ελληνοβουλγαρικού πολέμου του 1913* [Emmanuel M. Emmanuel, diary or war pages: The diary of a Cypriot volunteer in the Greek-Bulgarian War of 1913]. Salonica: Germanos.
- . 1997. *Η Κύπρος και οι Βαλκανικοί πόλεμοι: Συμβολή στην ιστορία του κυπριακού εθελοντισμού* [Cyprus and the Balkan Wars: Contribution to the history of Cypriot volunteerism]. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- , ed. 1999. *Πολεμικά Ημερολόγια, επιστολές και ανταποκρίσεις Κυπρίων εθελοντών από την Ήπειρο και τη Μακεδονία του 1912–1913* [War diaries, letters, and responses of Cypriot volunteers from Epirus and Macedonia, 1912–1913]. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- . 2010. «Ο κυπριακός εθελοντισμός στους πολέμους της Ελλάδας, 1866–1945» [Cypriot volunteerism in the wars of Greece, 1866–1945]. In *Κύπρος: Αγώνες ελευθερίας στην ελληνική ιστορία* [Cyprus: Struggles for freedom in Greek history], edited by Andreas I. Voskos, 204–229. Athens: National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.

- Singha, Radhika. 2007. "Finding Labor from India for the War Iraq: The Jail Porter and Labor Corps, 1916–1920." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 49 (2): 412–445.
- Smith, Richard. 2004. *Jamaican Volunteers in the First World War*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. 2002. "Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance." *Archival Science* 2: 87–109.
- . 2010. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tinker, Hugh. 1968. "India in the First World War and After." *Journal of Contemporary History* 3 (4): 89–107.
- Varnava, Andrekos. 2002. "The Maronite Community of Cyprus: Past, Present and Future." *Al-Mashriq: A Quarterly Journal of Middle East Studies* 1 (2): 45–70.
- . 2009. *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878–1915: The Inconsequential Possession*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 2013. "Sophronios III, 1865–1900: The Last of the 'Old' and the First of the 'New' Archbishop-Ethnarchs?" In *The Archbishops of Cyprus in the Modern Age: The Changing Role of the Archbishop-Ethnarch, Their Identities and Politics*, edited by Andrekos Varnava and Michalis Michael, 106–147. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- . 2014. "Recruitment and Volunteerism for the Cypriot Mule Corps, 1916–1919." *Itinerario* 38 (3): 79–101.

- . 2015. “The Politics and Imperialism of Colonial and Foreign Volunteer Legions during the Great War: Comparing Proposals for Cypriot, Armenian and Jewish Legions.” *War in History* 22 (3): 344–363.
- . 2016. “Fighting Asses: Procuring Mules in Cyprus and their Condition at the Salonica Front.” *War in History*, 23 (4): 489–515.
- . 2017a. “European Subaltern War Asses: ‘Service’ or ‘Employment’ in the Cypriot Mule Corps during the Great War?” *Britain and the World* 10 (1): 6–31.
- . 2017b. “The Impact of the Cypriot Contribution during the Great War on Colonial Society and Loyalties/Disloyalties to the British Empire.” *First World War Studies*. 8 (1): 17–36.
- . 2017c. “The Politics of Forgetting the Cypriot Mule Corps.” In *The Great War and the British Empire: Culture and Society*, edited by Michael J. K. Walsh and Andrekos Varnava, 291–303. London: Routledge.
- . 2017d. *Serving the Empire in the Great War: The Cypriot Mule Corps, Imperial Identity and Silenced Memory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 2020. *Andrekos Varnava, British Cyprus and the Long Great War, 1914-1925: Empire, Loyalties and Democratic Deficit*, Routledge, London: Routledge.
- Varnava, Andrekos, and Peter Clarke. 2014. “Accounting in Cyprus during Late Ottoman and Early British Rule, 1840–1918.” *The Cyprus Review* 26 (2): 33–55.
- Varnava, Andrekos, and Evan Smith. 2019. “Destitute Cypriots Abroad, 1914–1931.” In *Australia, Migration and Empire—Immigrants in a Globalised World*, edited by Philip Payton and Andrekos Varnava, 277–312. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wakefield, Alan, and Simon Moody. 2004. *Under the Devil's Eye: Britain's Forgotten Army at Salonica 1915–1918*. Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing.