ETHNIC GROUPS, SPACE AND IDENTITY

01

Nadia Charalambous Antoniadou, Nicos Peristianis
Intercollege Cyprus

01.1

0 Abstract

This paper utilises space analysis, and in particular the ìspace syntaxî theory and methods, to investigate ethnic group relations. More specifically, it considers aspects of Greek and Turkish Cypriot spatial and social relations, on the island of Cyprus. The relations between the two ethnic communities have been marked by intense conflict culminating in the division of the country. Presently the island is slashed in two by a territorial boundary (known as the ìGreen Lineî)- the result of the gradual hardening of the social boundaries between the two communities. Spatial analysis reveals that behind many apparent similarities (similar spatial and social ingredients), lurk strong differences in ethnic identity.

1 Introduction

In recent decades spatial analysis has seen tremendous growth, especially so with the work of Prof. Hillier and the development of the ìspace syntaxî theory and method, that has encouraged research into areas as diverse as the analysis of houses, courts, factories and hospitals, to the analysis of whole urban systems. A conspicuous absence, however, relates to the lack of research on the ethnic uses of space. Yet it must be widely agreed that in the ìlate twentieth centuryî, and especially since the downfall of communist regimes in 1989, there has been a resurgence of ethnic identification and ethnic conflict all over the world. Ethnicity has thus come to the center of attention of students and scholars from various disciplines, but also of politicians and the general public. As Horowitz puts it ìethnicity has fought and bled and burned its way into public and scholarly consciousnessî (Horowitz, 1985: p.xi).This paper takes a first step in the direction of utilising space analysis in the investigation of ethnic group relations, by considering aspects of Greek and Turkish Cypriot spatial and social relations on the island of Cyprus, in the Eastern Mediterranean.

2 Backround to Ethnic Relations in Cyprus

Ethnic relations in Cyprus have been growing ever more tense through time; there has been a progressive hardening of the social boundaries marking ethnic differences, accompanied by the creation of territorial division, culminating in the creation of the so called ìGreen Lineî (a demarcation boundary), that slashes the country from end to end, separating Greek from Turkish Cypriots. The Green Line could perhaps be better described as a 'cultural fault line', to use Samuel Huntingtonís expression, separating 'clashing civilizations' from one another: on one side of the divide is Christianity/the West/the Occident/the First World/modernity and devel-

Nicos Peristianis
Intercollege
46 Makedonitissas Avenue
P.O.Box 4005
1700 Nicosia
Cyprus
Tel. -357 8 41500
Fax. -357 3 57481
Email:perisnic@intercol.edu

Nadia Charalambous Antoniadou
Intercollege
46 Makedonitissas Avenue
P.O.Box 4005
1700 Nicosia
Cyprus
Tel. -357 4 635181
Fax. -357 4 635973
Email: cmakis@cytanet.com.cy

Contents

opment; on the other side is Islam/the Orient/the Third World/tradition and underdevelopmentî (Peristianis, 1999).

Greek and Turkish Cypriots account for the creation of this insurmountable boundary between the two ethnic communities, in completely different ways. Of primary importance is how each side views itself in relation to the Other, and how this view impacts on the perceived ìrightsî to the land. Greek Cypriots stress the salience of history, tracing their descent to early Hellenic civilization on the island and its diachronic continuity through Alexanderís heritage and the glory of the Byzantine empire; this cultural continuity prevailed over great adversities and repeated conquests from the various powers which dominated the region. Thus they regard themselves as ìindigenousî (which many take to mean they should ìown the countryî, since ìCyprus is Greekî), vis-avis the Turkish Cypriots whom they consider ìimportedî latecomers.

01.2

Turkish Cypriots point to the importance of geography, Cyprus being a ìpartî of continental Anatolia, from where came early settlers, with whom they feel they have some kind of primordial links. At the same time they acknowledge that their stronger descent links, and certainly their cultural continuity, relate to the Ottomans, who conquered Cyprus in 1571 and ruled over it for three hundred years.

The Ottoman conquest and subsequent rule of Cyprus is indeed of central importance in the evolution of Cypriot society, as it brought about a number of fundamental changes, which have respective ethnic and spatial consequences.

For one, after conquering Cyprus, the Ottomans either killed or expelled the previous European rulers, thus destroying European feudalism on the island. The land was distributed to the peasants ñ mostly the former serfs (Christians) and to the newly arrived Anatolian (Moslem) settlers. The latter, along with Moslem military and administrators, formed the basis of a distinct new ethnic community, thus establishing permanent ethnic heterogeneity on the island.

Obviously the presence of the Moslem community had important spatial corollaries - viz. the creation of Moslem settlements throughout the island, either as ethnically homogeneous villages, or in ìmixedî villages of heterogeneous ethnic composition (where Moslems usually occupied a physically discrete from the Christians, area).

Another change brought about by the Ottomans relates to the restoration of the Greek Orthodox Church to its previous position of prominence, within Greek Cypriot society, established during Byzantine rule. Throughout the Ottoman empire, the millet system accommodated ethnic diversity by allowing the various ethnic communities comprising the empire, a limited degree of autonomy and self-administration. Thus the Orthodox Church in Cyprus was assigned the role of political representative of the Christians on the island ñ enabling it in this way to gradually amass great political, administrative and economic powers. The central position given to the Church is evidenced by its respective spatial prominence in Greek Cypriot villages. The church, and with it the church square, became the spatial centres of Greek Cypriot settlements, where all religious, social and political life revolves (church attendance, feasts, ethnic celebrations and all other major events).

It would be important to stress that heterogeneity did not lead to ethnic conflict during Ottoman times, as it seems that social boundaries were quite loosely defined during that era ñ and that for a number of reasons. For instance, the distribution of Moslem soldiers throughout the island led to some intermarriage with Christian women (since this meant a better life for the women, avoidance of the burden of having to give a dowry at marriage ñ which was a taxing practice for Christian families at the time, and other similar benefits); religious conversion became a not infrequent practice ñ either through marriage, as above, or through forced conversion of Christian boys, or, finally, through the practice of Crypto-Christianity (i.e. the adoption of Islamic practices in public, while maintaining Christianity in private). Furthermore, language was not such an absolute barrier as most Moslems (Turkish Cypriots) spoke Greek and some Christians (Greek Cypriots) spoke Turkish. Even religion itself was not such a great source of ethnic antagonism: for example, the Turks of Cyprus, although Muslim, were much more secular than Moslems elsewhere. All such facts weakened the boundary line separating the two communities.

In fact, research seems to give support to the view that ethnic relations between ordinary people during Ottoman rule, were quite amicable. What characterized the period was class conflict instead, which often took the form of joint action of the peasant classes versus the ruling elite (Moslem military/administrative leaders and Christian church leaders). Conflict along class lines was converted into ethnic conflict through a gradual process during the subsequent period of British colonialism. It was linked to a large extent to the development of nationalism within the two communities: Greek Cypriots canvassing for Enosis (union with Greece) and Turkish Cypriots, in reaction, canvassing for Taksim (partition of the island). This basic ethnic antagonism was reinforced by socio-economic and other cleavages, so that by the end of British rule it reached explosive proportions. Independence, achieved in 1960, did not manage to eradicate underlying simmering tensions, and in 1963 intercommunal conflict led to withdrawal of the Turkish Cypriots into enclaves. In 1974, after a Greek inspired coup against President Makarios, Turkey intervened militarily, partitioning the island into two ìethnically cleanî zones.

It would not be difficult to discern a mutually reinforcing process in the formation of the social and territorial boundaries on the island. The gradual hardening of the social boundaries between the two major ethnic communities led to the gradual build up of the territorial boundary. The entrenchment of the territorial boundary has, in turn, contributed to the further hardening of the social boundary between the communities. Thus, after 1974, the Turkish Cypriot community has been putting increasing stress on its ìTurkishnessî, and thereby to its differences vis-‡-vis its Greek Cypriots.

Within the Greek Cypriot community Cypriocentrism rose to prominence in the years right after 1974, as a reaction to what was widely perceived as the great betrayal of Greece ñ that is, the Greek juntaís staging of the coup in Cyprus and Greeceís subsequent inability to forestall the Turkish invasion. However, by the late 1980s it became obvious that a process of reversal had set in with Hellenocentrism staging a comeback: this had to do with the impasse of the Cyprus problem and the renewed

relationships with Greece, seen to be the only hope in the unequal struggle versus an adversary of much greater military strength. Parallel to the above political processes, the rapid and massive modernisation accompanying the economic miracle in the south, together with the opening up of society as a result of the globalisation process, produced feelings of rootlessness within Greek Cypriot society, so that the return to Hellenocentrism and its age-old values was gaining renewed attraction. Clerides ascent to power in 1993 can be seen to be the logical outcome of the merging of all above trends.

It is then obvious that on both sides of the boundary the adversaries have re-affirmed their relations to their ìmother nationsî and their respective ethnic loyalties have gained new strength.

Despite the severity of the clash, ethnic relations between the two communities have not been the subject of systematic study and most writing on the issue is ideologically motivated. Thus, nationalists on each side blaim the other side for all evils (Greek Cypriots usually blaim it all on the ìbarbarianî Turks and mostly the ìintransigentî Turkish and Turkish Cypriot leaderships; Turkish Cypriots usually blaim the Orthodox Church and its leader ñ Makarios, who became the first head of state, and so on). Anti-nationalists on the other hand, often go to the other extreme, idealizing past relationships between the two communities, finding elements of symbiosis and peaceful co-existence everywhere. Here is a typical comment: ìWhen a geographer studied the forms and functions of the Rural Dwelling of the island in 1959, he gave an analytic description covering both nationalities because he did not discern any differences or divergences between them Ö. The same is true of their types of settlements, land tenure and water rights and other aspects of rural lifeÖ. Financial problems, debts, usury, etcÖî (Kyrris, 1977: p.28).

Such approaches, of whichever extreme, add little to our understanding of the problem. That is why a number of recent studies, which try to view ethnic relationships utilizing more dispassionate and non-ideological approaches, are more than welcome. The present paper, based on one such study (Charalambous, 1992), attempts to explore relations between the two communities, as revealed through spatial and cultural differences and/or similarities. The sample used for the analysis consists of fourteen Cypriot villages: four purely Greek Cypriot, four purely Turkish Cypriot and six mixed villages, randomly selected from one province of Cyprus in order to eliminate the possibility of regional variations. At the local level, the sample is made up of 184 houses taken from the above villages: 93 Greek Cypriot houses and 91 Turkish Cypriot houses.

3 Spatial Analysis

3.1 Domestic Space Organisation

Ethnographic studies of domestic space organisation suggest that space features in our societies in surprising and often unexpected ways, as a means of social and cultural identification (Bordieu,1973). Such studies which have concerned themselves with social organisation suggest that the household is a “sociogram” not only of a family but of something much more: a whole social system (Hanson and Hillier,1979,

1982) .

Ethnographic material on the rural life of Cyprus suggests that the household formed the main social and functional unit of Cypriot society (Markides, 1978), (Loizos, 1975). All social and most work related activities of the family took place within the boundaries of the household. The agricultural economies of the villages (both Turkish and Greek Cypriot) led to similar needs and a similar pattern of rural life of the two ethnic groups which, in turn led to similar "spatial ingredients" " and similar rules of growth (Ionas, 1988), (Papacharalambous, 1968), (Sinos, 1976), (Delaney, 1991). Visual inspection of some of the houses' layouts confirms this observation, Fig 1a,b,c,. The "ingredients" of each space-code seem to be identical: yards, kitchens, living rooms, bedrooms, storage for animals and goods.

Obviously, visual inspection and comparison of broad geometric and locational aspects, cannot on their own help us to ascertain how one ethnic sample differs or is similar to domestic forms in the other sample or to suggest what the dimensions of variability within each sample might be. Closer investigation, utilising syntactic analysis (Hillier and Hanson, 1984) based on Space Syntax methods,does indeed shed light on these issues and demonstrates that the forms of these dwellings embody patterns of family life and culture which are unique to each ethnic group, as is shown below.

On the basis of the access graphs from the front door (whether this is a boundary or entrance to a room), without considering the label of functions, a number of preliminary observations can be made , Fig 2. It seems that within a morphologically variable sample, groupings of characteristics can be observed. Firstly, it is evident that irrespective of the internal organisation of the complexes, the relation of the interior of the houses to the exterior is made, in most of the cases, via a transition. A second striking feature is the tendency of the Cypriot dwelling to get deeper as it gets bigger. A more formal way of saying this, is to compare the mean depth values of the graphs, as the number of spaces and transitions increase; the tendency to increase with the number of cells in the complex is clear; in other words, asymmetric relations predominate over symmetric relations. Thirdly, there is a preponderance of non-distributed over distributed schemes.

The most striking observation which can be made about the major part of the sample in relation to the ethnic groups and the ways in which spaces are named, is that in most cases a transition space, the yard, is the shallowest and the most integrating space in the complexes, Fig 3. However, as far as depth is concerned, syntactic properties reveal that different positions of the yard identify with one or the other ethnic group, Table 1.

It is apparent that for most of the Greek Cypriot subset the yard is the shallowest and the most integrating space. It is most of the times at depth 1and serves as the main link between the carrier and the other functions of the complex; that is, it controls all relations between the inside and the outside of the house.

Within the Turkish Cypriot subset, the yard of the smaller houses is the shallowest

space. As the houses and the graphs get bigger and more complex, the yard becomes up to five steps deep although it is still the most integrating space [Table 1]. In these cases, which form the rest of the Turkish Cypriot sample, the shallowest spaces directly connected to the carrier are either living rooms or verandahs and gardens which are only used as a transition to the living room [Table 2].

Table 1. Summary of houses' syntactic data by ethnicity and occupational class

01.6

Ethnic Group	Occ. class	RRA Integr. Funct.	RRA Trans.	RRA Exter.	RRA	L	Y	B	K Space
Greek Cypriots	Total	1.16	1.34	0.69	1.32				
	C2	1.32	1.48	0.98	1.41	0.26	0.69	1.84	1.22	Y
	C3	1.16	1.34	0.78	1.36	0.09	0.48	1.70	1.20	Y
	C4	1.02	1.19	0.31	1.18	0.18	0.23	1.18	1.14	Y
Turkish Cyp.	Total	1.14	1.20	1.06	1.50				
	C2	1.20	1.22	1.07	1.40	0.87	0.48	1.45	1.10	Y
	C3	1.19	1.25	1.06	1.75	0.77	0.64	1.44	1.36	L
	C4	1.02	1.12	1.05	1.34	0.68	0.25	1.17	1.51	Y&L

For most of the Turkish Cypriot sample, the yard becomes an internal courtyard, a "back yard", which serves as a link between the two parts of the split graphs identified in the unlabelled spatial analysis, Fig. 2. Although the different configurational properties of the yard seem to be associated with ethnic identity, some examples seem to cross the ethnic divide (particularly in the case of the smaller houses), and present variations within the ethnic groups.

Similar observations can be made for the living rooms. Firstly, it should be noted that in the smaller houses living rooms (as separate rooms) are rare, but where they occur they are shallow and integrating. In the bigger houses the living room is the shallowest space and directly permeable to the carrier. It is clear from the data that most of these cases belong to the Turkish Cypriot subset, whereas in the Greek Cypriot subset living rooms are deeper and relatively segregated, [Table 2].

Differences are also identified within the ethnic groups. In the Greek Cypriot sample, living rooms get deeper and more segregated as the houses get bigger. In the Turkish Cypriot sample, variation is more evident; as the houses get bigger the number of living rooms increases. Most importantly a new type of room appears, called the "guests" room or "oda", which is shallow but segregated, Fig.3.

Within the whole sample there are clear differences in which functions are spatialised. Two distinct genotypical tendencies emerge: one centres on the highly integrating and shallow yard, little spatial differences among living spaces, which are segregated, and a more integrated exterior. The other centres on the highly integrating and shallow living room, strong spatial differences among living spaces and a more segregated exterior; living spaces are in this case more integrating while the yard though still very integrating becomes relatively deep in the complex. The former identifies

with the Greek Cypriot subset while the latter identifies with the Turkish Cypriot subset.

These strong trends across the sample are in themselves strong evidence of underlying spatial cultures, expressing themselves through the spatial form of the houses. This suggests that although houses in both ethnic groups have the same spatial "ingredients", it is their spatial configuration which discloses ethnic identity.

Table 2. Syntactic Data of villages by Ethnicity

Houses Location	Ethnic Origin		RRA	L	K	B funct.	RRA trans.	RRA exter.	RRA
Vavatsinia	GC		1.28	1.43	1.33	2.06	1.57	0.92	1.16	
Katolefkara	GC		1.33	1.27	1.22	1.77	1.64	0.72	1.58	
Ora	GC		1.08	1.10	1.02	1.62	1.30	0.69	1.18	
Psevdas		GC		1.32	0.98	1.15	1.73	1.59	0.69	1.57
Mennoyia	TC		1.08	0.57	1.11	1.34	1.09	0.74	1.47	
Klavdia		TC		1.05	0.68	1.22	1.34	1.12	0.66	1.39
Kellia	TC		1.23	0.70	1.40	1.76	1.37	0.86	1.65	
Kivisil	TC		1.24	0.77	1.38	1.41	1.34	0.80	1.70	
Kalochorio	GC		1.21	0.71	1.37	1.64	1.36	0.65	1.59	
	TC		1.75	0.99	1.35	1.47	1.35	0.87	1.68	
Ayia Anna	GC		1.10	1.25	1.15	1.52	1.31	0.62	1.45	
	TC		1.18	0.78	1.13	1.37	1.31	0.64	1.48	
Pyrga	GC		1.17	0.96	1.07	1.67	1.28	0.71	1.53	
	TC		1.25	0.75	1.71	1.51	1.31	0.65	1.65	
Anaphotia	GC		1.26	1.27	1.24	1.58	1.51	0.81	1.42	
	TC		1.35	1.03	1.30	1.82	1.41	0.99	1.90	
Potamia	GC		1.16	0.82	0.91	1.38	1.33	0.57	1.35	
	TC		1.32	0.90	1.10	0.63	2.08	0.11	2.17	
Pyla	GC		1.22	1.11	1.25	1.47	1.45	0.70	1.51	
	TC		1.11	0.91	1.90	1.38	1.34	0.52	1.72	

However, as we have seen, ethnic differentiation alone cannot explain the variety of forms and syntactic properties presented within as well as between the two groups. In both cases, on the basis of the evidence available, it seems that the syntactic properties of depth, asymmetry and nondistributeness are found among the poorer houses of the lower occupational classes, while more prosperous houses tend to be more symmetrical and distributed.

3.2 The Global Level: Analysis of settlements layout.

As we saw earlier on, the household formed the main social institution of Cypriot villages. Interaction mainly took place in the neighbourhoods, the villagesí square and on special occasions in the Church or Mosque accordingly. Of primary importance for men, was the coffee shop (kafenion or kahve), usually found in the villagesí centre and serving a multitude of functions (socialising, exchange of information

and others). Around the centre one would find small shops like bakeries and groceries (Markides, 1978).

In order to establish how these "spatial ingredients" are configured within the villages we need to study the open space structure of the villages. Two levels of analysis will be used to describe the organisation of public space: the "convex" analysis or "two-dimensional" organisation of the system, and the "one-dimensional" or axial organisation (Hillier and Hanson, 1984).

01.8

The open space maps of the Cypriot villages show how the islands of buildings form a system of open spaces which vary in width and length, Figs 4a,b,c,. The "beady ring" structure thus revealed knits together the "fatter" to the ìlongerî segments of space much like beads on a string. This property is even more obvious in the convex maps of the Greek Cypriot villages; through the length and width of the convex segments and their variety, Figs 4a,b,c. In the same way, if we look at the Turkish Cypriot public space we can see both similarities and differences. In the smallest systems we see similar properties as the respective systems in the Greek Cypriot case. In the bigger systems, however, the Turkish Cypriot public space seems to be composed of more uniform parts. The buildings are arranged in such a way as to create a flow of open space with sections of little variation in size. This is also seen in the convex spaces which now become less variant.

As far as the convex interface maps are concerned, Figs. 4a,b,c, in the Greek Cypriot villages, the maps are dense and ringy, suggesting that the interface map will be more or less the permeability map of the settlement. Indeed the interface organisation values confirm this observation. The high values in the Greek Cypriot villages indicate that the interface and permeability maps are more or less the same, Table 3. What this suggests, is that interface in the Greek Cypriot settlements probably takes place in the open, public space.

In the Turkish Cypriot villages, on the other hand, a good many buildings and boundaries are relatively remote from the public, open spaces of the settlement, as the low interface organisation values indicate. A complete permeability map would therefore, need to include relations of adjacency and direct permeability from buildings to secondary boundaries and from secondary boundaries to each other. This observation suggests that unlike the case ofGreek Cypriot settlements, interface in Turkish Cypriot villages most probably takes place at the back of the houses and not in the wider public space.

Table 3. Purely Greek Cypriot and purely Turkish Cypriot villages - Basic Syntactic data

No	Code	Ethnic	Axial	RRA	Con	Depth	Convex		Convex		Axial
Inter.		Group	Organ.				Articul.		Organ.	Artic.	Organ.
1	Vavat.	GC	0.65	1.38	2.44	6.60	0.89	1.16	0.42	0.96	
2	Lefkar.		GC	0.90	1.42	2.50	4.75	0.74	1.53	0.33	0.93
3	Ora	GC	0.73	1.38	2.42	8.34	0.94	1.53	0.43	0.95	

4	Psev.	GC	0.69	1.29	2.33	6.94	0.82	1.55	0.28	0.96
5	Menn.	TC	1.26	1.59	2.71	3.94	0.74	1.65	0.24	0.76
6	Klav	TC	1.23	1.90	3.26	4.17	0.71	1.61	0.18	0.82
7	Kellia	TC	0.98	1.71	3.03	5.18	0.86	1.67	0.31	0.66
8	Kivisil.	TC	0.98	1.00	2.97	8.05	0.79	1.62	0.29	0.73

A study of the global properties of the settlements, through the axial maps, shows that unlike the Turkish Cypriot villages, in the Greek Cypriot cases the entrances to the villages are "complicated" and segregated; this is clearly shown in the bigger systems. In other words, the outside or carrier is relatively deep and segregated from the centre of the settlement, Figs 4a,b,c.

If we look at the integration cores, in both cases they include the most public spaces such as coffee shops and small shops. However, in the Greek Cypriot cases the integration cores are relatively deep from the outside , while in the Turkish Cypriot cases they are based towards one area of the villages, which is in most cases the centre of the villages.

If we now have a look at the other extreme, of the less integrating spaces, we find that in the Turkish Cypriot settlements these tend to cluster towards the periphery; a marked change in integration values is observed in these areas, which are relatively cut-off from the centre. These spaces include the residential areas of the villages. In the Greek Cypriot settlements, on the other hand, the less integrating spaces are clustered as we have already seen, around the entrances to the settlements. The quiet residential areas between the periphery and the centre, are of lower integration values but are achieved without cutting them off the main structure of the settlements.

Having in mind that the axial organisation refers to the access of visitors into the system, while the convex organisation refers to the inhabitants, we may broadly suggest that in the Greek Cypriot villages, access of visitors into the settlement is difficult; but once inside, the system ensures that the natural movement of inhabitants to, from and between the more segregated zones within the villages intersects the spaces used by visitors. This creates a strong, natural "probabilistic" interface between inhabitants and visitors in the settlements (Hillier and Hanson, 1984).

In contrast, the Turkish Cypriot settlements although easily accessible from the outside, restrict their integration cores and the movement of visitors to well defined peripheral areas and segregate large areas of the villages for the more exclusive use of the inhabitants. The stranger is allowed into the villages but under strong restrictions and control. The dwellings are segregated from both the open space of the village and from the outside world. Consequently, inhabitants do not interface with strangers in their role as inhabitants because of the depth of the open space from the dwellings, while strangers rarely penetrate into the residential neighbourhoods, because of their depth from the carrier.

Differences in space organisation, however, are also found within each ethnic group, Table 4; if we look at the mixed villages, certain neighbourhoods or areas exhibit different spatial properties than others within the structure of the villages. In the

Greek Cypriot parts houses of different occupational structures seem to share more or less similar syntactic properties.

In the Turkish Cypriot parts syntactic data reveals a different picture. Houses of higher occupational classes seem to be clustered along integrating axial lines, whereas houses of the lower occupational class are located in relatively deep and segregated locations. In all cases, the lower class is deeper, and both locally and globally, more segregated than the higher class.

Table 4 - Summary of syntactic data by ethnic group and occupational class

Ethnic origin	Class	RRA	Depth	Connect.
GC	C2	1.14	5.14	2.91
	C3	1.56	4.16	3.16
	C4	1.07	4.86	2.53
TC	C2	1.40	4.70	4.83
	C3	0.96	6.50	2.50
	C4	0.71	6.10	1.83

A further comment which could be made is that a look at the convex and axial maps of these villages, suggests that wealthier areas in the Turkish Cypriot parts are more convexly organised; that is, axial lines cover a large number of convex spaces, giving a better local - to - global relation. In the "poorer" areas, axial lines are many times as long as the convex spaces, Figs. 4a,b,c.

4 From space to society

We have seen in the previous section, two quite distinct forms of spatial organisation. To account for the social significance of these differences, we will now proceed to investigate possible relations between spatial patterns and sociological elements of each ethnic group.

In the traditional, rural society of Cyprus, the household was the primary social unit (Kyrris, 1975). Familism was the most important orientation in both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot cultures (Balswick, 1972) (Loizos, 1975). Within the family kinship was implicated in the construction of gender, that is, ideas on maleness and femaleness .

4.1.Greek Cypriot Community

As various ethnographic reports indicate, the idea of the household (nikokirio), is the single significant element through which marriage and kinship are formally regulated and through which individuals acquire their key statuses in the village as well as the most compelling rights and duties which reflect their relations (Markides, 1978) (Loizos, 1975).

In Greek Cypriot society womanhood is associated with nurturing, cooking and cleaning - in other words, the wife is responsible for everything that pertains to the everyday activities of the household and for the maintenance of the sexual honour of

the family intact. Manhood, on the other hand, means providing for and protecting the family as well as representing the household in the public life of the village. It seems that in the Greek Cypriot family, there is a natural division of labour so that the role expectations of men and women or husband and wife are clearly defined and complementary to one another.

However, a more careful look within the Greek Cypriot sample reveals differences between the three subsets introduced in the previous part. Visiting patterns differ in each sub-group. In the poorer families visitors are very rare, except close kin; the latter are entertained in the same living room shared by the family, a space which is shallow. In general, people hardly exchange formal visits among one another. The only cases in which they invite a great number of people to their house besides close relatives, for "fagopoti" (eating, drinking and merrymaking), are in engagements or marriage occasions (Markides, 1975).

In the wealthier households, even if, in general, luxury is absent, ostentation is not unknown. The best room in the house, the living room is almost never used by the family except to receive honoured guests; it is thus rendered a "transpatial" space. Its' function is to articulate relations across greater distances, both social and spatial, and to achieve this it must be unlinked as far as possible from the surrounding spatial system. Indeed the syntactic values of the living room express this requirement; it becomes more and more segregated by the addition of the loggias which act as transitions between interior and exterior.

In complete contrast to the living room, the yard has the contrary syntactic principles: shallow from the exterior and most integrated with the rest of the household. The yard is the key locus of spatial solidarity: it is the space to which all members of the household have equal access and to which they have equal rights. But it is also a space in which all local interaction dependent on spatial proximity - relations with neighbours - normally take place. However, although the yard door is usually left open for most of the day, neighbours who are involved in frequent interaction outside their houses, seldom enter one another's living spaces. Family life is reserved for the home. Every family struggles through each of its members to defend its honour (time), this being the expression of its moral heritage and of its social achievement. To protect itself against various forms of social control such as mocking and gossip, the family conceals the actions of its members behind a shroud of privacy (Peristiany, 1965) (Campell, 1964).

This sharp differentiation between the nuclear family and the outside world is modified by a number of relations which fan out of the family into the community, linking the family groups in a number of different ways.

At first sight the Greek Cypriot men appear to have a big advantage in terms of spatial arrangements outside the house, which is not available to women; they have a special place of their own, the coffee shop (kafenio), where women are not allowed to go (Photiades, 1975) (Papataxiarchis, 1988). The coffee shop suggests ideas that contrast with those of the household and immediate locality or the neighbourhood.

These observations would seem to imply that a woman's social world was limited to

her neighbourhood whereas a man's social world was the coffee house and the open space of the village. However, this is not actually the case; women are powerfully present throughout the local open space of the Greek Cypriot villages, not as a group but distributed everywhere through church attendance, work in the fields and neighbourhood life.

The house and family would exist in potential isolation were it not for the clearly defined code of neighbourhood conduct, emphasising sociability, openness and requiring frequent interaction from residents in the locality. This way of life accounts for the dense interface pattern both between inhabitants and between inhabitants and visitors, found in the Greek Cypriots settlements.

An interesting fact related to Greek Cypriot society is the fluidity of its social structure and the relative absence of direct poverty (Loizos, 1977). We do not find the emergence of a vertical, monolithic stratification system where the rich of the community determine both the economic life of the villages as well as the politics; we could suggest with some caution, that we have a relatively egalitarian social structure which clearly accounts for the uniform pattern of syntactic properties found for both rich and poor houses.

4.2 Turkish Cypriot Community

In Turkish Cypriot society we find very similar values relating to the family and the relations between the sexes, the main difference being that distinctions are much sharper (Pierce,1964) (Stirling, 1963&1965). This is well documented by the syntactic data of our sample. Indeed the spatial structure of the house carries a great deal of social information embedded in its layout and the labels which are attached to spaces. There are special places where visitors are entertained, men and women are allocated specific and distinct spaces in the house and there is an obvious attempt to enforce a strong boundary between the interior of the dwelling and the public street. In other words, the main difference between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots households seems to be that although social differences do exist in both cases, in the latter they are not ìbuild into the bricks and mortarî, neither are they institutionalised in such a way as to create marked structural inequalities.

To illustrate we could consider the living room. Most routes from one space to another in the system as a whole (and certainly those leading in and out of the women's domain located around the back yard), will pass through this space. Women, however, rarely visit this particular room, as they have to stay hidden away from strangersí eyes (Stirling 1965). The main living room, the ev, deep and segregating, is the province of the wife of the household head, where she sleeps with her husband and usually with her young children.

While in the poorer households only one living room exists for the rare entertainment of guests and most often kin, the wealthier households have a special room for the men of the household where they sit in the evenings and entertain neighbours and guests (viz. the "guests" rooms). In contrast to the main living room (ev), the guestsí room belongs to the men and should preferably stand apart from the rest of the house. The syntactic values of this space express these requirements; it is shallow from the exterior but deep from the rest of the spaces in the house, it is segregated

and non distributed.

The back yard in the Turkish Cypriot house becomes the hinge which separates the two different areas of the household. It is mainly a place for the realisation of womensí solidarity, strongly segregated from the outside world. The world of women in Turkish Cypriot villages is the private world of the house and the back courtyard. Very often the houses have passageways leading from courtyard to courtyard which allow women to move between houses without having to use a public lane or street. In complete contrast to the hideaway world of women, the world of men is the public world of the street, the place of business, the mosque and above all the Kahve, the coffee house

The above observations reflect how rules or residence have affected the proliferation of family segments over time. This is clearly seen in the sparse interface maps of the Turkish Cypriot villages; a consequence of these properties is that visitors experience a different settlement than the inhabitants know.

Unlike the Greek Cypriot case, economic power and political power are closely related in Turkish Cypriot society. The asymmetrical relationships within every aspect of the Turkish Cypriot community constitute very promising seedbeds of inequality, patronage and patron/client relations. This is experienced both at the local level of the domestic interior and the global level of the village. In the former case, as we have already seen, every household contained a living room but only the better off could afford a guests' room, a room which was more than an entertainment room. In other words, to possess a guests' room is a mark of wealth and standing; the wealthier houses possessed one, the humbler and poorer ones on the whole did not. Attendance in one of those rooms, implied political submission to and support of its owner.

At the global level of the village wealthy households tended to cluster in particular locations while poorer houses were located in different ìmahallesî (neighbourhoods). Each group exhibited different syntactic properties; the poorer were isolated within the segregated areas of the villages while the wealthy were concentrated in the centre of things, occupying the most integrating areas. In other words, both the local and the global level of the Turkish Cypriot society can be seen as a spatial mapping of a strong hierarchy in terms of social status and wealthy within the villages.

5 Summary of the findings: a comparison

The cultural investment in space, both locally and globally, varies to a considerable degree between as well as within each ethnic group. In almost every aspect the Greek Cypriots are unlike Turkish Cypriots, therefore casting fundamental doubts on the thesis of "harmonious symbiosis" founded on a "shared folk piety and a common lifestyle" suggested some students of the relations between the two communities (see section 2 above).

Morphologically, most of these differences add due to the fact that the Turkish Cypriots partake in a ìcorrespondenceî society, while the Greek Cypriots in a non correspondence society meaning that in the Turkish Cypriot case there is a correspondence between social groupings and social demarcations; that is, a cultural invest-

ment in the locality. A strong exogenous model is found in both household and village arrangements, based on the relations between men and women dictated by Islamic law and structuring strong patterns of encounters and avoidance between the two sexes. In the Greek Cypriot sample social structure is not reflected or does not correspond to spatial organisation, and there is more investment in the global structure at the expense of the local group. An endogenous model is detected which organises relations within and between the households which are spatially stable but non-territorial.

Based on the analysis we believe that although the two ethnic groups are made of the same spatial and social "ingredients", the spatial configuration of these brings about strong differences in ethnic identity. It has also been suggested that ethnic differentiation alone cannot explain the variety of forms presented within as well as between the two groups. We used both the form of the local spatial organisation at the domestic level and its relation to the global level, to suggest that spatial differentiation was also associated with the occupational class and status of different social groups in the villages. A more complex picture emerges which has both differences within each ethnic grouping as well as tendencies which cut across ethnic divisions, but which relate together people of a similar status or social position.

6 Notes

PAGE

PAGE 21

The sample used for the analysis consists of fourteen Cypriot villages: four purely Greek Cypriot, four purely Turkish Cypriot and six mixed villages. At the local level, the sample is made up of 184 houses taken from the above villages: 93 Greek Cypriot houses and 91 Turkish Cypriot houses.

"Space Syntax" is a set of techniques for the representation and quantification of spatial patterns

In this graph, each effective space, (room), is represented by a circle, each subsidiary space, (stable, stores) and transitions, (stairs, verandahs) by a point and each permeability (door, opening), by a line. The exterior, (in this case the open space of the village), is selected as the "root" and the rest of the spaces are then aligned above it according to how many spaces one must pass through to arrive at each space from the rest. The number of spaces that need to be crossed to move from one space to another is defined as the Depth between two spaces. The relative depth of the space taken as the root from all others in the justified graph is used in this paper as the quantified form of depth, the Real Relative asymmetry, RRA. Low values of RRA indicate a space from which the system is shallow, that is a space which tends to integrate the system, and high values a space which tends to be segregated from the system.

Mean depth of a system can be calculated by assigning a depth value to each space according to how many spaces it is away from the original space, summing these values and dividing by the number of spaces in the system lees one, (the original space).

To make this observation more precise, a symmetric complex or subcomplex is one in which the relation of cell a to cell b is the same as that from cell b to cell a; an asymmetric complex is one in which one or more cells control permeability to at least one other cell, thus in the case of a and b , they are asymmetric components with respect to each other but both are asymmetrically related to c.

A non-distributed complex or sub-complex is one on which all relations to the carrier are controlled by one cell; a distributed complex or subcomplex is one where there is more than one non-intersecting route back to the carrier

All values are the mean values of total RRA, RRA of living rooms, yard, kitchens, bedrooms, functional spaces, transitions and exterior. Careful study of the information obtained from the Department of Statistics and Research, Ministry of Finance in Cyprus led to the differentiation of occupations in four occupational classes. Guidance was also given by the village's headman. Information on Turkish Cypriot houses is based on information provided by local people and headmen familiar with the village's history. It should be noted here that the apparent lack of class crystallisation was manifested in the Cypriot villages where

we could not find clusters of families with clearly defined characteristics such as mannerisms, clothing and style of life that one may encounter in other developing societies. There are to some extent some wealthy and some poor and there is the great majority in the middle. To that extent there are social classes in the villages if we restrict the concept ìclassí to the economic position of the individual within the economic sphere.

The "convex" analysis or "two-dimensional" organisation of the system, refers to the local organisation of the system from the point of view of those who are already statically present in the system; it can be described by dividing the public space into smaller spaces in such a way that it is divided into the fewest and "fattest" convex spaces

the "one-dimensional" or axial organisation, refers to the global organisation of the system form the point of view of those who move in to and through the system; that is, terms of its lines of access and sight. It can be described by drawing the fewest and longest straight lines which pass through all the convex spaces of the settlement.

A key map describing interface is the convex interface map. In this map, circles represent convex spaces, dots are house complexes, while lines link dots to circles whenever there is a relation of both adjacency and direct permeability from the building or boundary to the convex space.

Convex Articulation is given in average number of buildings per convex space.

Convex Organisation is given as the axial integration of convex spaces,)average number of convex spaces per axial line)

Axial articulation is given in average number of buildings per axial line).

Axial organisation values are given in RRA values from the outside

RA3 is the integration value within three steps of the local system understudy.

The RRA value measures the integration of the system, it compares how deep the system is from a certain axial line with how deep it could theoretically be. Low values of RRA indicate axial lines with "low integration" or "segregated" and are shown in dark black lines. RRA is used instead of Relative Asymmetry, RA, in order to eliminate the factor of size and be able to compare systems which vary in size. Interface organisation is given in average number of buildings adjacent and permeable from the open space structure of each village per the whole number of buildings in the village. Higher values closer to 1 will indicate that the interface map of the system looks like the permeability map of the system.

The integration core of a settlement consists of the 10% most integrating lines

The presentation of social structures is by no means exhaustive. Themes are selected in relation to the paper's main concerns and are to a large extent generalised. Differences in social organisation also exist; however, villages were chosen from the same region in order to avoid possible regional variability, and themes were carefully selected in order to give a clear picture of the prevailing social structures.

A label grouping is called here transpatial because it does not depend on spatial proximity

In the mornings, women can be found standing in small groups on street corners or neighbourhood shops, discussing domestic matters or village gossip. Thus, social contact takes place under the disguise of some other activity, such as buying bread and shopping in the local grocer. Women, therefore, far from being in total seclusion, manage to combine a high degree of social interaction outside the home with their primary obligations as housewives.

These properties are immediately referred to the concept of transpatial solidarity, like the living room in the wealthy Greek Cypriot house. However, unlike the latter, the guests' room in solely for the realisation and strengthening of male solidarity.

Stirling, (1965) has gone so far to argue that the existence of a very roughly agreed scale or rank in the villages became clear from the seating arrangements in the guests' room; the position nearest the fireplace was that of the greater honour.

7 References

Alastos, D. (1960). Cyprus Guerilla, Grivas, Makarios and the British. London: Heinemann.

Attalides, M. (1979). ìRelations Between Greek and Turkish Cypriots and the Problem of Bicommunalismî in Attalides, M. (ed) (1979). Nationalism and International Politics, Ch.5, pp. 80-103 London.

Bailey, F. G. (1971). Gifts and Poison: the politics or Reputation. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Balswick, J. (1972). The Greek Cypriot Family in a Changing Society, Department of Welfare Services, Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance, Cyprus.

Bordieu, P. (1973). ìThe Berber Houseî in Douglas, M. (1973) (ed) Rules and Meanings. London: Penguin.

Campell, J. (1964). Honour, family and Patronage: A study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community. Clarenon Press, Oxford.

Christodoulou D. (1959). The Evolution of the Rural Land Use Pattern in Cyprus, Geographical Publications Ltd.

Davis, J. (1983). Honour and Shame in Pisticci. UK: Proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Institute.

Delaney, C. (1991). The Seed and the Soil: Gender and Cosmology in Turkish Village Society, University of California Press.

Foley, C. (1964). A Legacy of Strife. London: PenguinPublishers.

Hadjinicolaou, E. (1981). Ethnicity and space: Syntactic Analysis of Thirteen Cypriot Villages, Unpublished MSc thesis, University College London.

Hanson, J and Hillier, B. (1982). ìTwo Contempovary Space Codes Comparedî, Architecture and Behaviour 2.

Hanson, J. Hillier, B. (1979). Tradition and Change in the English House: a Comparative Approach to the analysis of small house plans, London: Unit for Architectural Studies, University College London

Hill, Sir George (1952). The History of Cyprus, Vol.4, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hillier, B. and Hanson, J. (1984). The Social Logic of Space, Cambridge University Press.
Hillier, B. et al (1984). Ideas are in things. Londons: Unit for Architectural Studies, University College London.
Hodge, B. and Lewis, G.L.(1966). Cyprus School History Textbooks: A study in Education for International Misunderstanding, London: Parliamentary Group for World Government.
Ionas, J. (1988). La Maison Rurale de Chypre. Publications of the Science Research Centre, Nicosia Cyprus.
Jones, B. (1959). Grivas and the story of EOKA. London: R. Hale.
Kitromilides, P.M. ìThe Dynamics of Ethnic Conflict in Cyprusî in M. Attalides (ed) Cyprus Reviewed, pp. 35-70.
Kolars, J. (1963). Tradition, Season and Change in a Turkish Village, The University of Chicago.
Kucukerman, O. (1985). Turk Evi, (Turkish House). Kendi Mekarinin Arayisi Icinde.
Kyrris, C. (1985). Peaceful co-existence in Cyprus Under British Rule and After independence, Nicosia.
Lee, D. (1934). Great Britain and the Cyprus Convention Policy of 1878, Harvard Univerisy Press.
Loizos P (1975). The Greek Gift, Oxford. Basil Blackwell.
Loizos, P. (1960). ìThe Progress of Greek Nationalism in Cyprus, 1878-1970î in Davis, J. (ed) (1974) Choice and Change, pp. 114-113, New York Humanities Press.
Loizos, P. (1977). ìPolitics and Patronage in a Cypriot Villageî in Gellner and Waterbury, (eds) (1977). Patrons and clients in Mediterranean Society, pp. 115-135.
Makrides, Nikita et al (1978). Lysi: Social Change in a Cypriot village, Nicosia, Cyprus. Research Centre.
Mayes, S. (1960). Cyprus and Makarios, London: Putnam.
Papacharalambous, G. (1968). Kipriaki Ikia, (The Cypriot Dwelling). Publications of the Cyprus Research Center II, Nicosia.
Papadopoulos, T. (1965). Social and Historical data on Population 1570-1881. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Center.
Peristiany J,G. (1975) Mediterranean family Structures. London: Weidenfield and Nicolson.
Peristiany, J.G. (1965). ìHonour and shame in a Cypriot Highland Villageî in Peristiany (ed) Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society: London: Weidenfield and Nicolson.
Pierce, J.E. (1964). Life in a Turkish Village. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Purcell, M.D. (1969). Cyprus. London: Ernest Benn.
Sinos, S. (1976). Anadromi stin Laiki architechtoniki tis Kiprou, (A Review of the Folk Architecture of Cyprus), Athens.
Stirling, P. (1963). ìThe Domestic Cycle and the Distribution of Power in Turkish Villagesî in Pitt-Rivers (ed) (1963). Mediterranean Countrymen, pp. 203-216, Greenwood Press Publishers.
Stirling, P. (1974) ìCause Knowledge and Change: Turkish Village Revisitedî in Davis (1974), J. (ed) Choice and Change, pp. 191-220, New York: Humanities Press.
Stirling, P. (1974). Turkish Village (1965). London: Weidenfield and Nicolson.
Young, M. and Wilmott, P. (1962). Family and Kinship in East London. London: Pelican

8. Appendix

Ethnic Groups, Space and Identity

a. Institutional Affiliation: Intercollege Cyprus

Authors
Nadia Charalambous Antoniadou
Nicos Peristianis

Address

Nicos Peristianis
Intercollege
46 Makedonitissas Avenue
P.O.Box 4005
1700 Nicosia
Cyprus
Tel. -357 8 41500
Fax. -357 3 57481
Email:perisnic@intercol.edu

Nadia Charalambous Antoniadou
Intercollege
46 Makedonitissas Avenue
P.O.Box 4005
1700 Nicosia
Cyprus
Tel. -357 4 635181
Fax. -357 4 635973
Email: cmakis@cytanet.com.cy

Ethnic Groups, Space and Identity

Abstract
This paper utilises space analysis, and in particular the ìspace syntaxî theory and methods, to investigate ethnic group relations. More specifically, it considers aspects of Greek and Turkish Cypriot spatial and social relations, on the island of Cyprus. The relations between the two ethnic communities have been marked by intense conflict culminating in the division of the country. Presently the island is slashed in two by a territorial boundary (known as the ìGreen Lineî)- the result of the gradual hardening of the social boundaries between the two communities. Spatial analysis reveals that behind many apparent similarities (similar spatial and social ingredients), lurk strong differences in ethnic identity.

Introduction

In recent decades spatial analysis has seen tremendous growth, especially so with the work of Prof. Hillier and the development of the ìspace syntaxî theory and method, that has encouraged research into areas as diverse as the analysis of houses, courts, factories and hospitals, to the analysis of whole urban systems. A conspicuous absence, however, relates to the lack of research on the ethnic uses of space. Yet it must be widely agreed that in the ìlate twentieth centuryî, and especially since the downfall of communist regimes in 1989, there has been a resurgence of ethnic identification and ethnic conflict all over the world. Ethnicity has thus come to the center of attention of students and scholars from various disciplines, but also of politicians and the general public. As Horowitz puts it ìethnicity has fought and bled and burned its way into public and scholarly consciousnessî (Horowitz, 1985: p.xi).This paper takes a first step in the direction of utilising space analysis in the investigation of ethnic group relations, by considering aspects of Greek and Turkish Cypriot spatial and social relations on the island of Cyprus, in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Backround to Ethnic Relations in Cyprus

Ethnic relations in Cyprus have been growing ever more tense through time; there has been a progressive hardening of the social boundaries marking ethnicul co-exist-

ence in Cyprus Under British Rule and After independence, Nicosia.
Lee, D. (1934). Great Britain and the Cyprus Convention Policy of 1878, Harvard Univerisy Press.
Loizos P (1975). The Greek Gift, Oxford. Basil Blackwell.
Loizos, P. (1960). ìThe Progress of Greek Nationalism in Cyprus, 1878-1970î in Davis, J. (ed) (1974) Choice and Change, pp. 114-113, New York Humanities Press.
Loizos, P. (1977). ìPolitics and Patronage in a Cypriot Villageî in Gellner and Waterbury, (eds) (1977). Patrons and clients in Mediterranean Society, pp. 115-135.
Makrides, Nikita et al (1978). Lysi: Social Change in a Cypriot village, Nicosia, Cyprus. Research Centre.
Mayes, S. (1960). Cyprus and Makarios, London: Putnam.
Papacharalambous, G. (1968). Kipriaki Ikia, (The Cypriot Dwelling). Publications of the Cyprus Research Center II, Nicosia.
Papadopoulos, T. (1965). Social and Historical data on Population 1570-1881. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Center.
Peristiany J,G. (1975) Mediterranean family Structures. London: Weidenfield and Nicolson.
Peristiany, J.G. (1965). ìHonour and shame in a Cypriot Highland Villageî in Peristiany (ed) Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society: London: Weidenfield and Nicolson.
Pierce, J.E. (1964). Life in a Turkish Village. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Purcell, M.D. (1969). Cyprus. London: Ernest Benn.
Sinos, S. (1976). Anadromi stin Laiki architechtoniki tis Kiprou, (A Review of the Folk Architecture of Cyprus), Athens.
Stirling, P. (1963). ìThe Domestic Cycle and the Distribution of Power in Turkish Villagesî in Pitt-Rivers (ed) (1963). Mediterranean Countrymen, pp. 203-216, Greenwood Press Publishers.
Stirling, P. (1974) ìCause Knowledge and Change: Turkish Village Revisitedî in Davis (1974), J. (ed) Choice and Change, pp. 191-220, New York: Humanities Press.
Stirling, P. (1974). Turkish Village (1965). London: Weidenfield and Nicolson.
Young, M. and Wilmott, P. (1962). Family and Kinship in East London. London: Pelican