

Introduction



Fieldstone walls, vineyards, old farmhouses, olive trees, pebble-strewn beaches and brush-covered hills figure in this book. It introduces its readers to rural villages, historic city quarters, taverns that serve simple but tasty food and family-run enterprises that make cheese from goat and sheep milk. These settings epitomize what we consider old, genuine, untouched by modernization. Unadulterated culture, as well as unspoiled nature, are master tropes in the cosmology of Western modernity, which locates authenticity, as the antithesis of technology-driven progress, in the absence of calculated intervention. Indeed, these places appear as if they were relics of an earlier time, bypassed by change and spared from modernization. Yet, they would not exist if they had not been intentionally preserved, or even materially reconstructed, if they had not been identified by experts, discursively marked as heritage and strictly regulated under national law and transnational conventions. Also, we would not be able to visit them – or, indeed, be interested in doing so – if these places were not also advertised as sightseeing attractions in tourist destination areas, and if their official entry into heritage registers or lists of protected sites did not guarantee their genuineness. Heritage is not something that exists prior to preservation efforts, but is the very result of purposive action, guided by standards that are decidedly nonlocal and that obey a ‘global hierarchy of value’ (Herzfeld 2004).

Anthropology has a long history of critically engaging with the making of heritage, both cultural and natural, attacking it under various guises as the commodification of culture, the invention of tradition, the rise of the heritage industry and the social construction of nature. Early on, anthropologists suggested that commercialization is inherently evil, polluting culture and dispossessing local populations of their birthright. However, to lament the loss of identity and the disenfranchising of local populations that occur once their patrimony is reinvented as an object to be bought and sold, even though often morally justified, does not afford any insights into what is happening, how and why. More recently, however, anthropology started to scrutinize closely the mechanisms of how these conversions operate, how culture – and nature! – are constructed as items that presumably are exempt from modern commodity circulation, and how this exemption then constitutes their unique selling point in the market. Indeed, knowledge-based and technologically enhanced regimes of valuation and valorization (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2006) remake things, peo-

ple and places once they come into the purview of heritage making and become constituted anew as objects of exhibition and trade (Herzfeld 2004). Heritage, then, is a product that is fashioned according to historically generated specifications. Heritage production is based on and propagates normative assessments of what is fit to 'embody the uniquely characterized and enduring presence of a collectivity' (Filippucci 2004: 72). More often than not, the designation of an object or a practice as an exemplar of authentic heritage rests on hegemonic definitions by cultural elites or state bureaucracies. They may, in turn, enlist academic research and scholarly knowledge as authoritative sources on how to distinguish the authentic from the inauthentic. The anthropological and ethnological disciplines have from their inception been complicit in the construction of the divide between tradition and modernity that continues to underlie much heritage production. Heritage production, then, is itself a modern phenomenon, deeply rooted in both the political economy of capitalism and the emergence of the modern nation-state, as 'stable national identities presuppose the standardization of cultural expression' (Eriksen 2004: 20).

This book is about a small country on the margins of Europe, the Republic of Cyprus. On the island of Cyprus, accidents of history as well as unique biogeographical conditions have created a particularly rich and intensely diverse cultural and natural landscape on a relatively small-scale territory. Cyprus has often been called a cultural catalyst and a bridge between Occident and Orient. Since Neolithic times, the island has served as an easily exploitable resource for successive waves of conquerors and emperors, as a mere stopover for seafarers and traders and as a new home for various groups of invaders and colonizers through the ages. Its landscape today is littered with the relics of prehistoric settlements, Hellenic temples, and Roman villas. It is studded with crusader's castles and Byzantine chapels; its cities boast Gothic cathedrals, Venetian fortifications and Ottoman mosques, with many an ancient edifice having undergone multiple transformations and receiving new functions whenever it came within the purview of yet another ruler or religion. Cyprus also contains many landscapes of spectacular beauty. Its coastal areas as well as the mountain regions are known for their biodiversity. While some plants and a few animals are endemic to the island, the fauna and flora exhibits a unique overlap of the Mediterranean and the Near Eastern regions. What interests me primarily about the legislation and regulation of the cultural and natural heritage of the country, and the social actors, institutions and practices that implement them, is how they are related to the process of Europeanization that Cyprus is currently undergoing. The Republic of Cyprus, the state that represents the entirety of the island but whose *de facto* sovereignty extends only over the Greek Cypriot southern portion of the island, acceded to the European Union (EU) in 2004. European supranational institutions started to exert influence even earlier. Indeed, as Cyprus was a British colony prior to

1960, both nature conservation and cultural heritage regulation on the island had been subject to principles prevalent in Western Europe for more than one hundred years before EU accession.

‘Past Presencing’ on the European Periphery

The focus of this book is on the social practices and discursive operations that make – and sometimes, also unmake – heritage. Instead of reifying objects or practices of the past as ‘patrimony’ or cultural ‘legacy’, the notion of heritage being made highlights the practical, even technical side of conservation, preservation and safeguarding, and their processual character. The constructivist turn in anthropology made it possible to conceptualize ‘tradition’ and other forms of ‘authentic’ culture as discursively produced, to chart how these are deployed, and to enquire into the ways in which these play into the self-representations of modern societies, and into perceptions of Europe more generally (Macdonald 2012: 237). Social anthropologist Sharon Macdonald, whose conceptualizations of heritage provide one of the theoretical moorings for my enquiry, argues that heritage is an important element of ‘the European memory complex’ (Macdonald 2013: 5), referring to specifically European modes of engaging with ‘the past’, ‘capable of reorganising land- and cityscapes and validating certain social groups (and not others)... Heritage invariably implies ownership’ (Macdonald 2013: 18). In her work on museums as well as on memorials and historic sites, she has consistently posed the question of ‘why and how some things come to count as “heritage” and the consequences that flow from this’ (Macdonald 2013: 17). The selectivity that is inherent in heritage making, valuating certain artefacts as worthy of preservation and letting others fall into oblivion, is understood to be also a politicized process, catering to and engineered by the interests of elites, but sometimes also of minorities and marginal groups. Heritage making creates references to ‘multiple pasts’, and the same site or artefact may indeed evoke radically different interpretations and meanings for different audiences. ‘Difficult’ or dissonant heritage confronts societies with uncomfortable truths about historical responsibility and offers particular insights into how contemporary social actors deal with the legacies of the past. In contrast to much of the earlier anthropological critiques of cultural commodification and the heritage ‘industry’, Macdonald does not consider the outcome of heritage making wholly explicable by retracing how it originates in a particular political ideology or specific social actors’ economic interests. Rather, her perspective allows for unexpected, even paradoxical effects of heritage making, effects that, however, have much to do with the materiality of heritage objects or sites and how they allow for specific forms of embodiment or emplacement, and also afford specific affective and sensorial responses. Macdonald suggests

that anthropologists abandon the notion of 'heritage' in favour of paying attention to practices of 'past presencing' in modern European societies. According to her, 'past presencing' encompasses all technologies, materializations and objects that societies have created in order to make the past present, which should all constitute the object of anthropological enquiry, with a special focus on 'how they allow access to distant pasts and places' (Macdonald 2012: 246).

When studying heritage, anthropologists usually have in mind museums, archives, monuments and sites of commemoration as well as architectural heritage, food traditions and other manifestations of the man-made. In this book, however, I extend this analytical framework to include constructions of nature as well, following along the lines of sociologists Phil Macnaghten and John Urry (1998), who insisted that nature, as it is embodied in Western European notions of landscape, countryside and – more recently – environment, is also historically generated and invested with cultural meanings and collective memories. So nature reserves, national parks and other forms of protected areas will also be considered, for the purposes of this study, examples of 'presenced pasts'. I submit them to the same types of anthropological enquiries as ensembles of old village houses placed under preservation orders. I am particularly interested in the role of expert knowledge that goes into 'past presencing', and what kinds of material-discursive practices constitute the making of heritage. Experts – scholars, administrators, entrepreneurs and cultural brokers – take centre stage for my research into what I consider a technology of governance at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

European Products

In Cyprus, heritage is a European product. 'European products' stand for a rather broadly conceived category of things, practices and ideas that are infused with European Union regulatory mechanisms. As I have argued elsewhere (Welz 2005; Welz and Lottermann 2009), European products have emerged as a result of the implementation of EU directives and laws. Indeed, they would not exist without them. They are effects – some by design, some unintentional – of EU governance practices. As the application to heritage artefacts and sites suggests, 'European products' need not be commodities in the conventional sense, or goods that European economies are exporting abroad. They are as diverse as children's toys that are guaranteed to be free of harmful toxic substances, food products labelled to warn people who suffer from allergies that they may contain traces of peanuts or, as in this book, nature conservation areas legislated under the EU's Habitats Directive and managed as so-called Natura 2000 sites. Quite a few are material, others are intangible and still others take the form of standards. Not all of them are mandated by

the European Union, as some are also based on other intergovernmental accords between European states. Nevertheless, it is the rules that regulate these European products, as well as their development, implementation, monitoring and subsequent modification which make up a large part of the work that is being done in the European Commission and in the General Directorates of its services, keep the members of the European Parliament busy, and fill countless pages of documents.

Since the 1990s, anthropologists have been enquiring into the modalities and effects of the European integration process. The new research focus on the European unification process entailed moving in an epistemological landscape quite different from that of an earlier anthropology of Europe, which conducted ethnographic studies of village communities and peasant societies and looked for relics of tradition and the residues of premodern social order. Europeanists in anthropology were now entering into lively debates on modernity, subjectivity, power and the state. (Borneman and Fowler 1998) They also insisted that Europe was no stable object or predefined geopolitical unit, but the result of ongoing negotiations and even contestations, and that 'an anthropology of Europe needed to focus on the interrelationship between local events and macro social processes of "state formation, national integration, industrialization, urbanization, bureaucratization, class conflict and commercialization"' (Goddard, Llobera and Shore 1994: 14). Instead of aligning itself with the anthropology of Europe,¹ this book argues for an anthropology of Europeanization. Europeanization foregrounds becoming rather than being European, paying special attention to the unevenness and discontinuity of the process, instead of expecting convergence and increasing cohesion. More precisely, for anthropologists, being interested in Europeanization means to focus on social actors and practices in those countries that belong to the EU, have recently joined or aspire to do so in the future. Rather than assuming that the balance of power is irrevocably tipping from the member states to supranational institutions and that national sovereignty is being evacuated by governance shifting to actors both above and below the nation-state, the Europeanization approach is 'grounded in an understanding of Europeanization as interactive process' rather than 'a narrow, linear, top-down notion' (Radaelli 2004: 4) of the impact of European Union institutions on politics in the member states. Each country adapts to the challenges that alignment with the EU poses in its own way, thereby recontextualizing EU regulatory frameworks and making them work 'on the ground' (Börzel and Panke 2010). This ultimately results in a two-way transfer of policy blueprints and problem-solving strategies. 'Europeanization deals with how domestic change is processed, and the patterns of adaptation can be more complex than simple reactions to "Brussels"' (Radaelli 2004: 4).

Research addressing Europeanization from an anthropological point of view does not only look at national-level bureaucracies and domestic deci-

sion makers in relation to their counterparts in the EU, but also engages with nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), social movements, regional governments, municipal administrations and local initiatives. Many analysts of the way the European Union implements the policies that it develops argue that the EU works by way of engaging other actors beyond the narrowly conceived political institutions, and that it often ‘functions without any direct imposition of order but through a steady process of ordering’ (Barry 2002: 147). Indeed, the institutionalizing of so-called multistakeholder deliberation and the involvement of nonstate actors, such as business people, experts and civil society organizations, in so-called new governance procedures is quite typical for the way the EU manages to implement its policies in the member states. Many analysts point out that this makes the EU an outstanding example of neoliberal state practices.

Anthropological enquiries into Europeanization benefit from anthropological work on transnational governance and neoliberal governmentality. Following Foucauldian theoretical inclinations towards identifying technologies of power, ‘governmentality offers a way of approaching how rule is consolidated and power is exercised in society through social relations, institutions, and bodies that do not automatically fit under the rubric of “the state”’ (Gupta and Sharma 2006: 277). Europeanization poses new challenges, both to the state’s practices of spatialization and to anthropology’s attempts to conceptualize statehood.

The EU manages ‘to intensify the regulatory and technical interconnections between its member states’ (Dunn 2004: 163) by introducing new procedures of management and quality control. Hailed as helping to increase productivity and the competitiveness of the economy as well as facilitating transnational commerce, these herald much more fundamental transformations of society and everyday life. Much of this is happening not through the implementation of laws, state controls and sanctions, but rather informally, by introducing so-called best practices and soft law. In this book, I contend that the designation of heritage provides inroads for the Europeanization of social life, institutions and individual agency. Indeed, the present past in Cyprus today is a European product, a social construction infused with EU values, standards and regulatory power.

Cyprus: Postcoloniality, Division and EU Accession

For almost three hundred years, Cyprus had been part of the Ottoman Empire before it came under British colonial rule in 1878 (Faustmann and Peristianis 2006). Greek-speaking Christian inhabitants of Cyprus were encouraged, not only by the British colonial elites but also by travellers from other countries of

the European north, to consider themselves heirs to the Hellenism of antiquity that in turn was considered to be the patrimony of the entire Occident. When the Crown released Cyprus into independence in 1960 and the Republic of Cyprus came into being, the two main communities on the island, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, were forced by the departing colonial power to become reluctant partners in a shared sovereign state. (Kizilyürek 2002) Their mutual antagonism that had been catalyzed by the divide-and-rule politics of the British and fuelled by the nationalisms of their 'mother countries', Greece and Turkey, erupted into civil war in the winter of 1963/64. Intermittent intergroup violence had already in the 1950s resulted in the division of the capital city of Nicosia, and a United Nations (UN) peace mission was installed on the island. In 1974, the Turkish military invasion of the island, ostensibly to protect the Turkish Cypriot minority, caused numerous deaths among Greek and Turkish Cypriots. Greek Cypriots were expelled from the north of the island by force, and Turkish Cypriots fled from the south. Since then, about one-third of the island has been occupied by the Turkish army. The de facto partition of the island remains in place today in spite of numerous attempts by domestic and international political actors to affect a resolution and reunification. In 2003, the strict prohibition against crossing the 'Green Line' that applied to Cypriots of both communities was lifted unilaterally by the authorities in the north, thereby making travel back and forth possible across designated checkpoints. This gave displaced persons the opportunity to visit their lost homes, although a resettlement of refugees has not been possible as yet and continues to be one of the bones of contention in negotiations between both sides.

On 1 May 2004, the Republic of Cyprus, along with nine other countries, became a member of the European Union. Accession negotiations between the EU and Cyprus had started in 1998. Throughout the accession process, much hope had been invested in the ability of the EU to bring an end to the division between the Republic of Cyprus in the south and the Turkish-occupied north of the island. However, in a referendum in 2004, a majority of Greek Cypriots voted against a United Nations peace plan that was supported by the EU and had offered a comprehensive framework for the reunification of the island. This was only one week before the Republic of Cyprus became a new member of the EU. As a consequence, the European Union's community contract, the *Acquis Communautaire*, was suspended for the internationally nonrecognized Turkish Cypriot polity in the north of the island. Even though talks were reopened under the aegis of the United Nations in 2008, the political process has remained stalled until recently. In the springtime of 2014, a new round of talks generated hope that the Cyprus problem might be solved within the foreseeable future.

So far, however, the so-called Cyprus problem remains an unresolved issue. After 1974, Greek Cypriot society bonded around the trauma of the invasion and the prevailing political insecurity, with all social groups striving for a so-

cietal consensus. This also restricted opportunities for dissent and pluralism and cemented conservative attitudes that preclude risk taking. The Turkish invasion of 1974 is often cited as a cause for a delayed modernization process. Economically, however, the Republic of Cyprus experienced an unprecedented economic comeback, dubbed 'the Cyprus miracle' (Christodoulou 1992).² Since then, the economy showed impressive growth rates, and incomes were steadily on the rise. Cyprus transformed itself from a developing country into a rapidly expanding services-based economy that thrived on its position as a bridge between Europe and the Middle East. For many years, the workforce enjoyed full employment, and the labour market also attracted many temporary immigrants from non-European countries. In the 1980s and 1990s, the fast-growing tourism economy was a major factor in this, also contributing to marked population growth in the urban centres and the coastal agglomerations.

Billed under the heading of 'construction', another booming economic sector since the late 1990s has been real estate development, increasingly targeting buyers as well as investors from abroad. In many of the environmentally sensitive coastal areas, the mushrooming of resorts and villa developments that are advertised abroad as second homes or tax havens represents an especially problematic effect of these developments.

While the image of a sun-and-sea tourism destination with a rich cultural heritage is still being deployed, other economic sectors have been on the ascendancy since the 1990s, most markedly the financial sector and corporate services. In 2011, services accounted for 80 per cent of the economy, with tourism making up only one-quarter of the service sector. Instead, the Republic of Cyprus has emerged as an important centre for so-called offshore financial sector operations, able to use low taxation as well as a well-developed banking sector, an efficient state administration, a transparent legal system, a high level of education in its workforce and the prevalence of the English language in its business sector to its competitive advantage. Even though EU accession introduced stricter regulations in the banking sector, Cyprus continued to enjoy the reputation of being a financial 'asset-protection location' (Kaufmann, Christou and Christophorou 2010), which in turn incited European officials and especially German politicians to denigrate the Cyprus economy as a tax haven.³

In retrospect one can say that the EU accession process 'proved to be the single most important driving force for Cyprus's socio-political, economic and institutional modernization' (Agapiou-Josephides 2005: 157) since independence. During the accession process, Cyprus speedily transposed EU rules and standards into national legislation. In the 1990s, there was broad support and even enthusiasm for attaining EU membership among Greek Cypriots. This was motivated most of all by the promise of security and the hopes for a solution to the political problem of the island that the EU appeared to offer. The extent of the ongoing social and economic transformation of the Republic of

Cyprus was most likely unintended by the political architects of Cyprus's accession to the EU, while the rewards that were anticipated with accession in terms of the solution of the Cyprus problem have not materialized. However, the experience of Europeanization exacerbated a widespread conviction that Greek Cypriot society is experiencing discontinuities and disjunctures in a process of rapid social change, summarized by a member of Parliament I interviewed in 1999, one year after EU accession was incepted: 'Superficially, we behave like the Europeans behave. The odd thing about Cyprus is that in economic terms, we developed very rapidly in the last forty years. But at the same time, in terms of social concepts and values, there is a lot of confusion.'⁴ Social anthropologist Vassos Argyrou, in a contribution to a volume that looked back on fifty years of Cyprus as a sovereign state, argues that Cyprus remains a 'post colony, a society formed during the colonial period and hence a society also that cannot not reproduce the colonial power that formed it' (2010: 41). This postcolonial condition, according to him, explains the readiness of Cypriots to submit to the hegemony of European Union regulation. The aspiration to European Union membership, as Argyrou and other critics contend, and the desire to be recognized as a full-scale European society 'inadvertently reproduce(s) a historical experience of symbolic domination – the recognition that their cultural identity is inferior to that of the countries of Western Europe and North America' (Argyrou 1996: 3). Ultimately, Europeanization has set in motion a series of fundamental changes. Some of them are clearly positive, as are the increased opportunities for transnational exchange and cooperation, the strengthening of civil society and a more liberal cultural climate. However, the increasing reliance of the economy on business sectors especially vulnerable to the global financial crisis, and heavily implicated with the economic fate of Greece, has compounded the negative effects of European integration. These came to a head in the dramatic weeks of the March 2013 crisis when the so-called Troika of the European Central Bank, the European Commission and the International Monetary Fund imposed harsh measures on the government, banks and unsuspecting citizens alike in return for keeping the Cypriot state from bankruptcy. Since then, the economy of the Republic of Cyprus has been shrinking significantly, and unemployment is dramatically on the rise. Political actors in Cyprus engage in a discourse of crisis 'that is increasingly framing political conduct within the parameters of emergency, whereby the deterioration of social welfare and rights is considered inevitable and thus naturalized' (Demetriou 2013a).

Fieldwork in Cyprus: Ethnographic Modalities

Mediterraneanist anthropologists were slow to abandon the community study approach and held on to a focus on rural, often marginal village communities.

(Welz 2002) In recent decades, they exchanged the focus on traditional culture for a lively interest in how villagers respond to the exposure to modernization and social change. Coincidentally, the way for this paradigm shift was paved by an ethnography that Peter Loizos (1975) conducted in the 1960s in Cyprus, in a village of the Morphou district. However, even when single-sited community studies were still the norm in many of the southern European research areas frequented by Mediterraneanist anthropology, studies in Cyprus seem to have involved some degree of multisitedness almost from the very beginning, as fieldworkers would often be moving back and forth between the capital city of Cyprus, Nicosia, and a village setting.⁵ Since 1974, the armistice line between the Republic of Cyprus in the south of the island and the Turkish-occupied north, the Green Line, was an almost insurmountable obstacle to mobility between the two parts of the island. However, some anthropologists managed to conduct fieldwork bicommunally,⁶ both among Turkish Cypriots in the north and in Greek Cypriot society, even before the Green Line became passable in 2003.

This book, however, differs from most of the work done in Cyprus by anthropologists. For one thing, it is not strictly ethnographic, if one takes ethnography to mean a fieldwork approach that relies primarily on participant observation and is predicated on the fieldworker's ability to communicate in the native language. Conversely, I take ethnography to mean an epistemological stance based on the assumption that cultural realities are coproductions between the researcher and those he or she does fieldwork with and among. This book is based on a series of small-scale case studies that span the better part of two decades. The case studies coalesce around the issue of heritage making in the Republic of Cyprus, but they were not initially intended to form a unified monograph. The material for them was collected at different sites over periods of time of varying length, some over many years, within the framework of a protracted research engagement. Beginning in 1991, I started coming to Cyprus with my late husband, Stefan Beck, often for two, sometimes three, times a year. Visits would last from a minimum of two weeks to extended stays of up to three months, dividing time and alternating between the region most intensively and best represented in the case studies, the northern part of the Paphos district in the west of the island, and the capital city of Nicosia. We often did fieldwork together but pursued separate research interests. Stefan Beck was a medical anthropologist and addressed the interface between biomedical science and social change. Over the years, his research ranged from thalassemia prevention and cystic fibrosis screening to reproductive medicine, organ transplantation and bio-banks.⁷ In Cyprus, he discovered 'novel entities, facts, and relationships brought into being through the application of biomedical technologies' (Beck 2007: 17). He also used ethnographic accounts generated by his fieldwork, to develop and sharpen arguments extending far

beyond the implementation of biomedicine, in order to enquire into Cyprus as production-site of modernity. The collection of research materials for this book spans a period of fifteen years, from 1997 to 2012, with some earlier work done in 1995 also integrated into the analysis. In sum, the duration of these short-term visits adds up to more than eighteen months. Clearly, this kind of intermittent, piecemeal research does not comply with requirements of conventional ethnographic fieldwork as an intensely sedentary, continuous activity by a fieldworker who immerses him- or herself in the daily life of the community under study. Nor does my research in any simple way mirror the new modes of 'multisited research' (Marcus 1995) that have been invented in order to make ethnographic fieldwork more compatible with the challenges of globalizing cultures. These abandon the conventional focus on a single site of data collection in favour of much more flexible research designs that might engage a multiplicity of sites spread over a number of countries but connected by links of mobility or communication. As opposed to cross-cultural comparison, there is no juxtaposition of social units, but multisited projects aim to emphasize transnational networks and mobilities. Recently, George Marcus has called our attention to a new 'modality of collaboration' in ethnographic fieldwork:

As fieldwork has become multisited and mobile in nature, subjects are more 'counterpart' than 'other'. Fieldwork becomes implicated in the organized knowledge of its subjects, in the form of social movements, NGOs, research groups. The basic trope of fieldwork encounter shifts from, say, apprentice, or basic learner of culture in community life, to working with subjects of various situations in mutually interested concerns and projects with issues, ideas, etc. (2009: 7)

Rather than calling my research 'multisited', however, I prefer to apply the label of 'studying sideways', a term that Ulf Hannerz coined some years ago to denote a new type of fieldwork that has been emerging with the growing interest of anthropologists in expertise and knowledge practices (Hannerz 2004). Many of the people I worked with in my research can be considered experts in the sociological sense of the word: they are civil servants, representatives of NGOs, entrepreneurs, university professors, journalists, artists and politicians. The areas in which they were trained and in which they apply their professional expertise cover regional planning, architecture, art history, folklore, anthropology, food science, archaeology, biology, geology, environmental policy, nature conservation, heritage management, agricultural economics and sustainable tourism development. Most of them received their training and acquired their academic degrees abroad. They are working in areas that are increasingly connected transnationally, especially within the European Union, and their command of the English language is generally very good. A few could be interviewed in German which is my native language. Increasingly, anthro-

pologists find themselves interviewing and working alongside professionals of other disciplines whose work habits and interests are often not so dissimilar from social science research, and with whom the anthropologist often shares standards of professionalism and work ethics. At the same time, cultural differences also become much more apparent when interacting closely with 'counterparts' whose professional universes intersect with mine as fellow academics, teachers, researchers, conference speakers and authors.

Much of my work was with these counterparts, many of whom live and work in Nicosia, the divided city that is capital to both polities, south and north. In addition, the area of and around the municipality of Polis Chrysochous in the north of the Paphos district became a permanent field site for me and my husband over many years, affording a long-term association with places and people, refreshed every year by one or more 'revisits'. Sociologist Michael Burawoy, whose epistemological as well as political enquiries into the history of ethnography in the social sciences are particularly insightful, uses the term 'revisit' to denote sequential fieldwork spread over a number of years, often decades, during which the researcher keeps returning to the same place or area. Burawoy argues that there is a special reflexivity afforded by the fieldwork modality of the revisit, as 'every entry into the field is followed not just by writing about what happened but also by an analysis in which questions are posed, hypotheses are formulated, and theory is elaborated—all to be checked out in successive visits' (2003: 668). The research that this book is based on was conducted as sequential fieldwork of short-term research visits spread over a period of more than fifteen years. The Swedish social anthropologist Helena Wulff claims that 'repeated returns strengthen [the] bonds to the field', and adds that 'immersion ... is a process that occurs along a time axis' (2002: 123).

'Temporalized' forms of conducting research today, however, do not only mean travelling back and forth between 'the field' and one's academic home institution, but also entail switching between on-site and off-site fieldwork (Dalsgaard 2013). What counts as fieldwork today may include both face-to-face encounters with social actors 'in the field' and long-distance interaction, such as keeping up with people in the field by phone or email and reading newspapers published in the fieldwork community or country. Because my engagement with this particular permanent field site spanned almost two decades, the development of modalities of research also made me more acutely aware of the 'changes in the technologies of practising ethnography' (Wilk 2011: 15) that have not just extended the scope of ethnography but also, as Richard Wilk convincingly argues, are making boundaries between the professional practices of anthropology – research, writing, teaching – more porous,⁸ eventually eroding the separation between work and free time, professional and private life. Indeed, during the fifteen years of research that led to this book, not only has email as a mode of correspondence become ubiquitous, even among officials

of the Cyprus government, but in Cyprus, cell phones have effectively replaced the use of public phone booths as a mobile telephony option and considerably eased the fieldworker's efforts to establish contacts and make appointments. Gone also are the days when the Cyprus newspapers that I subscribed to would be sent by mail, to arrive in Germany a week after the date. Today, the Cypriot press is accessible to a large degree on the Internet; many newspapers have websites, hosting online editions that are updated frequently as well as news services and blogs. Even more importantly, much of the information sources that during the 1990s were only accessible in hard copy, printed on paper and filed away in archives, today are available and easily accessible on the Internet. Increasingly, government documents that used to be published exclusively in Greek are now also available and can be quoted in an English-language version.

This is also an effect of the 2004 European Union accession of the Republic of Cyprus. For one thing, being a EU member state meant that the state bureaucracy but also nongovernmental actors as well as the business world established closer links with transnational networks, both within and without the EU. Also, the new mode of neoliberal governance, operating by way of quality control, documentation and self-checking, generates a huge amount of written texts, both online and offline. The documentary practices of organizations are particularly useful to the anthropologist to 'unpack the work of institutions and bureaucracies' (Escobar 1995: 113). By translating events or objects into textual form, organizational texts⁹ bring schemata and structuring processes to bear on local populations (Ferguson and Gupta 2005). For the purposes of my analysis, government documents, EU publications and NGO reports constitute important devices that make Europeanization socially effective.

About This Book

This book explores how heritage as a European product plays out in Cyprus. The book looks at Cyprus as a postcolony and as a recent member to the European Union that is currently undergoing a severe crisis both of its economy and of its self-image as an equal of other European nations. Unlike most social science studies of Cyprus, however, the book does not address the Cyprus problem, the division of the island, and the likelihood of achieving reconciliation of the two main communities and a reunification of the island. While this issue continues to draw much attention from academics, politicians and the media, the effects of European integration on Greek Cypriot society have not been discussed as widely as the Cyprus conflict by social scientists. The small but growing number of studies conducted in Cyprus by anthropologists also, for the most part, address aspects of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot past or future coexistence on the island. While these studies are particularly valu-

able in contesting mainstream analyses by political scientists and historians, instead highlighting issues of local agency and counter narratives to hegemonic discourses, this 'resulted in the relative neglect of other areas that have traditionally concerned anthropology elsewhere' (Papadakis, Peristianis and Welz 2006: 23). This book is an attempt to address some gaps in a number of understudied research areas pertinent to Cyprus. So far, there have been only a few studies in the anthropology of tourism addressing Cyprus.¹⁰ The production of heritage within frameworks of tourism, rural development, urban and regional planning, and environmental policy in the Republic of Cyprus has rarely been tackled.¹¹ Nor has the role of the European Union in the current transformations of Greek Cypriot society received as much interest by anthropologists, or members of other social science disciplines, as it deserves. This book deals with case studies in the Republic of Cyprus exclusively and will refer to comparable situations and developments in the so-called Turkish Republic of North Cyprus only in passing. Yet, heritage making in the Republic of Cyprus can only be discussed against the backdrop of the ongoing division of the island. Two polities, south and north, are competing for ownership of cultural heritage sites, often voicing conflicting claims for the same cultural artefact or heritage site. This comes to the fore in some of the case studies assembled in this book.

The first section of the book explores how abandoned buildings in rural areas have been reinvented as vernacular architecture within a framework of state-legislated and state-funded historic preservation. Chapter 1, the first chapter within this section, shows how, even before EU accession, historic preservation was infused with European standards, aesthetic as well as material, and also served as a conduit for Europeanization. The second case study in this section enquires into how vernacular architecture became an asset and a resource to be exploited economically when the new tourism product of 'agrotourism' was introduced in Cyprus. Chapter 2 shows how agrotourism creates an interface between so-called traditional houses and tourist consumption. The last chapter in this section addresses how the inland and mountain regions of Cyprus became aligned with the European Commission's hegemonic ideas of rural economies and agricultural land uses. Chapter 3 looks at rural development policies in Cyprus, and considers them to be a European governing technology that produces new categories of social actors as well as new discourses about 'rurality'.

Anthropologists consider food items and food practices to be important sites for the creation, negotiation and contestation of cultural meanings. The second section of this book engages with the political dimensions of food production and consumption. Chapter 4 addresses the invention of culinary heritage within the framework of mass tourism in Cyprus since the 1960s. The so-called Cyprus *meze*, a plethora of various individual dishes combined in a set meal, embodies many of the tensions and contradictions that accom-

panied the emergence of Cyprus as one of the sun-and-sea destinations of Mediterranean tourism. By symbolizing affluence and even excess, *meze* also reflects social change within postcolonial Greek Cypriot society. As an effect of industrialization and changing consumer habits throughout Europe, many artisanal foods that used to be produced in rural households and small family-run businesses have become almost extinct because they cannot compete against mass production. This has also happened in Cyprus. The EU's origin foods programme is intended to strengthen the economic competitiveness of regional food producers as well as to sustain the diversity of the European food repertoire. Chapter 5 engages with this programme as an instance of neoliberal governmentality, analyzing the conflicts that coalesced around an application to the EU to safeguard halloumi cheese as a Greek Cypriot product.

The third section combines two case studies. One addresses nature conservation in a coastal area encroached upon by real estate development, the other cultural heritage protection in the divided city of Nicosia. At first sight, these topics may not be closely related. However, the European Union and other transnational agencies are operating with economy-driven notions of heritage as a 'resource', which allows them to conceptualize both unspoiled nature and historically generated culture as productive assets. Chapter 6 reports on long-term research into conflicts over the future of the Akamas Peninsula, a wilderness area in the west of the Republic of Cyprus. The second case study addresses the historical heart of the city of Nicosia, the old town encircled by the Venetian walls and dissected by the barbed wire and sandbag fortifications of the Green Line. Chapter 7 explores how cultural politics engages with the division of the city, striving to subvert and ultimately to overcome it. Heritage preservation, cultural projects and artistic production play an increasingly important role in the attempts to position Nicosia, and the whole of Cyprus, well within the European cultural arena.

What about the 'unmaking' of heritage that the title of the book refers to?

Today, because of the risk of state bankruptcy, the demise of the banking sector, the declining economy and the dramatic rise of unemployment, especially among young adults in Cyprus, 'heritage' may appear as a comparatively inconsequential, even banal topic for ethnographic enquiry. Yet, the production of heritage, the commodification of traditions and the construction of tourist destinations bear scrutiny precisely because the so-called Troika and the Cyprus government in their Memorandum of Understanding have earmarked tourism and real estate development as future economic growth sectors for Cyprus. The book's conclusion consolidates the perspective of postcolonial critique and attempts an assessment of the future role of 'heritage making' within the realm of the European Union's hegemonic politics, in Cyprus and elsewhere in Europe.

Heritage is but one example of how 'European products' are being standardized across Europe. However, heritage making emerges as a privileged and

indeed authoritative political tool within the wider framework of Europeanization. The celebration of historic legacies is employed throughout Europe, to instil a sense of European citizenship in the populations of European countries and to establish 'a common cultural basis for a European demos' (J. Scott 2005: 227). For heritage to fulfil its European role, it has to transcend its narrow association with national identities and ally itself with the EU's normative ideal of culture building via 'unity in diversity'. But the cultural logic of all heritage making itself harbours a fundamental tension between the assertion of distinctiveness and the fact that in order to plausibly exhibit its uniqueness, it has to resort to conventional means of heritagization that are becoming increasingly similar not just within Europe, but worldwide.

Notes

1. Today, the anthropology of Europe has become a well-established area of specialization in anthropology, engaging researchers from most European countries (Kockel, Nic Craith and Frykman 2012) as well as non-Europeans, mostly from North America. The impact of European Union policies on European citizens, who may well experience them as interventions from above, their identity projects and how they engage, in affirmation or resistance, with the symbols of inclusionist Europeanness, the representations of a common legacy and shared future, figures prominently in many of these studies. European citizenship as a category of rights and entitlements and also as the effect of exclusionary practices draws the interest of many younger ethnographers who address issues of immigration politics, human rights and the EU's regimes of policing its outer boundaries. Though the voice of anthropology is not heard often enough, and even more rarely listened to in the centres of European integration research and European studies, ethnographic studies rise to challenge the hegemony of historians and political scientists who have the monopoly on explaining how and why a unified Europe came about.
2. Greek Cypriot refugees from the occupied north had effectively been impoverished by the loss of property and land at the hand of the invaders, and had to be integrated at great cost into the south's economy and housing market. However, not only economically, but also in terms of social effects and even health issues, the consequences of the displacement and loss forced on the refugees are complex and not easy to gauge (see Loizos 1981, 2008).
3. In addition to growing into an important centre for 'offshore' financial services, the Republic of Cyprus has also come to prominence for hosting a register for foreign-owned ships. For ship-owners it is advantageous to register a vessel in a country like Cyprus, where labour legislation for many years allowed for low-wage employment and pay continues to be low. This in turn makes Cyprus also a location for maritime services, many of them concentrated in the port city of Limassol.
4. From an interview conducted in 1999 with Katherine Clerides, a politician representing the progressive wing of the centre-right party DISY (Welz 2001: 232). For an acute analysis of social change in Cyprus since the 1930s and the resulting bifurcation of class cultures since the 1960s, see Argyrou (1996).
5. Peter Loizos, in his 1975 study about the fate of his co villagers from Argaki who were displaced by the Turkish army in 1974, travelled all over Cyprus to meet with the refugees. This study, then, prefigures the multisited fieldwork ideal. With him, however, it was no

methodological ploy; his fieldwork responded to the fate that his friends and relatives were suffering from, having found temporary refuge in many places, dispersed over the south of the island.

6. Bicommunal anthropological fieldwork in Cyprus, both in the north and in the south, has been done by Papadakis (2005), Bryant (2004) and Dikomitis (2012). A multisited study in the Turkish Republic of North Cyprus is Navaro-Yashin (2012).
7. He was particularly interested in the condition of postcoloniality, and in the social bases of altruism and solidarity in Cyprus. Some of his research took place within the framework of research grants, such as the EU-funded project 'Challenges of Biomedicine', other studies of his were self-funded and independently conducted, benefiting from close cooperation with medical specialists and anthropologists in Cyprus, in particular, Violetta Anastasiadou-Christophidou (Cyprus Institute of Neurology and Genetics), Pavlos Costeas (Karaiskakiou Foundation) and Costas Constantinou (University of Nicosia). See Beck 2007; Niewöhner and Beck 2009; Amelang, Beck et al 2011; Beck 2011; 2012.
8. In 1999 and 2005, I organized and directed excursions with groups of graduate students in anthropology from the Goethe University Frankfurt to Cyprus, where they conducted small-scale research projects (Welz and Ilyes 2001). From these excursions, more intense engagements of some of these students with Cyprus resulted: a few returned to Cyprus as exchange students or as fieldworkers for periods of up to three months and wrote their master's theses or doctoral dissertations under my supervision. The topics of most of these dissertations, some of which are published as book chapters in an anthology (Welz and Lottermann 2009), engaged either with the Cyprus problem and bicommunal activism, or with immigration of third-country nationals to Cyprus and the EU's border regime (see Lenz 2010).
9. In recent years, the work of legal anthropologist Annelise Riles has turned our attention to those textual genres that she considers to be the most significant artefacts of institutional life. In her work, documents, funding proposals, newsletters and organizational charts have figured prominently (Riles 2001, 2006). Anthropologists are increasingly including these textual genres in their work.
10. Among them are the work of Julie Scott on transformations of the tourism economy in northern Cyprus (Scott and Selwyn 2011), the ethnography of Ramona Lenz on the tourism sector of the Republic of Cyprus as a labour market for immigrants (Lenz 2010) and Evi Eftychiou's critical analysis of the implementation of agrotourism in the Troodos Mountains (Eftychiou 2013).
11. Anthropologists have tended to look at social memory and heritage making in Cyprus primarily within the context of the political issue of Greek and Turkish Cypriot relations (see Bryant and Papadakis 2012). Within the context of the EU-funded project 'Identity and Conflict: Cultural Heritage and the Re-construction of Identities after Conflict', which addressed a number of postwar and conflict situations in Europe, a research team addressed Cyprus under the auspices of the Cyprus office of the Peace Research Institute of Oslo (PRIO) (see Constantinou and Hatay 2010; Demetriou 2012). One other exception is the multinational project 'Mediterranean Voices', funded by the EU under the aegis of the EuroMed Heritage II programme, which created a database of oral histories and cultural traditions from thirteen cities around the Mediterranean, including Nicosia (see J. Scott 2005).