INTRODUCTION

In this report we map the discriminatory landscapes of Cyprus. Our focus is on ethnic discrimination in the labour market and in schooling and education. In spite of the various policy declarations, legal provisions and legislation affirming equal treatment for all irrespective of ethnic, ‘racial’ or other background, there is significant evidence that suggests that in both these fields, as well as in other areas, there are significant variations in the treatment of groups of migrants and of persons from specific ethnic backgrounds. It must be stated that few studies of discrimination as such exist for Cyprus; however, from the little evidence that does exist (official reports and independent research) discriminatory practices are abundant. What emerges is a strong case for investigating further the underlying discourses and structural forces at play, that give rise to discrimination.

As things stand today, following the de facto division of Cyprus since 1974, the main recipients of racial abuse, violence and discrimination, in other words the victims of racism, are what we call ‘subaltern migrants’ (i.e. migrant workers from south east Asia, the middle east and eastern Europe). Additionally, the Turkish-Cypriots residing in the territory controlled by the Republic of Cyprus (i.e. Greek-Cypriot controlled) as
well as the Greek-Cypriots residing in the occupied north of the island (i.e. Turkish-Cypriot controlled) are discriminated against, even though they are all Cypriots. For the purposes of this study, we will concentrate on the territory controlled by the Republic of Cyprus, as there is little access to the north and hence difficulty in collecting the relevant data.

The report will be divided into two major parts, the first dealing with the labour market (written by Panayiotis Pantelides and Nicos Trimikliniotis) and the second dealing with schools and the educational system (written by Nicos Trimikliniotis). Before turning to these chapters, however, we provide a short historical background of immigration to Cyprus and a longer section on the institutional and legal framework of immigration policy relating to the employment of migrant workers.

Migration of labour to Cyprus is a relatively recent phenomenon by international standards. Cyprus, during the 1960s and early 1970s was a net source of migrant labour, mostly to the UK and to a lesser extent to other destinations. After the events of 1974 emigration from Cyprus continued and it was only during the 1980s and mostly during the 1990s that significant flows of migrant labour to Cyprus gathered pace. The recent increase in the movement of migrant workers to Cyprus is associated with the economic development and economic restructuring that took place in Cyprus during recent years creating conditions for additional labour demand in the productive spheres of the economy and for the provision of services such as the case of domestic workers. An important factor which has contributed to the inflow of migrant workers to Cyprus was the breakdown of the economies and societies of Central and Eastern Europe and particularly the Balkans in the early 1990s thus creating conditions of abundant labour supply. Therefore, during the 1990s there was a steady increase in the number of migrant workers in Cyprus, working on a temporary basis through fixed period work permits. During this period there was also an increase in the number of migrant workers not holding the required permit (“illegal workers”).

During the 1990s there was also an inflow of migrant workers from the Black Sea area of Russia with Greek origin: the Pontians. This category of migrant workers is different from the temporary workers mentioned above since there is no requirement for a work permit in their case. They are Greek citizens and are thus entitled to permanent residence and employment permit through a bilateral agreement with the government of Greece. A third category of migrants in Cyprus, which is numerically less significant, refers to self-employed workers. An even smaller number of migrants in Cyprus are those who have acquired the Cypriot citizenship mostly through marriage.

We analyse these categories of migrant workers in Cyprus statistically and we also describe the institutional context of the employment policy for migrant workers. We also critically discuss this institutional context to bring forward inherent discriminatory features of the current system. A brief reference will also be made to the divergence of the existing rules and regulations in Cyprus in relation to the evolving EU framework for the employment of third country nationals.
Statistical Background

Cyprus is a small country with a population of less than a million and with significant political problems arising mainly due to the ethnic relations and the division of the island since 1974. Nevertheless, Cyprus has achieved significant economic growth in recent years and has also gone through the EU harmonisation process successfully so that its accession to the EU is expected to be ratified at the European Council in Athens on 16th April 2003. Of course, the recent economic development does not imply that economic and social imbalances do not exist. For instance, in the economic field Cyprus has exhibited an undue reliance on the services sector and especially tourism thus creating a vulnerable and unstable framework of future economic growth. The issue of migrant workers in Cyprus has both economic and social aspects and it is an area that Cyprus has had to adapt in, within a very short period of time due to the rapid increase in the number of migrant workers in recent years. In this report we examine the institutional and legal framework as regards the inclusion and treatment of migrant workers in the labour market and educational system.

In an area of 9,251 sq. km, the total population of Cyprus is around 754,800, of whom 666,800 are Greek-Cypriots (living in the Greek-Cypriot controlled area). In 1960 Turkish-Cypriots constituted 18% of the population, whilst the smaller ‘religious groups’, as referred to in the Constitution, consisting of Armenians, Latins, Maronites and ‘others’ constituted 3.2% of the population.

Table 1. Population and Ethnic Groups in Cyprus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thousands</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Thousands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Cypriot community</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Cypriot community</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>95^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Source: http://www.pio.gov.cy/cyprus/people.htm]

First, we set out some basic statistical information regarding the migrant population in Cyprus. This information is provided in table 2 where a broad outline of basic statistical information is given. Note that the total migrant population given refers to the workers possessing work permit. Additional categories of migrant workers will be analysed and discussed in a separate section.

Table 2 Statistical Data: An overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population (thousands)</td>
<td>748.8</td>
<td>753.2</td>
<td>757.0</td>
<td>762.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential working population (thousands)</td>
<td>431.5</td>
<td>436.6</td>
<td>442.2</td>
<td>447.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita (constant prices/euro)</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>15,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant workers (possessing work)</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>21,368</td>
<td>23,701</td>
<td>29,730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table it can be seen that the total number of migrant workers in possession of work permits is close to thirty thousand or 6.7% of the potential working population. However, there are additional categories of migrant workers that are not included in the above figures. A more detailed analysis of the migrant workers possessing work permits will be attempted in the labour market section below. However, in order to substantiate the submission above, that labour migration in Cyprus is a recent phenomenon, the challenges of which have not been responded to by the social and political forces in Cyprus, we can briefly consider the change in the total number of migrant workers during the past decade.

In 1990 the total number of migrant workers (excluding domestic workers) was 545. By 1996, this number had increased to 10,370 and by 2002 to 30,225. In other words, there has been a threefold increase in the total number of migrant workers employed legally and in full possession of all the necessary papers within the last eight years. However, the total number of migrants in Cyprus is significantly more than those possessing a work permit.

Recent estimates given by the Immigrant Support Action Group indicate that the total number of migrants in Cyprus is around 72,000 which corresponds to around 16% of the potential working population in Cyprus. Table 3 provides an estimated breakdown of the total number of migrants in Cyprus into different constituent categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of migrant workers in Cyprus</th>
<th>Estimated Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant workers possessing work permits</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant workers of Russian-Greek origin (Pontians)</td>
<td>10,000-12,000 (approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek citizens</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant workers employed in offshore companies</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees and asylum seekers</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant workers without papers</td>
<td>5,000-15,000 (estimated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62,000-74,000 (estimated)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Dept. of Labour and Dept. of Statistics, Republic of Cyprus)

As shown in the above table, migrants in Cyprus consist of different categories. Regarding the geographical spread of migrant workers in Cyprus, unfortunately there is no available data. Obviously, there are some regional concentrations such as the Russian-Greek migrants, who are mostly living and working in the Paphos area. Also, many workers in offshore companies live in Limassol. Further work on this subject will be done at some future stage through local studies.

With regard to the country of origin of migrant workers, as already mentioned above, there are two groups who are holders of Greek passports: migrant workers from mainland Greece and Russian-Greeks (or Pontians) who have immigrated to Cyprus from the Black Sea area. Through a bilateral agreement with the Greek government, Greek citizens have permanent residence rights as well as the right of employment in Cyprus. In the offshore business sector, the majority of non-Cypriot employees of offshore companies originate from Central and Eastern Europe and especially Russia and the former Yugoslav Republics.
Certain observations can be made regarding the countries of origin of the largest category of migrant workers in possession of a work permit, connected to the sector in which they are employed. Most domestic workers originate from Asia and especially the Philippines and Sri Lanka. Other main sector categories in which migrant workers are employed, are: agriculture, manufacturing, construction, hotels, restaurants and trade. In the last three of these sectors, the majority of migrant workers originate from Central and Eastern Europe and particularly the Balkans. In the first three of the sectors mentioned, which are low skill and hard working environments a significant number of Asian migrant workers are being employed.

From the above broad statistical overview of migrant workers in Cyprus we can discern some significant features. First, there has been a large increase in the total number of migrant workers in the last ten to twelve years. Secondly, the majority of these workers are being employed in low skill / low wage sectors and their countries of origin are mainly Central and Eastern Europe and in certain cases from Asia.

**Immigration Policy and Institutional/Legal Framework for the employment of migrant workers**

In this section we present a brief summary of the existing legal and institutional framework regarding the entry into Cyprus and employment conditions of migrant workers and we discuss some of the main problems and challenges relating to the discriminatory effects of the existing system. The objective of this section is to highlight those elements of the institutional structure having adverse consequences on the terms of employment of migrant workers. In fact, as presented below, the Government immigration policy is not only self-contradictory and ineffective, but it also distorts the labour market by producing and reproducing inherently discriminated categories in the labour market, hence the more extensive treatment of the subject attempted here.

The legal framework as regards immigration is fragmentary and has developed very rapidly over the past decade, following the change of policy that allowed the entry of migrant labour in Cyprus, after years of a highly restrictive policy on migration. At the same time, the Government policy on migration included a set of measures to curtail and repress what they termed as ‘illegal immigrants’. The net result was the failure to control the flow of migration and the facilitation of the super exploitation of migrant workers by their employers as a result of the purge of clandestine migrants. The flows and inconsistencies of this policy become evident in the government’s efforts on the one hand to curtail immigration by being tough on overstayers and on ‘illegal’ immigrants and on the other hand to ‘protect’ migrant and Cypriots alike from any attempt to use the vulnerable position of migrants to undercut wages and exploit them. This was partly reflected on judicial decisions on migration cases.

All ‘aliens’, i.e. non-natives of the Republic, are subject to immigration control. There is a wide margin of discretion afforded to Immigration Officers regarding the entry into Cyprus of ‘aliens’ that may well lead to arbitrary decisions. Such discretion, combined with the lack of proper guidelines and training may result in discrimination:

> “Concern is also expressed at reports of discriminatory checks on the part of immigration officers of non-whites coming to Cyprus. Again,
ECRI feels that further training aimed at preventing the occurrence of discrimination and discriminatory attitudes should be provided to immigration officers.” (ECRI Report)

In brief, the system currently functions in the following way: the Ministry of Interior issues work permits, temporary or permanent. Permanent permits are issued to persons wishing to reside in Cyprus as self-employed professionals or to persons with long-term employment contracts. Temporary work permits are issued for a certain period (up to 4 years with a possibility for extension up to 6, according to a recent Ministerial decision) and for specific positions/jobs in sectors where labour shortages are observed and no suitable Cypriots are available. The procedure is that an employer applies for a permit to employ a foreign worker for a specific job prior to the worker’s entry into Cyprus. If there is a change of job or of the employer, a fresh application must be filed. The Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance examines the applications by employers and makes appropriate recommendations according to the labour market situation. The terms of temporary employment of foreign workers (with the exception of domestic workers) was agreed by the social partners in the early 1990s and have not been altered since that date.

The analysis appearing below is based largely on the research work done in the context of the study for the review of the employment policy for migrant workers in Cyprus (see Pantelides and Trimikliniotis, forthcoming). The main objectives of the criteria agreed were set as follows:
Firstly, the need to ascertain that work permits would only be granted in cases where it was clearly demonstrated that no suitable Cypriot workers were available for a given job vacancy.
Secondly, migrant workers would enjoy equivalent terms and conditions as Cypriot workers.
Thirdly, work permits would only be granted on a short-term basis, for one year in the first instance and renewable, by following the necessary procedures, on an annual basis for a maximum of 4 years.

Even though the policy assumption for the employment of migrant workers formulated in 1990s was that their stay was to be short-term, temporary and restricted to specific sectors, the developments of the past decade changed this scenario. In other words, if the original objective was that of granting work permits for a limited period in order to meet temporary labour market needs, which in time would be eliminated so that Cyprus would return to zero labour migration, the picture which emerges twelve years after the policy was initiated is completely different. In 1990 the total number of migrant workers in Cyprus was about 500 while in April 2002 the total rose to more than 30,000, not counting the non-registered ‘illegal’ workers whose number cannot be ascertained but may range between 5,000 and 15,000 (Intercollege Report 2002).

Most European countries have benefited significantly from the employment of migrant workers during the post-war period and have created the setting for cultural interaction and social cohesiveness between communities. In Cyprus, where this phenomenon appeared fairly recently, the institutional structures are completely inappropriate and in certain respects anachronistic. The main shortcomings of the existing model of employment of migrant workers in Cyprus are the following:
(a) The fallacy of short-term and temporary basis of employment of migrant workers; (b) The condition that migrant workers must be attached to a specific employer; and (c) The criteria and institutional aspects for the provision of work permits and terms of employment of migrant workers.

(a) The fallacy of Short-term and temporary basis employment of migrant workers

As already indicated work permits are granted on an annual basis for a maximum of four years (six years in the case of domestic workers) and only after demonstrating the non-availability of Cypriot workers for the specific labour market position. If the rationale for this policy is that labour needs in Cyprus are only temporary and labour migration would eventually be eliminated, it has demonstrably failed. Also the maximum ceiling for the provision of work permits has the intention of prohibiting migrant workers from working legally in Cyprus for the statutorily required period in order to be eligible for permanent residence and eventually citizenship. However, the outcome is not different in terms of the presence of migrant workers in Cyprus. If out of the current migrant labour a certain proportion are long term residents rather than holders of short-term work permits, this does not affect the total number of migrant workers present in Cyprus at any particular point in time. If it is assumed that upon the expiry of the work permit period most of these migrant workers would return to their countries and by following a restrictive policy on new work permit applications the total number of migrant workers would be reduced, experience has so far proved that such assumptions do not materialise. From studies carried out as early as 1993 it was apparent that migrant workers are likely to be a permanent features of Cypriot society (Matsis and Charalambous 1993). It must be accepted that the labour market in Cyprus has been permanently transformed, as has been the case in most European countries and the first and most basic precondition for adjusting to this phenomenon is to evaluate and appreciate its benefits. Only then will it be possible to create the preconditions for improving the institutional and social structure to the advantage of both economic efficiency and social and cultural diversity and enrichment.

In recent years there has been an increase in the total number of migrant workers in Cyprus, both ‘legal’ and ‘illegal’, despite the imposition of a ‘moratorium’ regarding the granting of work permits with exceptions for certain cases. Therefore, we can reach the preliminary conclusion that a restrictive policy for controlling and excluding migrant workers from Cyprus does not have the effect of diminishing their numbers, deriving from reasons of demand and supply: employers find it preferable to employ migrant rather than local workers and Cyprus is an attractive destination for migrant workers.

It has to be stressed that migration flow to Cyprus has been beneficial to the economy and society: migrant workers contribute to economic growth, as they carry out tasks undesirable to Cypriots, they bring into the economy new skills and they contribute to the cultural diversity of the island. The real issue is whether the institutional framework and the policy regime, which determine the composition, the terms of employment of migrant workers and their level of social integration in Cyprus follows the most preferred course of action.

The policy of limiting the duration of work permits issued to migrant workers has not only failed to control their number but it has changed the composition of migrant
labour in a very undesirable manner, as it has led to a proportionate increase in the numbers of ‘illegal’ workers. The creation of this illegal pool of migrant workers in Cyprus is overwhelmingly due to the violation of the short-term work permit system rather than due to illegal entry that is minimal as a consequence of the physical barriers of an island. If this policy regime continues into the future, the proportion of the so-called ‘illegal’ migrants will keep increasing with very undesirable consequences for the economy and social fabric of Cyprus, when in fact these persons are as a rule mere ‘over-stayers’ (i.e. persons who entered legally and have remained once the visa has expired).

There are additional adverse consequences of the short term/ temporary element of the current employment policy for migrant workers. It discourages investment in training by the employers as there is every risk that such investment will be recuperated, since it is known that each specific employee will only remain in Cyprus (‘legally’ at least) for a limited amount of time. This policy discourages skilled and professional workers from coming to Cyprus since they cannot expect a secure and long-term career structure. Finally, this policy regime creates serious social consequences since it does not provide migrant workers with the time, space and means for their social integration. It is a policy that constantly gives the wrong signals to the migrant workers, who are made to feel basically unwelcome but essential for economic reasons. It is a policy of social exclusion, which prohibits the development of a feeling of belonging to the economic and social structure of Cyprus and from which potentially there would flow a series of positive consequences.

(b) The condition that migrant workers must be attached to a specific employer
The requirement that migrant workers cannot change employer or be employed for a different task during their work permit period is particularly problematic, as it can lead to abuse, contract violation and super-exploitation of migrant workers. The problems regarding contract enforcement are already quite severe and the relevant authorities declare their inability to make the necessary checks and ensure that the terms agreed between the government, trade unions and employers are adhered to (Pantelides and Trimikliniotis forthcoming). The inability to change employer creates serious inefficiencies in the labour market and is against the notion of flexibility and competitive behaviour, which are declared objectives of the European Union. This policy has more serious adverse consequences for those segments of migrant workers who are in a particularly vulnerable position such as the “entertainers/artists” and domestic workers.

Migrant workers are left with no alternative but to accept the terms imposed by the employer. If a migrant worker files a complaint with the Complaints Commission, then deportation becomes a real possibility. The migrant workers under this system have no real possibilities for an alternative course of action. This aspect of the employment policy reinforces the previous arguments regarding the shortcomings of the short term/temporary model for the employment of migrant workers.

All these consequences are directly at odds with declared EU policies, as indicated in the Joint Assessment of Employment Priorities in Cyprus compiled by the Ministry of Labour and the EU Commissioner for Employment and Social Affairs:
“It seems certain that Cyprus will continue to have a relatively large foreign workforce in the future. The pattern to date has been one mainly of temporary employment of foreign workers. Even so, continued inflows of foreign workers over a long period inevitably involves an increase in the number of such workers with a deeper attachment to the Cypriot labour market. Parallel developments in other European countries are giving rise to widespread review of policies on foreign workers. A similar review would provide a useful basis for the formulation of future policy in Cyprus.”

The need to question the current model for the temporary employment of migrant workers is being highlighted by EU officials.

As for the link between employer-migrant worker, this has been criticised by the ECRI Report (2001) and the Ombudsman (2001) and NGOs have advocated the delinking of migrant workers from particular employees (e.g. the Immigrants Support Action Group). The Second ECRI report notes:

In line with the approach strongly linking immigration with employment, one of the main immigration issues faced by the Cypriot authorities has been the need to ensure that migrant workers and their families enjoy equal treatment with that offered to nationals in matters of employment. However, the practical application of this principle appears not to have been uniform.

(c) Criteria and institutional aspects for the provision of work permits and terms of employment of migrant workers

There are provisions in the criteria for the employment of ‘foreign’ workers, such as the one providing that in case of redundancies migrant workers would be the first to be dismissed, which constitute direct discrimination against migrant workers and are incompatible with EU regulations. Also elements such as the structures of dependency on the employer, whereby the requirement that accommodation and food be provided by the employer operates as additional pressure on migrant workers in cases where the employer violates the contracts terms.

Specific categories of migrant workers: ‘Illegal immigrants’, entertainers, domestic workers

‘Illegal immigrants’

The issue of ‘illegal immigrants’ represents one of the most difficult and controversial areas in which very little research has been conducted in Cyprus. The employment of Illegal workers is highly beneficial to employers since they don’t have to adhere to any officially agreed terms of employment and they don’t have to pay social security contributions or indeed a salary. It imparts on the economy the characteristics of a "cheap-labour" model and perpetuates a ‘primitive’ approach as to how the economy ought to be organised, creating the basis for an informal/black market.
Domestic workers

Domestic workers are amongst the most vulnerable groups as they are not unionised and generally reside with the employer. Among their many disadvantages is that until this year they had not had any increase in their stipulated salary as agreed between the government, trade unions and employers for the last 11 years (see relevant section in Part I below).

Entertainers

‘Entertainment workers’ (cabaret dancers) drawn from poorer eastern European countries, are the victims of the sex industry without any action being taken against the implicated parties. If cabaret dancers are granted work permits in the first place, they ought to be treated as legitimate workers, but they are not. Many of them are brought to Cyprus upon false pretenses and without their knowledge that they will be working in the sex industry. This sector forms an illegal network that requires special attention and strict regulation. Cabaret dancers are not officially allowed to engage in prostitution, but this does happen on a routine basis. There is hesitation in legalizing such practices as prostitution in cabarets due to social conservatism, however the failure to do so results in the non-implementation and the inability to monitor compliance of the law. The net result is that many of these women are caught in the margins of illegality and their dependence on their employer-pimp increases.

The dilemma for policy-makers is that as they attempt to make regulation and control ‘tighter’ (through reducing their stay; more scrutiny upon entry; repressive measures by police etc.) the cabaret dancers’ position becomes ever more marginal and their dependence on their employer increases. The laws on prostitution must be applied to all irrespective of ethnic origin, including of course the tight control of those who muster wealth on immoral earnings. There are currently no social policies of encouraging and supporting women who are willing to exit the sex industry, neither is there any policy of attempting to improve working conditions of women wishing to continue without the exploitation, violence and humiliation by their employers.
PART ONE: THE LABOUR MARKET

The economy of Cyprus: A brief overview

The economy of Cyprus has experienced significant economic growth in recent years and has managed to achieve a GDP per capita higher than the EU average. Also, a very satisfactory feature of the economy of Cyprus, in contrast with the European experience, has been the consistently low levels of unemployment.

Table 4: The Cyprus economy: An overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP growth (%)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita (euro)</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>15,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment (%)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current account (million euro)</td>
<td>298.5</td>
<td>540.9</td>
<td>203.9</td>
<td>495.0</td>
<td>457.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of production (% GDP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The economic indicators show that Cyprus has a thriving economy and with the discipline to be imposed by EU accession the appropriate framework has been set for future economic and social development. However, this is far from the whole picture and although some positive steps have been taken for economic and social advancement, serious structural imbalances can potentially hamper the prospects for future growth. The high degree of dependence of the economy on the tourist industry, a highly variable and vulnerable form of economic activity, does not provide the appropriate incentives for the development of the productive sectors of the economy through agricultural and industrial development. Thus, in recent years both the primary and secondary sectors of the economy have been in relative decline. This tendency of faltering competitiveness has also given rise to additional problems such as high import penetration and stagnant exports. In general, the unsatisfactory performance of the agricultural and industrial sectors of the economy have created a framework where the economy depends more and more on low skill, low productivity and low wage labour, in particular migrant labour.

Migrant workers in Cyprus: Labour market issues

The above characteristics of the economy have created a framework where low wage migrant workers can be utilised, rather than high skill, professional workers. These features can be seen from the distribution of migrant workers in various sectors of the economy of Cyprus. The decomposition of total migrant workers in Cyprus possessing work permits is shown in Table 5 and it is obvious that there is a concentration in low wage-low skill sectors such as the tourist sector (hotels and
restaurants), construction, agriculture and manufacturing. It is also very notable that about one third of ‘legal’ migrant workers are occupied as domestic workers.

**Table 5 Distribution of migrant workers in sectors of the economy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2903</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>2088</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>2901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2153</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2078</td>
<td>2252</td>
<td>2146</td>
<td>2524</td>
<td>2735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td>2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>2909</td>
<td>3149</td>
<td>3917</td>
<td>3518</td>
<td>5337</td>
<td>7232</td>
<td>4853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>2189</td>
<td>2441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestics</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5594</td>
<td>6179</td>
<td>6745</td>
<td>8243</td>
<td>9716</td>
<td>10164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>2263</td>
<td>2346</td>
<td>2774</td>
<td>3412</td>
<td>3384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10370</td>
<td>17024</td>
<td>19000</td>
<td>21368</td>
<td>23701</td>
<td>29730</td>
<td>30225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘illegal’ migrant workers are employed in sectors of the economy with extremely hard working conditions such as construction, agriculture, manufacturing and the “entertainment” business. Obviously, such workers are paid minimal wages, far below the official minimum wage, long hours of work, unhealthy conditions of work and not uncommonly they are being harassed, not to mention the common practise of employers to simply withhold their wages, particularly in the case of seasonal workers. Migrant workers without papers are considered ‘criminals’ and the authorities have adopted a policy of persecution. However, even this approach is hesitantly pursued since ‘illegal’ migrant workers represent a valuable source of ‘cheap labour’ to employers. Further research in this area is required preferably in a comparative context with other Mediterranean countries.

As regards the other categories of migrant workers (apart from those possessing official work permit papers), the Greek-Russian (Pontians) migrant workers constitute another group which is highly exploited often under similar circumstances as those migrant workers without papers. They have no trade union protection and their terms of employment are not prescribed by any regulations. Also, it is a group with high levels of unemployment or irregular work patterns. Even though in principle racial relations for this group should have been smoother because of the Greek origin connection, in practice the opposite is the case with frequent incidents of violence being reported (often in a misleading way by the Cypriot media).

In contrast to migrant workers of Greek-Russian origin, mainland Greek citizens working in Cyprus do not suffer serious cases of discrimination. They are on the whole skilled or well educated and they come to Cyprus due to the high rate of unemployment in Greece. Also, professional workers in offshore companies are a distinct case with favourable treatment since the government has a declared policy of attracting offshore companies to Cyprus.

Regarding the case of migrant workers with official work permits, more can be said about their terms of employment and the potential grounds for discrimination since
their employment is supposed to be accompanied by certain rules and regulations. These terms of employment and the criteria which allow them to be employed in the first place have been agreed between the government, trade unions and employers’ organisations since the early 1990s and have remained in existence ever since without any alterations at all, despite the criticisms and the problems which have arisen. In this section we concentrate on issues relating directly to the labour market.

This section considers the extent to which migrant workers (in possession of official papers) are discriminated against in terms of wages, working conditions, opportunities of employment and career advancement. The problem of data availability is also relevant in this case but we will attempt to draw some conclusions from the inherent imbalances of the regulations of employment of migrant workers, from qualitative analysis including interviews with migrant workers, from a study performed by the University of Cyprus on the impact of migrant workers on the labour market (Christophides and Pashiardis 2001) and from other sources.

**Specific Aspects of Discrimination: Gendered and Racialised Labour Markets and the Racialisation of Domestic Workers**

The different categories of migrant workers (according to the sector in which they are employed) obviously do not face the same problems and are not subjected to the same forms of discrimination; accordingly, the appropriate policy responses have to differ. There are some principles and lines of action, which are common to all migrant workers, but we have to distinguish between the common elements and the peculiarities of the different migrant groups.

Domestic workers have been employed in Cyprus since the early 1990s and currently form the largest group within the category of migrant workers in possession of work permits. The total number of domestic workers exceeds 10,000, which is over a third of the total. These migrant workers mostly originate from countries in S.E. Asia and are almost exclusively women.

The demand for the services of domestic workers is associated with the rising standard of living of some of the Cypriot families. In some cases domestic workers are employed by old or sick people, reflecting the fact that social services for the elderly and the disabled in Cyprus are undeveloped. Also in some cases, the employment of domestic workers provides the opportunity for Cypriot women to enter the labour market but there is no evidence regarding relative proportions. In general, domestic workers are provided accommodation within the household in which they are employed which creates a high degree of dependence with their employer and provides the opportunity for pressurizing them to work at irregular and long hours. There is a lot of evidence of contract violation and even abuse of these workers but very few cases are being reported from fear of expulsion or even deportation. The wages of migrant domestic workers are below the national minimum wage applicable for Cypriots and has not increased at all since the initial terms of employment were agreed in the early 1990s. The wages of migrant domestic workers are roughly one quarter of the wages of Cypriot women doing similar type of work. The level and forms of discrimination in this case are quite obvious and so is the unwillingness of the authorities and the trade unions to respond accordingly.
Some research has been undertaken on the working conditions of domestic workers, who suffer from such treatment and the ECRI Report referred to them as the most vulnerable group:

“As noted by ECRI in its first report, a particularly vulnerable group appears to be constituted by domestic workers, who comprise almost one third of all legal immigrants working in Cyprus. There have been reports that the terms of contract of these workers are often breached by employers, who may for instance force the women to work much longer hours or during their days off, assign them to duties not provided for by the contract, or dismiss them in an unjustified manner. There have also been reports of inhuman treatment and sexual harassment of these women.”

A study involving 71 interviews of Asian female workers in the island’s capital (Lefkosia) revealed that these workers’ right and terms of contract are routinely violated: Only a small fraction of those interviewed worked the required 8 hours per day, whilst the rest were forced to work unpaid overtime, some up to 16 hours a day. Almost half of them are not entitled to rest time, whilst more than half had a ‘curfew’ imposed on them, had no paid vacation and the vast majority had paid agents to secure a job and a work permit for them in Cyprus, some of them extortionate amounts (Kadir 2001).

Asian women have become the stereotype of domestic workers/servants and seen as a ‘necessity’ for every household that can afford them. In fact the term Asian woman (In Greek: Ασιάτισσα) is used in many instances interchangeably with Filipino woman (In Greek: Φιλιππινέζα) or Sri Lankan woman (In Greek: Σριλανκέζα). A common phrase used in popular discourse is: “What do you think I am? Your Asian/Filipino woman?” The expression “I work like a ‘black’” (In Greek: μαύρος), with its racist connotation, was used before the wave of new migration, but has now reached wider application in popular discourse and found in casual talk among Cypriots. It is also used as a term of abuse against migrant workers.

Colour is only one of the signifiers of racism, not exclusively or necessarily the most important. It has been suggested that darker people are more likely to be the target of racism. Regarding Cyprus one may crudely suggest that people from different geographical areas are concentrated in different occupations, with ‘whites’ (northern/central Europeans/ Americans) concentrated in more office type works, with a very large number as managers. ‘Black’ people (northern Africa/Arabs, and south east Asians, with the exception of Lebanese and Jordanians), on the other hand, are more likely to be concentrated in manual jobs. However this is a crude and at times misleading picture: there is an anomaly with east Europeans who, depending on their class position of course, generally occupy jobs at the lower end of the market. This is also the case for the Lebanese and, to a lesser extent, Jordanian migrants. Therefore, we can argue that racism cannot be reduced to a phenotypic prejudice solely based on colour, without wanting in any way to underestimate the historical and systematic racism faced by black people (Gilroy 1987; Miles 1989; Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1992: 132-140).

As for the gender dimension, there is a gender division of labour based on racial background: eastern European (white) women are the first preference for the sex
industry (prostitution and ‘artists’/ ‘dancers’), by and large replacing the traditional stereotypes of the ‘exotic’ Asian women working in cabarets, as was the case before the collapse of eastern European regimes. Asian women are preferred for home care and ‘caring jobs’, perhaps linked to some stereotype notion of the ‘black (or dark) maid’. The cultural basis for the position of the Asian maid was found in the category the “kori” (κόρη) in traditional society, where the woman, daughter and wife, ‘served’ the man. This operated together with class, as lower class women were the cleaners and maids in the houses of the rich (αρχοντικά) One must consider the connection between gender and ‘race’, and racism and sexism, if one is to understand the position of migrant women labour and the kind of racialisation they face. We are reminded that “racialized and ethnic minority women are concentrated in the most arduous and poorly paid work” (Anthias and Yuval-Davies 1992: 117) and the experience in Cyprus clearly shows this, if one looks at domestic workers and the way the media portrays them. 6

Migrant workers: Wages, Unemployment and Trade Unions
A general characteristic of the rest of the groups within the category of migrant worker in possession of work permits is the fact that they are being employed in low wage-low productivity- low skill jobs often under difficult working conditions. Even though the terms of employment stipulate that migrant workers shall have the same rights and contract terms as Cypriot workers, contract violation is a common phenomenon even though very few cases are being reported (PEO 2002). The level of unionisation of migrant workers is very low and the authorities do not carry out the appropriate checks on employers as a matter of conscious decision and also by using the excuse of staff shortage.

Detailed empirical evidence on this issue is not available; however some inferences pointing towards this outcome can be deduced from the study by Pashiardis and Christophidis of the University of Cyprus (Christophidis and Pashiardis 2001). In the study on the labour market in Cyprus, the authors set out to examine the impact of the presence of migrant workers in Cyprus on the wages and chances of employment of Cypriot workers. Note that the authors do not examine whether there is discrimination against migrant workers, but concentrate on whether or not the employment of migrant workers has a ‘negative’ impact on native workers. Regarding the issue of employment opportunities the authors conclude that the employment of migrant workers does not create unemployment for the locals since migrant workers take up jobs that Cypriots are not prepared to accept. In general, migrant workers in Cyprus do not face the problem of unemployment, since the right of entry to Cyprus is conditional upon a secure job offer. In case a work contract is terminated, migrant workers face the possibility of deportation. The only category of migrant workers where a small level of unemployment is observed is that of the Russian-Greek migrant workers, since their right of entry and residence in Cyprus does not require prior arrangements regarding their employment.

Studies in other countries, such as in Greece7 (Sarris and Zagrafakis 1999) and other European countries (Simon 1989, Harris 1995, 1999; Dale 1999a, 1999b) generally show that immigrants do not compete directly with native workers; there are several cases illustrating that employers in some occasions may well make use of a strategic recruitment of migrant labour as a deliberate means to undermine labour combativity (Senseng-Dabbous 1999, Petrillo 1999, Dale 1999c). One response, of course, is the
tightening of immigration and repression of illegal immigration. As correctly pointed out by Dale:

“…labour organisations themselves become wedded to the divisive logic of racism” (Dale 1999: 12).

What many policy-makers and those who are not well acquainted with the issues may find paradoxical is that, in the case of ‘illegal’ migrants, as the repressive measures increase, so do the numbers of ‘illegal’ immigrants. The tighter and more regulated the immigration policy is, the greater the numbers of clandestine labour. As Gubbay (1999: 59) points out:

“Other things being equal, restrictions on legal migration lead to an increase in illegal migration”

In a prosperous country like Cyprus where it is possible for everyone, both Cypriots and migrants alike, to have a job and lead a secure life of employment, the generation of new jobs in the economy is greatly connected to overall economic policy and planning: the extent to which employment is a policy priority is a matter of political choice.

Regarding the issue of the impact of the employment of migrant workers on the wages of Cypriot workers, the authors (Christophidis and Pashiardis 2001) through econometric estimations conclude that there is a negative influence in some sectors. From this it can be deduced that there is wage discrimination against migrant workers, which acts as a downward influence on the wages and salaries of Cypriot workers. The trade unions acknowledge that discrimination against migrant workers has a negative impact on the terms of employment of Cypriot workers. However, even though they protest against such discrimination of migrant workers they argue that the government should adopt a more restrictive approach towards the granting of work permits for migrant workers. The employers’ associations on the other hand, support a liberal policy towards the employment of migrant workers as long as their cost remains low.

On the whole, trade unions have failed to take action to support or demonstrate their solidarity to migrant workers (see Trimikliniotis 1999). In spite of the ideological differences and the differences in emphasis between the trade unions, there is a consensus in their opposition to the presence of migrant workers, who are regularly blamed for rising unemployment. There has even been common action by trade unions taken against migrant workers in the hotel industry in Paphos.

In the 1990s trade unions adopted a defensive approach towards migrant workers, and made regular xenophobic remarks. It was common for trade unionists, particularly those on the right of the political spectrum, to claim that “they [‘migrant workers’] are stealing our bread”. There are allegations that migrant workers ‘contaminate our culture’, or are to be blamed for rising criminality and other ‘social problems’. Interestingly, even the super-exploitation and human rights violations of migrant workers have been invoked as justification for their deportation. The trade unions of the Left are more cautious and adopt a more sympathetic approach towards migrants reflecting the internationalist traditions of the Left, but they have done little to organise migrant workers in their ranks. Recently, there was a shift towards a generally more sympathetic approach towards migrant workers, even criticising their own previously ‘defensive’ stance (see Pantelides and Trimikliniotis, forthcoming).
yet it is not clear whether this is the result of a more ‘enlightened approach’ or a pragmatic recognition that migrant workers are here to stay.

Recently, there has been a change of policy, with PEO arguing that there is no such thing as an ‘illegal worker’, only ‘illegal employers’, showing the shifting away of the blame from the migrant workers towards employers (PEO Theses on the employment of migrant workers 16.9.2002). PEO has recently strongly advocated the need to take measures to combat the widespread discrimination against migrant workers, especially in sectors where collective agreements are not in existence (Pantelides and Trimikliniotis, forthcoming). It has suggested that a major overhaul of the institutional structure for the employment of migrant workers is required as well as a more determined effort to identify cases of contract violation.

There are sectors of the labour market that have traditionally been trade unions strongholds (e.g. the construction industry), where migrant workers are also working. In such sectors trade unions have eventually started to recruit migrant workers as members; however in sector which have not been unionised, such as the agricultural workers (predominantly made up by migrant workers), trade unions have failed to unionise them, due partly to employer’s hostility and partly to the difficulty of unionising seasonal labour, but also due to an absence of a sense of priority by the unions. The second ECRI report notes:

> While there are sectors, notably in unionised and construction industry, where foreign workers appear to enjoy in practice the same conditions as their Cypriot counterparts, in others the practical application of the principle of equality of treatment of migrant workers in respect of their terms and conditions of employment has been less successful.

In any case, it is apparent that there are structural barriers to the proper representation, organising and articulating the case for migrant workers by the trade unions.

No research has been carried out as to the characteristics of the working conditions of migrant workers in Cyprus, with the exceptions of specific studies: one on the process of racialisation of migrant workers (Trimikliniotis 1999), another on the policy framework governing migrant workers (Intercollege 2002) and one on domestic workers (Kadir 2001). As for the institutional framework, it was noted by the Planning Bureau of Cyprus since 1989 that “there are no effective mechanisms to monitor” the agreed policy framework for the employment of migrant workers (Planning Bureau 1989) and there was reported “administrative laxity” on the part of the administrators. However, very little research has taken place on the issue of enforcement of the agreement in controlling employment and protecting wages (Matsis and Charalambous 1993). In fact this raises questions as to whether the state bureaucracy, prone to clientelist tendencies and to arbitrary discretion in the enforcement of rules, is enforcing an unofficial policy, as alleged in the case of Greece. In that case it is argued that there is a specific informal or unofficial policy of flexibilisation of working conditions, informal jobs and the black economy, which is only possible via “the toleration by the state of the violation of labour and social legislation (Karanesini 1999). These are structural issues that are certain to produce discriminatory effects on the labour market, but no study so far has been carried out.
Conclusion and Further Research

Research in the area of discrimination against migrant workers in Cyprus is rather limited and at a very early stage. A first attempt in this direction was made through the study for the employment policy of migrant workers at Intercollege (2002), which documents inherent discriminatory features in the institutional structure for the employment of migrant workers. The study by Christophides and Pashiardis (2001) does not directly address the issue of discrimination against migrant workers but it considers instead the possible negative impact from the presence of migrant workers on the wages and employment opportunities of native workers. This reflects the current prevailing attitude, which assumes that the presence of migrant workers is problematic and detrimental to Cypriot society, assumptions, which are yet to be demonstrated empirically. Qualitative evidence regarding discrimination of migrant workers in its various forms is provided both by the trade union movement and the NGO Immigrants Support Action Group.

Further research is necessary in order to document empirically the extent and various forms of labour market discrimination of migrant workers in Cyprus. There is currently no study on the role of employers or trade unions in the processes of negotiations on the working conditions and pay of migrant workers, in order to locate the source of structural discrimination in the institutional processes. Statistical evidence ought to be complemented by qualitative evidence through focus groups, from the views of non-governmental organisations and the trade unions. This analysis will take place at later stages of this project.
PART TWO: THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Introduction to the Cypriot Educational System: ‘Communal’ Education, Ethnocentrism and the ‘National problem’

Given the importance of education in the production, and particularly reproduction in the shaping and the reshaping of ‘national’ sentiments, prejudice, racial stereotypes, myths, discourses and attitudes about ethnic minorities, migrants and the ‘other’, whatever shape such education takes, it is remarkable that so little empirical and theoretical research has taken place in Cyprus. Recently however some important initiatives have been made and research has been conducted as a result of the growth in influence of the peace and bi-communal movement in Cyprus, the presence of migrant workers for a decade now and the processes of accession to the EU. Nonetheless, the material available is still fragmentary and research is at a very early stage. The importance of the ‘historical’ context of education in Cyprus is that it is ever-present: the structure of the educational system determines the current basis of educational policy, the content of education (through the syllabi) and the structural links between religion, national belonging, racial exclusion and structural discrimination.

According to the Cyprus constitution educational matters are matters that classified as ‘personal laws’ and are thus left to each of the communities to regulate under the Communal Chambers. In fact education had been divided under the British colonial rule, continuing from the Ottoman millet system, which allowed separate education on the basis of religion, under the leadership of the Orthodox Church. The Church or the ‘Ethnarchy’ was a traditional political leader, whose head, the Archbishop, led the flock under the millet system. During British colonialism, ‘liberal’ educational policies on the one hand and ultimate authoritarianism entailed in the colonial system on the other, created the conditions for the growth and evolution of nationalism and the subsequent clash of Greek and Turkish nationalisms in Cyprus, the conflicting national projects of Enosis and Taksim (Attalides 1979). In any case it is well documented that the educational system was crucial in the spreading of nationalism (Anthias and Ayres 1983; Grecos 1991), due to the segregated schooling as well as the fact that personnel and school literature were imported from the ‘mother-countries’, i.e. mainland Greece and Turkey (Anthias 1992: 43).

The term ‘Community’ is rigidly defined in Article 2 of the Cyprus Constitution, leaving little room for ambiguity and choice for that matter. There are two communities in Cyprus the Greek and the Turkish communities. Art. 2(1) provides:

“The Greek community comprises of all citizens of the Republic who are of Greek origin and whose mother tongue is Greek or who share the Greek cultural traditions or who are members of the Greek-orthodox Church.”

Article 2(2) defines the Turkish Cypriot community:

“The Turkish community comprises of all citizens of the Republic who are of Turkish origin and whose mother tongue is Turkish or who share the Turkish cultural traditions or who are Moslems.”
The rigidity of the Constitution fixes ethnic identity in such a way that the two communities must be kept apart. Anyone not belonging to either of the two categories, such as members of smaller “religious groups”, falls under the category defined by Art. 2(3) and includes Maronites, Latins and Armenians, who must opt to belong to either of the two main communities and be subject to the ‘Communal Chamber’. The term ‘community’ is rare in constitutional texts but it is not unique in the Cyprus constitution. From the other minorities in Cyprus, who enjoyed certain minority rights, particularly religious rights, but were forced in 1960 to choose with which of the two main communities they would want to be part of. Maronites, Armenians and Latins chose to be part of the Greek-Cypriot community, although still retaining their religious representatives in the House of Parliament, albeit with a mere observer and consultancy status (see Grecos 1990: 390-396). The few Cypriot Jews are said to have also chosen to be part of the Greek-Cypriot community (Dickstein 2001). The Rroma population of Cyprus, which is said to have been over a thousand, have chosen in 1960 to be part of Turkish-Cypriot community due to their Muslim faith (Williams 2000; Kyrris 1969, 1985). A future federal arrangement can accommodate for different ethnic groups, women and ‘minorities within minorities’ by utilising the experiences and regimes developed elsewhere, without of course dogmatically ‘importing’ regimes that do not account for the conditions of the island. The problem of ethno-centric education, particularly of the communal type as the one opted for in the case of Cyprus, becomes even more complicated with the introduction of the migrant communities, who themselves are entitled to their own cultural rights.

The turbulent political history inevitably shaped the social life of Cyprus and as such the question of ethnic/racial discrimination during the period of independence up until 1974 is best viewed in this light. It is not surprising that the political question and widespread ethnic violence has overwhelmed the research agenda leaving little research interest for such issues such as racial discrimination. When it comes to racism, racial discrimination, structural or ideological, the case of Cyprus is a peculiar one, as the problem of racism must be somehow linked to one of a long-drawn conflict, which took the form of ‘ethnic conflict’ since the 1950s, what Azar (1986) termed as “protracted social conflict”. The ‘Cyprus problem’ must be connected to the attitudes, practices and discourses in the daily life of ordinary persons, not just today, but also viewed in a historical perspective. It does not take a genius to realise that underlying the historical so-called ‘ethnic conflict’ lays the politics of ethno-racial segregation. It is experienced in the ‘everyday life’ of individuals of the two communities who happen to ‘cross over’ in their daily exchanges as some form of discrimination, ranging from prejudice to abuse, even to violence and murder by extremists of both sides. However, there is strong evidence illustrating chronic discriminatory practices from the early days of the Republic (see Plaza 1965). The difficulty is that the ‘Cyprus problem’ is primarily a problem of nationalism and state/ethnic conflict and one ought not conflate ‘racism’ into ‘nationalism’ and vice-versa, retaining the analytical categories that describe connected but separate phenomena.

As one observer noted, the history of the Greek-Cypriot education is a strong case of “using education for political ends”, in other words the legitimisation of Hellenocentric education (Persianis 1996: 26). Turkish-Cypriot education mirrored this. The Ministry of Education and Culture came about only after the constitutional crisis of
1963; even today its existence is based on the “doctrine of necessity”, due to the withdrawal of the Turkish-Cypriots from the administration, in 1963, as required by the Constitution (see Persianis 1996). At the heart of Cypriot education lies the ethnocentric model, a major structural problem and a barrier in properly tackling discrimination in education particularly against migrants and minority groups. The second major structural barrier is the social position of (subaltern) migrants and other marginalized groups, as noted in one study (Trimikliniotis 2001a: 17-50). Social position refers to the combined effect of the way these groups are being stratified in society (economic, class, ‘racial’, cultural and legal status), all of which are matters of this study.

In the territory under the control of the Cyprus Republic (south) there are no schools, even though there are a couple of hundred Turkish-Cypriots living there (see Kyle 1997; ECRI 2001). However, there are Turkish-Cypriot children in the south, particularly in the Turkish sector of Lemesos, some of whom are attending Greek schools; other Turkish-Cypriot children, who arrived very recently from the occupied territories in the north and do not speak Greek do not attend the school. Apparently for the last year there has been an approved budget of about 11,000 euros for elementary schooling of Turkish-Cypriots in the south but this is yet to materialise.

**Structural Racism and Schooling in Cyprus**

The second ECRI Report on Cyprus (2001) makes a number of recommendations that derive from an assessment of the current situation in Cyprus in the area of education, which provide a good starting point of analysis, not only in the direction of policy-making to remedy the situation, but in order to properly analyse the current state of affairs. The ECRI Report, under the heading G. Education and awareness raising recommends that the Cypriot authorities promote human rights awareness in schools and devote particular attention to the fight against racial prejudice, respect for difference and promotion of tolerance as well as to extending the curricula of all school children to include education in human rights. Furthermore, considering the increasingly multicultural composition of the student population in Cypriot schools, ECRI urges the Cypriot authorities first, to ensure that all teachers are properly trained to teach in a multicultural environment and secondly, to react to any manifestations of racism or discriminatory attitudes in schools. Moreover, ECRI stresses the importance of initiatives in the field of education specifically aimed at facilitating better understanding between the Greek-Cypriot and the Turkish-Cypriot communities and supporting bi-communal events involving both students and adults.

Under the heading “I. Access to public services- Access to education” ECRI “encourages the authorities to ensure that the provision of Greek as a second language meets the demands of the immigrant community and that teachers are properly trained in this respect”, considering “the increasing numbers of immigrant children in Cypriot schools”. Furthermore, it urges the authorities to consider introducing “teaching in languages other than Greek for students of non-Greek mother tongue in parallel with education in Greek to facilitate the process of learning for these students” (see point 27 ECRI Report 2001).

The following tables are indicative of the numbers of minority, non-Greek. They do not cover ethnic background as such but do provide a good basis for analysis.
**Table 6 Primary Schools by Town where children whose native language is not Greek, year 2001-2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lefkosia</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemesos</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larnaca-Ammohostos</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pafos</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Over 935</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[source: Ministry of Education, collected by Maria Rousou. Total no. of students 63,800]

**Table 7 List of Elementary Education Schools with foreign language speaking children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>No. of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. NICOSIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Phaneromeni</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ayios Dhometios Β’ (KA’ + KB’)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ayios Dhometios Γ’</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pallouriotissa Α’ (KA’ + KB’)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pallouriotissa Β’ (KA’ + KB’)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pallouriotissa Γ’</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kaimakli Α’ + B’</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Engomi Α’ (KA’ + KB’)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. LIMASSOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Β’ Elementary School</td>
<td>More than 10 foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Στ’ Elementary School</td>
<td>language speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ΙΓ’ Elementary School</td>
<td>children go to each of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Α’ Elementary School</td>
<td>these schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ε’ Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. LARNACA - FAMAGUSTA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalogereras Elementary School (KA’ + KB’)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayia Napa</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralimni Δ’</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. PAFOS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pafos Α’</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pafos Β’</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pafos Γ’</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pafos Δ’</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pafos Ε’</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pafos ΣΤ’</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pafos Ζ’</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pafos Η’</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pafos Θ’</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pafos Ι’</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Source: Data collected by Dr. Maria Roussou. These tables and data demonstrate the size of the minority groups of the various communities in Cyprus.

Table 8 Children from the Religious Groups, by level and public/private schooling for year 2000-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>PRIMARY</th>
<th></th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latins</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maronites</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Total number of pupils: 63,800. Source: Framework Convention for the Protection of national Minorities pursuant to Article 25, January 2000.]

The Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (2001) considers that the method of recording national minorities is inadequate as “there is a possibility that the census data do not reflect the number of persons belonging to national minorities” (point 27). The insistence that groups such as the Maronites and the Latins be considered as a religious group and nothing more, rather than a national minority, has been criticized by the Opinion of the Committee. The Advisory Committee is not convinced by the governmental submissions that a set of legal provisions would be superfluous, as there appears to be no cases of discrimination. The Committee encourages the government to make such legislation, enforcement structures and procedures that would protect all persons from discrimination on the grounds of language, culture, ethnicity and religion.

**Multiculturalism Or Institutional Racism?**

Even before the ECRI Report, Cypriot authorities responded to the presence of non-Greek speakers at schools by developing a ‘bi-cultural’ educational program (In Greek: διαπολιτισμικό εκπαιδευτικό πρόγραμμα) for those schools where a high number of non-Greek speaking children appeared. Instead of opting for a comprehensive plan for multicultural education, the plan is for a kind of ‘ad hoc multiculturalism from below’.

In one study (Trimikliniotis 2001a: 27) an expert involved in the design and teacher training of ‘bi-cultural’ educational program noted that the schooling structure is not conducive to a genuine response from below, but nonetheless does provide for “action research”. A deputy head-masters involved in the development of a ‘bi-cultural’ educational program at local level noted, “there is no planning from the Ministry… it is based on the private initiatives of the teachers to find the teaching material and read on their own” (see ibid: 26-28). The idea of the program however is not a genuine multicultural approach that recognises and values all cultures, but a practical allocation of teaching time for the non-Greek native speaking children to learn Greek. The presumption is that these children have a language or cultural deficiency and require ‘special assistance’ in language learning. This teaching is seen as mere extra
curricula activities with no special weight or significance. The Minister of Education insists that there is a very clear educational policy on the matter, however most teachers interviewed in that study stated that if there is such a policy they have never been notified of it (ibid: 26-31).

Ultimately, there is a conflict between the notions of ‘bi-cultural education’ with the ethnocentric core of the educational system. In fact the former Education Minister, although quite adamant about the need for ‘bi-cultural education’, rejected vehemently any move to create a genuine multicultural system that treated all cultures as equal and valuable stating that he would never even consider taking steps to “discolour Cypriot education”, since Greek children of Cyprus need to know who they are and where they must go” (quoted in Trimikliniotis 2001a: 30-31).

Even with the knowledge that education is not a mechanistic model of reproduction and instruction, with pupils and students acting as passive recipients, but a negotiated, contested and active process (Willis 1977), Hellenocentrism and nationalism at schools certainly influences the production an reproduction of stereotypes and ideas. Education is indeed ideologically and nationally ‘coloured’ very strongly indeed and as Spyrou (2000) vividly illustrates the essentialisation of identity occurs through a process of discursive construction, which mythologize the past and construct the ‘other’ in a demeaning and derogatory manner. In his research, Spyrou cites numerous examples where teachers, in the course of a history lessons, identify ‘Us’ with the ‘glorious’ Byzantine empire, and contrast us, who are ‘peace-loving’ to ‘Them’ (i.e. the Turks), who are ‘barbarians’, ‘wild’ and war-like. In such a context the idea of respecting other cultures and valuing other identities as equal disappears into thin air.

The educational system of Cyprus may declare on the one hand the it is based on humanistic, liberal and universal principles such as ‘freedom, democracy, equality, justice and international understanding” as set out by UNESCO, but at the same time it aspires to transmit, conserve and enhance the ‘Helleno-Christian’ or ‘Helleno-orthodox’ values. The latter leave little, if any, scope for other religions or indeed any questioning of these value-systems. Children from the recognised ‘religious groups’ are exempted from the lessons of religious education, and parents of other sects or even keen parents who object to the religious teaching may seek permission to have their children excepted from this lesson. Nonetheless there is little scope for pupils and children themselves questioning or challenging the fundamental value system that is the cement of the educational ideology of the Greek-Cypriots.

Discrimination, therefore, based on religious belief (or cultural practice) is inherent in the system, as the exception practice does not resolve the problem, though it may alleviate from some daily pressures. The ‘Helleno-Christian’ ideals spill over and are dispersed throughout the educational environment. The practice of Morning Prayer is a systematic feature and those students of a different belief or background may, and often are singled out. Other lessons, one can say key lessons, which aim at developing the critical mind, knowledge, understanding and judgement, such as Modern Greek (language and literature) as well as History and other lessons have curricula loaded with ethno-religious biases. National celebrations and anniversaries have also a religious bias many times: The most important school celebration is the 25\textsuperscript{th} March, the day of Virgin Mary and the anniversary of the 1821 Greek revolution. However, this day is the national day of the school parades, where the top pupil gets to be the
‘flag-carrier’ (σημαιοφόρος), the Greek and the Cyprus flag. However, what happens
if the top student happens to be non-Greek, non-Christian? Does he or she get to carry
the Greek flag with the cross on it? If the teachers interviewed (Trimikliniotis 2001a)
are correct and the non-Greek students are of the caliber to make them top students,
we should soon have this possibility. Such an incident occurred in a Greek village
recently and sparked a bitter debate in that community: The parents were divided, as
some teachers and parents strongly objected to a Muslim flag carrier. The matter may
appear quite simple for the European ‘civic nations’ that have tolerance and multi-
ethnicity, but such tolerance is not always abundant in Cyprus. In any case why
should a child be faced with such dilemmas in the first place? It is discriminatory to
single out and possibly stigmatize persons of a different ethnic, religious or cultural
background. Given that in Cyprus education is communally organized such problems
are inherent: discrimination goes to the heart of the system. However, even secular
societies such as France may well impose a kind of authoritarian republicanism as the
recent cases with the girls who wished to wear the hijab to school indicate.

Structural Racism at Elementary Schools
A study on the primary education of the children of Pontian migrants examined the
kind of issues facing them and has found serious and systematic processes that
discriminate against them (Trimikliniotis 2001a). It is ironic that the terms of
reference of this study were loaded with the kind of racial prejudice that the findings
eventually strongly criticise. From the Minutes of the meeting of the Parents
Association that requested and sponsored the Association of Cypriot Sociologists to
conduct the above-mentioned study, apparent are a number of racial stereotypes and
attitudes of hostility and mistrust towards the Pontian migrants and their children: In
areas with a high concentration of Pontians, the Parents Associations complain that
the promise by the Minister of Education to disperse Pontian children among the
different classrooms so that they are only a maximum of 5 in each class was not kept,
resulting, as they allege, in an inability to cover the syllabus due to language
difficulties of these children. As a consequence ‘Cypriot children’s educational
attainment suffers’. Secondly, they allege that due to these problems, Cypriot parents
enrol their children in other schools, leaving certain schools in a state of ‘imbalance’
(i.e. high number of non-Cypriots). Thirdly, apparently Pontians concentrate in poorer
areas with affordable rent and so they are ghettoised in the neighbourhoods and at
school. Also, there is, they allege, a tendency to criminal behaviour in children of the
Pontians, who due to their problems at school drop out of school and resort to
criminal acts (see ibid 2001a: 54-55). However, such behaviour is not attributed only
to migrant workers, but to young ‘ghettoised’ Cypriots residing in blocks of flats
designed as camps for the Greek-Cypriot displaced persons form the 1974 war
(Frederic College Report 2002). Apparently these groups of youngsters are seen with
suspicion and prejudice from the wider society, as are poor migrants who also reside
in poor estates at different locations (see report Phileleftheros 27.3.01; Frederic
College Report 2002).

The Study on the Pontian elementary education (Trimikliniotis 2001a) involved three
schools with a high concentration of Pontian children: in Lemesos, Lefkosia and
Pafos. The study found that the manner in which this community migrated and settled
in Cyprus is indicative of the absence of Government policy with regard to the
concentration of these groups in specific areas, lack of planning and lack of relevant in-depth research of how to offer a support infrastructure and how to combat racism.

The educational problems raised as regards the non-Cypriot children are the result of both the lack of a comprehensive and systematic policy on the question of multiculturalism as well as the lack of the necessary infrastructure. Teachers do not seem to have the necessary training and teaching material to offer a genuine multi-cultural education even when they are keen to do so.

The following issues have been raised by the teachers as regards the elementary education of Pontians, which may well be generalized to include other migrant communities: it seems that the knowledge and experiences (linguistic, cultural etc) of migrant children in particular are not considered to be of any value and to be built upon, a matter which clearly shows the institutional discrimination of the teachers of the hegemonic culture to recognize and therefore build upon those cultural experiences for educational purposes. There seems to be a social segregation of the children themselves who “naturally choose” to socialize with peers of a similar linguistic and cultural background. Parents of migrant children, particularly Pontian parents, do not seem to trust the education authorities and therefore do not have the necessary contact with the teachers on the progress of their children.

It was found in the study referred to above that in the classroom there are problems with the quality of education even where the numbers of non-native Greek speakers were relatively ‘high’. The only difficulties faced by migrant children in the early classes are with the Greek language and arithmetic lessons, which in any case are taught separately. However, wherever there was a rise in the numbers of non-native Greek speakers in a particular class, Greek-Cypriot parents requested that heir children be moved to another class or even to another school.

According to the evidence provided by the teachers, school attainment of Greek-Cypriot students does not seem to be affected negatively from being in the same classes with non-native speakers. In any case, teachers noticed that despite the difficulties and prejudices that certainly exist, the attainment of migrant children is not lower than that of Greek speakers. A point noted by teachers was that the only difficulty that migrants may have is related to the fact that the current learning environment may not be properly related to their previous knowledge and interests. Of course this is the impression of teachers interviewed and not the result of a systematic and comparative analysis of figures, grades and other relevant material.

There appeared to be some problems of discrimination and racism between children and by certain teachers but there is no system of properly monitoring the extent of the problem. The head-teachers of the schools assured that there is no such problem, however a number of specific incidents of racial abuse and some minor allegations of discriminatory practices were mentioned. In any case, it would have been rather unnatural to expect that the attitudes prevalent in society at large would not be reflected in the school environment and given that there is no anti-racist program at the school nor is there special training for teachers, one would expect discrimination of different sorts to take place. From the three schools studied, the school in Pafos faced most difficulties due to the fact that there exists a climate of antipathy and
xenophobia towards Pontians in particular by the local community, something that is reflected in the school.

A clear example of the way in which the communities treat the Pontian migrants is the fact that they are many times referred to as ‘Russian-Pontians’ (In Greek: Ρωσσοπόντιοι), something the Pontians find quite offensive. Teachers interviewed in that study many times use the terms “Russian-Pontians” and some of them went as far as saying that for all they knew those persons are from Russia and they claim to be Pontians in order to gain entry into Cyprus but there is no way of checking, which illustrates a suspicion that they are in Cyprus perhaps illegally\(^21\) (Trimikliniotis 2001a).

As far as the question of violence at elementary schools is concerned, teachers and headmasters concurred that there is no such problem and that, if anything, it is the Cypriot children who are more violent. Finally it was found that one of the major problems facing Pontian children was the fact that their living conditions are poor, they are living in ghettoized communities and generally their contact with the Cypriot community is minimum.

However, attitudes of teachers as regards migrants vary considerably across the board. In the study by Frederic College it was found that teachers and head teachers, were more xenophobic than their students. The findings surprised the researchers, who if anything were more biased in favour of teachers and head teachers as they were for years in those posts. In a survey conducted as part of this study, where they were asked ‘if discrimination was ever justified’ it was found 67% and 68% respectively said it is ‘sometimes’ justified, whilst a significant number of teachers and head teachers considered that the causes of discrimination are due to the behaviour of the minority groups themselves. However, these findings are only based on the impression of teachers interviewed; it does not reflect a wider survey of teachers or any comparative examination of the educational attainment, therefore they need to be considered with caution. Nonetheless, the study deliberately collected data from schools with a high percentage of children of migrant workers.

**Education: Further Research**

So far we have no access to data on the extent to which there are differential patterns of access to higher education of children of migrants, who have been naturalised as Cypriot citizens. The reason for this is firstly that the presence of migrants is a very recent phenomenon and secondly that the vast majority of migrant workers are in Cyprus on a short-term basis. A research on this question would be extremely valuable. Educational policy on the question of minority and migrant persons requires closer analysis, particularly if one examines the attitudes of migrant parents and children themselves. Research on the question of ethnic and social background and educational attainment is also another subject needing further research. No research has been carried out at secondary level, or college and university level on the issue of migration, discrimination and attainment; such studies would be extremely valuable. Furthermore, an interesting study would be a comparative study of the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot education as regards the policies and practices to minority and migrant communities (Christophides and Pashiardis 2001).
Conclusion: Cyprus and Institutional Racism

If one is to understand “racial” discrimination in Cyprus, one must appreciate the fine linguistic and cultural issues relating to the meaning of the key terms and the extent to which they are considered to be morally, politically and socially deplorable or repugnant. The concept of φυλή (Greek for “race”) is not redundant in public discourses not even of the politically correct media world. In any case, in Cyprus there is little sense of political correctness in the media language and society at large. The term “race” can be and is being used without the inverted commas in spite of the fact that Cyprus has signed and ratified all the UN and other international instruments which totally reject the pseudo-scientific theories of race and consider the term itself to be totally discredited and therefore abandoned (see National Report of the Republic of Cyprus on the Conclusions of the European and World Conference against Racism 2002). Racism, in Greek ράτσισμός or φυλετισμός, is certainly deplorable and unacceptable as a phenomenon for Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots alike and it would be fair to say that for the vast majority of Cypriots racism is considered to be a serious offence and morally reprehensible. Nonetheless, the dominant view, as shown in a variety of surveys as well as public discourses (as it will be shown further down) is that this “bad” practice either happens elsewhere or if it is brought home it is Cypriots who are the victims of racism: Cypriots have suffered in the hands of colonialism; Cypriot migrants have suffered from the racism of the indigenous populations (eg. in the UK, USA and Australia). More importantly the slogans of the nationalists in Cyprus who oppose a federal solution of the Cyprus problem are that any federal system that relies on the notion of ethnicity is inherently racist, as were the London Zurich Accords in Cyprus. Racist was considered to be the Turkish policy in Cyprus as the continued occupation of the Northern part of Cyprus expelled and excludes 200,000 Greek Cypriot refugees from their homes and, following Yugoslavia where the term “ethnic cleansing” was discovered by the media, Turkey is accused of having followed a racist policy that ethnically “cleansed” the north of Cyprus from the Greek-Cypriots and has demographically altered the population by bringing settlers to replace them.

Whilst there is no doubt that the Greek-Cypriots expelled from the occupied territories by the Turkish army in 1974 were victims of a policy that racially discriminated against them, unable to return to and enjoy their homes, this argument is by and large used to undervalue and underestimate the historical context and nationalist politics of both communities, the role of Greece and Turkey and international politics. Nationalist discourse which has been generalized as a state ideology through schooling and media coverage of national anniversary celebrations and national heroes, ignores the fact that between 1964-1974 Turkish-Cypriots had also been the victims of violence, sectarian massacres in the hands of army and paramilitary groups, of generalized ethno-racial discrimination and were forced to withdraw into enclaves. There is literature examining the politics of memory, memorials and museums from ethnographic and anthropological perspectives; hardly surprising in a conflict-ridden island such as Cyprus, where historiography essentially mirrored the nationalist perceptions of history by both communities (see Papadakis 1993).

The issue of racism against migrant workers was up until very recently dismissed as ‘isolated incidents’ by the authorities, a matter that attracted serious criticisms of institutional racism or at least government inaction. The racism debate with migrants at the receiving end and Greek-Cypriots as the perpetrators did not ‘fit in’ the national
story of victimisation of Greek-Cypriots. Of course not all Greek-Cypriots are perpetrators and not all migrants are victims, but the power structure puts migrants at the receiving end.

A careful reading of the Second Report on Cyprus of ECRI may lead to the conclusion that what we have is institutional racism, underlying the whole legal and administrative system, that is responsible for the employment and general implementation of the framework of entry and stay in Cyprus. The Report falls short of using the term ‘institutional racism’, but a careful reading reveals a resemblance with the kind of structural practices associated with the what Lord Macpherson called ‘institutional racism’ (Macpherson 1999). As defined in his Report, point 6.17:

“Unwitting racism can arise because of lack of understanding, ignorance or mistaken beliefs. It can arise from well intentioned but patronising words or actions. It can arise from unfamiliarity with the behaviour or cultural traditions of people or families from minority ethnic communities. It can arise from racist stereotyping of black people as potential criminals or troublemakers. Often this arises out of uncritical self-understanding born out of an inflexible police ethos of the “traditional” way of doing things. Furthermore such attitudes can thrive in a tightly knit community, so that there can be a collective failure to detect and to outlaw this breed of racism.”

For Cyprus then in all but name the picture painted by the report is particularly gloomy, the underlying policy effect that are indeed discriminatory as the ECRI report note with concern. The inadequacy of remedies in some situations is mentioned in the executive summary:

Problems of racism, xenophobia and discrimination persist, however, and immigrants appear to be in a particularly vulnerable position in this respect. The rights of immigrant workers, notably domestic employees, are often not respected and the remedies available in these cases are not always effective”

In fact the issue of ‘excessive violence by the police’ is noted in the executive summary:

Of serious concern are reports of use of excessive force by the police against aliens who enter or stay in Cyprus illegally and the detention of this category of persons for long periods of time pending deportation.”

The report refers to immigration officers who require training on human rights; to public figures, whose remarks may lead to a xenophobic climate all of which cause the ‘vulnerable position of migrants’. Also ECRI notes that “foreigners account for almost 30% of the total prison population of Cyprus” and that in most cases, they are detained for offences linked to their right to stay in the country and very rarely for violent crimes. ECRI encourages the Cypriot authorities to carry out research on the causes of the disproportionate representation of foreigners in Cypriot prisons.

The Immigrant Support Action Group has regular complaints about the police and other authorities, such as social workers, for mistreatment and racial discrimination, citing also the Reports by the Ombudsman. The most effective means of screening has proved to be the Commissioner for Administration or Ombudsman22, as noted also by
the ECRI Report. As with the previous year most complaints about human rights violations came from migrant workers: Out of 1999 complaints 156 were from migrants, mostly migrant workers (Ombudsman Annual Report 2002: 35) and the tendency is for the complaints to rise every year\textsuperscript{23}. For the years 2000 and 2001 most complaints by migrant workers were against the Immigration Office and Police (Immigration Section). The Report notes that the sharp rise of 52.94\% in comparison to the year 2000, is the result of the tougher line of the administration to exercise control on immigration; the increase in the cases of violent abuse or violation of human rights against migrants and the creation of support institutions to inform them and assist migrants.

The Ombudsman Annual Report (2002) for the year 2001 is illuminating on the kind of practices by the administration ranging from failure to remedy situations of maltreatment to policies without due process to extreme harshness. Characteristically the Report (2002: 41) notes the “the administration exhausts all the reserves of strictness” when it comes to implementing legal provisions as regards deportation of any migrant worker who loses their job, which is the polite way of saying that the authorities are harsh. Furthermore, the Report refer to the prejudicial situation migrant workers are, in a very unequal employment relationship with their employers, and the Report is critical of the practice whereby the employers use the Police to get rid of their former migrant employee so that they can obtain permit to bring a new one, leaving no opportunity for migrant employee to complain or put his/her case. “The possibility of recourse to the Labour Tribunal the Supreme Court is in most cases a theoretical one”, the Report notes (2002: 41).

It is on this basis that a reading of the ECRI report on Cyprus, by taking all the information available that leads to the conclusion that institutional racism is structurally embedded in the legal and administrative system that racialises migrant workers. However, a great deal needs to be researched in the different areas of policy formulation so that any underlying patterns of structural discrimination is revealed and tackled.
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Estimated number of Turkish Cypriots living in the occupied area of Cyprus (since 1974). The population does not include a number of Turkish settlers exceeding 115,000 illegally residing in the Turkish-occupied part of Cyprus. As previously mentioned, the figure of the Greek-Cypriot population includes the 8,000 Maronites, Armenians and Latins who opted to join the Greek Cypriot community. Under the 1960 Constitution they had to choose to belong either to the Greek Cypriot or the Turkish Cypriot community.

Cyprus based NGO set up in 1997 to support rights of migrant workers.

An extract from a letter to a Cypriot newspaper written by a migrant reads: “I have been in Cyprus for one and a half years and what has happened is too much for a person like me, when I cannot sit on my own balcony without getting verbal abuse from Cypriot people, who call me “mavro” or shout other bad words...”. Lanitis, in the same paper the following week suggests that he has received many letters by migrant workers complaining about their plight (The Cyprus Weekly 7-13.10.97)

As Anthias and Yuval-Davies illustrate, the discourses of racism and sexism can be separated, even though there is close interconnection between the two discourses, in practice “as experienced by the groups of subjects [they] are intermeshed” (1992:131)

In the case of Greece, migrant workers occupy the lower skilled jobs and Greeks have moved upwards, as the study by Sarris and Zagrafakis (1999) shows. The same is now happening in Cyprus as Cypriots, though education and training, have improved massively in terms of their skills and are thus moving upwards in the hierarchy.

One must distinguish between the Left-wing and the Right-wing trade unions, as there are differences in emphasis and ideological leanings. PEO has to be considered in conjunction with AKEL and the broad Left. SEK (Confederation of Labour of Cyprus) is ideologically and organically tied to the Right-wing party DESY (Democratic Rally).

See the reports in the daily newspapers Haravvi 12.12.96 and O Phileleftheros 13.12.96.

Interview with Assistant General Secretary of SEK, Demetris Kittenis, Ergatiki Foni 30.10.96).

AKEL, at its’ 18th Congress, pledges that it “will work so that foreign workers employed in Cyprus get the same treatment as their Cypriot colleagues and will decisively fight against possible phenomena of racism and xenophobia” (AKEL 1995:40). This clearly sets AKEL against racism; however the reference to “possible phenomena” and not “actual phenomena” implies that racism and xenophobia are something to guard against in some distant future. Also AKEL does not refer to the ways in which it will fight racism and little initiative has been taken by the Party to support migrant workers. Furthermore, “illegal foreign workers” are referred to as a problem and AKEL calls upon the Government to take “drastic measures to put an end to the illegal employment of foreign workers” (AKEL 1995:40). The phrase “drastic measures” may well mean in practice violation of the fundamental human rights of undocumented workers, as well as other migrant workers, who may come under any heavy handed Police action. However, initiatives by some of AKEL’s MPs, such as those in the Human Rights Parliamentary Commission (House of Representatives 1997b) illustrate that AKEL is taking up the issue of racism more seriously and that the debates over racism in Europe are beginning to influence AKEL policy makers.


This requires a written Statement and approval of the Communal Chamber of such other community, as provided by Art. 2(3). A Greek or a Turkish citizen who wishes to cease to be a member of the community to which he is a member by birth must write and sign a declaration submitted to the officers of the Republic and the Presidents of the Greek and Turkish chamber [Art. 2(5)(a)].
15 The Communal Chamber of the Community, which he wishes to belong, must approve this [Art. 2(5)(b)]. Article 7, contrary to any consideration for gender equality, provides that a married woman shall belong to the Community her husband belongs [Art. 2(7)(a)]. Children are automatically members of their father’s community, unless the father is unknown or he/she has been adopted to the community of his/her mother [Art. 2(7)(b)].
16 Whereas a ‘minority’ is a numerically smaller group of people in comparison to a majority in a State, who retain certain rights relating to identity, religion, schooling, language, a community is endowed with more rights. A ‘community’ in the sense employed by the Cyprus Constitution is the intermediary between a ‘minority’ and a ‘people’. A community is not a ‘people’. The people of Cyprus as set out in the Cyprus Constitution consist of both communities and the other religious minorities. The problem of defining what is community and what rights should be endowed with each community is amongst the most bitterly contested issues in the Cyprus problem.
17 For more about the Armenians in Cyprus, see Ashdjian (2001).

18 Critiques of communitarian nationalism in Cyprus started from the 1970s (Kyriakides 1968, Loizos 1972, 1976; Attalides 1977, 1979; Kitromilides 1977; 1979; Pollis 1979, Anthias and Ayres 1979, 1983), very recently there has been a serious intellectual questioning of “the rigid communitarian norms and conventions that define the parameters of constitutional discourse within which claims to identity are asserted” from the vantage point of a diasporic and post-colonial perspective, utilising the poetics of Cavafy (Constantinou 1998). Such critiques are extremely useful in the debates over nationhood, racism and identity, as diasporic perspectives that de-essentialise ethnic identity utilising the poetics of the class and the subaltern can open up stale debates and provide for alternatives imaginings and futures.

19 The Report of the UN special envoy Mr Gało Plaza in the years 1960-65 provides an illuminating insight into this period. The Plaza Report refers to the underlying ethnic divisions and the failure to properly protect individual human rights, such as the right not be discriminated against. Under the heading “The protection of individual and minority rights”, Mr. Plaza notes the difficulty in applying the principle of equality of treatment and human rights without discrimination due to “the fact that the population of the island continues to consist of two principal ethnic communities, the further fact that they are unequal in numbers and finally the gravity of the conflict which has developed between them”. The same Report noted the difficulty of the task of rebuilding a “progressive re-birth of confidence and the re-establishment of social peace”, as the obstacles “are no less psychological than political.” The way forward, according to the Report, is “the establishment of the most rigorous guarantees of human rights and safeguards against discrimination”, which goes to illustrate, if in an indirect manner, the prevalence of discriminatory practices that inevitably go hand-in-hand with the ethnic conflict and turbulence that existed, particularly during the period 1963-67, throughout the short life of the Cyprus Republic. One can expect to see widespread discriminatory practices, even if there is no study that illustrates this given the collapse of the Republic that was brought about by the Zurich –London accords (see Trimikliniotis 2003).

20 Nonetheless, it is extremely valuable to attempt to view racism in Cyprus within the nationalist/ethnic conflict in a historical perspective in order to examine: (a) the links in the discourse of racism and nationalism, and particularly to view how these are articulated in the political arena; (b) the way in which the discourses and ideologies of nationalism develop over time, particularly how continuities and ruptures of belonging and exclusion materialise in specific contexts; and (c) whether there is process of ‘transformation’ of nationalism into racism and vice-versa.

21 The Pontians were given permit to come to Cyprus as Greek citizens and therefore do not count in the statistics of “foreign or alien workers”

22 The Ombudsman, vested with power to investigate complaints against the public service and its public officers, including the Police, expressly covers investigation into complaints that acts or omissions violate human rights, and covers thus complaints as to racial or other related forms of discrimination and intolerance.

23 Table of Complaints to the Ombudsman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Total Human Rights Complaints</th>
<th>Complaints on Immigration Matters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>