

Harbours of crisis and consent: The technopolitics of coastal infrastructure in colonial Cyprus, 1895–1908

Serkan Karas

Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey

Stathis Arapostathis

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

The Journal of Transport History

2016, Vol. 37(2) 214–235

© The Author(s) 2016

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0022526616667365

jth.sagepub.com



Abstract

By the late 1800s British colonial rule in Cyprus was experiencing both a socio-economic and a legitimacy crisis. Britain's development projects were intended to quell the crisis and consolidate colonial authority. Famagusta Harbour construction was an integral part of that programme, but it antagonised wealthy and influential Cypriots in Larnaca. They believed that such infrastructure would undermine the importance of Larnaca harbour and threaten their commercial and political interests. Their protests threatened the colonial administration with a new crisis that was averted by the integration of Larnaca's Harbour into British plans. The colonial regime had to negotiate and co-operate with local networks of power in order to realise its development programme: harbour development was no mere rational engineering exercise.

Keywords

Cyprus, harbours, crisis, constructive imperialism, politics

Introduction

By January 1908, traders of Larnaca could enjoy the extra space and safety of a newly improved harbour – an enterprise undertaken solely by the colonial

Corresponding author:

Serkan Karas, Faculty of Engineering, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.

Email: serkan_karas@yahoo.com

government. Thus, the steamer lines and vessels doing trade in the Levant and Cyprus could still regard Larnaca a convenient port of call. The improvements in Larnaca commenced right after the development of another Cyprus harbour – at Famagusta – into a modern port served by a railway line. The expansion and renovation of Larnaca port were neither motivated by imperial visions nor colonial trade policies. Instead, its improvement was the product of events that pushed the colonial Cyprus Government to a crisis which put its foundational institutions under scrutiny.

Until the early twentieth century, Larnaca was the trade centre of the island of Cyprus, whereas Famagusta was a relatively backward town on the east coast without any significant political or economic influence. Yet the British chose Famagusta as the port that should be invested in and developed into the major harbour of the island. The Famagusta Harbour construction project occurred between 1903 and 1906 and was based upon British technocratic practices in the West African colonies. The practice of constructing railways stretching deep into the hinterland and terminating at one port was translated in Cyprus as the dogma of ‘one harbour-one railway’. The implementation of this dogma was anything but straightforward. The Cyprus Government had to manoeuvre between the Colonial Office, experts and local politicians, merchants and leading figures of bourgeois society. Similarly, the story of Larnaca port improvements was one of politics, mediation of expertise, trade-offs and compromises.

This research paper examines the establishment of coastal infrastructures in colonial Cyprus in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It argues that these were the results of a socio-political process of co-production of technological infrastructures and colonial political order – technological networks and infrastructures that are politically and culturally embedded in colonial localities.¹ With this methodological approach, the paper asks how colonial policies, engineering priorities and local politics shaped transport policies and harbour design. The paper also asks how Joseph Chamberlain’s colonial estate’s policy (which emphasized state-driven infrastructure development projects) was implemented in Cyprus.

The period 1895–1908 was marked by major infrastructural projects in Cyprus. British colonial administration was seeking both local and metropolitan consent in order to consolidate its control of the island. Colonial and imperial policy was led by Joseph Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for Colonies from 1895 to 1903. British imperial policy was transformed by his ‘colonial estates’ ideology which, stressing ‘constructive imperialism’, emphasized the role of technological infrastructures and scientific assistance for tropical agriculture.² So too, this was a period in which the British Empire began to feel competition from industrial powers such as Germany and the USA. For this reason Joseph Chamberlain supported policies that would boost local economies and make them key to the economic prosperity of the British Empire.³

The term ‘constructive imperialism’ was coined to describe the colonial development plans and projects during Joseph Chamberlain’s tenure. Primarily, the

objective of his constructive imperialism was to serve British interests in decreasing the expense of maintaining and defending a vast empire. This practical policy gave importance to railway construction and presupposed the boosting of investment and employment in British industry through orders for new railways. Railways were considered a means of opening access to the hinterlands of the West African Tropics, and a way of providing a counter-balance to the economic expansion of the USA and Germany. The policy had a secondary objective. Self-sufficient and autonomous colonial economies were thought to produce contented colonial subjects and a stronger imperial defence. This was an intended consequence for the colonies in Western Africa and the West Indies, and it was also the case in Cyprus too.

The historian Andrekos Varnava has argued that Cyprus was unimportant to the British Empire's strategy or defence. Thus, as we show below, it had to be protected not from another imperial force but from its own inner crisis and from emerging criticism within the British Empire.⁴ British colonial authorities sought to answer the social and economic crisis, and the growing crisis of colonial legitimacy as it was experienced in the island, through economic development schemes that included the construction of ports, railway networks and irrigation. In the process of port construction, the local colonial administration⁵ found their strategies and policies undermined by the political and economic elite in Cyprus.

Chamberlain's policy for the management of the crisis had an unintended consequence. It created further deterioration of the political situation which led to the reconsideration of the two fundamental institutions of the British occupation: the Tribute and the 1882 Constitution. The Tribute, a term used in the Cyprus Convention of 1878, was an amount from the excess of Cyprus' revenue over expenditure. It had to be paid annually to the Sultan and amounted to approximately £92,000. On the other hand, the 1882 Constitution, the most liberal amongst non-settler colonies, provided Cyprus its legal and administrative framework while granting it the Legislative Council. The establishment of the Legislative Council was significant because it opened a political space that contributed to the expression of the political will of both communities despite its colonial structure.⁶

In order to consolidate their colonial establishment, the British had to negotiate, co-operate and compromise with local networks of power whose vested interests in Larnaca had been threatened by the construction of a new harbour and railway in Famagusta. As Varnava suggests, the decision-making about Cyprus was not directed from the top of the British government but instead was filtered through state departments and civil servants.⁷ We corroborate this argument by showing that the imperial policy had to be negotiated and appropriated between the High Commissioners, various engineers and the local elite. This fact forced the Cyprus Government and the Colonial Office to improve the Larnaca port in order to reproduce the existing political relations amongst the British and Cypriot ruling elites. We show that the construction of the harbours of Famagusta and Larnaca brought the governability of Cyprus under the existing relations and institutions (the Tribute and the Legislative Council granted by the Gladstonian Constitution

of 1882) of the island into question. Unlike the nationalist-induced governability crisis of 1912, the Legislative Council and Tribute were placed under scrutiny by the colonial establishment because of the vested interests of the Larnacan elites.⁸ The result was the improvement of the Larnaca harbour in a negotiated fashion by the mediation of the engineers' designs and an increase in grants-in-aid to the island.

Cyprus as a show case of Chamberlain's colonial agenda

In the years prior to 1895 – the year that Joseph Chamberlain began his work as the Secretary of State for the Colonies – Cyprus had already been experiencing economic and social decline. It had been a British protectorate since 1878 and British occupation was followed by the gradual modernisation of state institutions on the Island. The late 1880s and early 1900s were a period of crisis that has generally been attributed to the dissolution of the Island's long established legal, social, political and economic institutions.⁹ British fiscal policy on the island (and particularly the taxation system) was severe and unpopular and led to rural indebtedness and dispossession.¹⁰ During the first decade of the twentieth century conflict worsened, especially among the Muslim and Christian elites. The dissolution of traditional hierarchies and authority within the two communities led to a decade of political mobilisation, identity building and the creation of a new political authority amongst traditional and populist elites. These elites (mostly clerics, merchants, doctors, lawyers and large land-owners) dominated the spiritual, economic and political life of the islanders'. The situation culminated in the inter-communal crisis of 1912.¹¹ Meantime, in 1896 Britain's policy for Cyprus triggered a reaction in London among some Members of Parliament. Conservatives and Gladstonian Liberals alike believed that British rule in Cyprus was unfair and disgraceful.¹² But tensions were so high on the Island that Joseph Chamberlain condemned these statements. He warned the British Parliament that people in Cyprus were ready to accept 'as gospel, statements of this kind, and assume that they are mistreated and to be discontented in consequence'.¹³

By 1899 the Liberal Unionists under the leadership and influence of Joseph Chamberlain developed the so-called 'colonial estates' policy as an attempt to consolidate the Empire, increase the wealth of Britain and again become economically and politically competitive with the USA, Russia, and Germany.¹⁴ Besides scientific assistance in agriculture, an essential aspect of Chamberlain's colonial policy was the construction of railways, a policy priority that influenced his strategy in the context of Cyprus.¹⁵ His 'undeveloped estate' theory (colonies or protectorates without investment) foresaw an active role for the colonial government in economic development, the encouragement of private investment, and the development of railway networks.¹⁶ Despite the scepticism and the ambivalence of the Treasury towards Chamberlain's 'constructive' colonialism, Cyprus was one of several colonies for which he managed to gain a Parliamentary vote in allocating funds for projects.¹⁷ Cyprus, an island not famous for its natural resources,

Table 1. Colonial loans allocated under the Colonial Loans Act 1899.^a

<i>Name of colony or place</i>	<i>Purpose of loan</i>	<i>Maximum loan (£)</i>
Cyprus	Harbour, railway and irrigation	314,000
Gold Coast	Railways, Accra Harbour Works	676,000
Jamaica	Public works, railways, misc.	453,000
Malay States	Railways	500,000
Lagos	Railways	792,500
Sierra Leone	Railways	310,000

^aCyprus is the only non-tropical colony in the list.

Source: Data compiled from D. Sunderland, *Managing the British Empire, The Crown Agents 1833–1914* (London, Boydell Press & The Royal Historical Society, 2004).

received a relatively large amount from the 1899 Colonial Loans Act (£314,000 of the £3,500,000 available; 9.3 per cent of the whole amount). It was an amount comparable to that received by vast colonies like the Malay States and Sierra Leone (Table 1).

Consolidating colonialism: Famagusta harbour as the entrepôt of the Levant

From the beginning of the British colonial period in Cyprus, Famagusta city and its harbour occupied a romantic place in the British colonial mind. When the administration of Cyprus passed to Britain in 1878 from the Ottoman Empire (an outcome of the Congress of Berlin in 1878) many British politicians and military men began thinking about the strategic potential of the island for the Empire. Famagusta Harbour in particular was conceived of as a potential coaling station en route to India.¹⁸ However, the fall of Egypt, which brought the Port of Alexandria under British control in 1881, combined with the insanitary conditions of Famagusta and the economic restrictions upon Cyprus's revenue, rendered the viability of the proposal of a coaling station at Famagusta 'out of the question'.¹⁹ Until 1900 Famagusta remained a peripheral, small and decaying port, whereas Larnaca, Limassol, and Kyrenia underwent renovation and infrastructural improvement.²⁰ Meanwhile the city of Larnaca – the second largest city on the island after Nicosia²¹ – became the naval and mercantile centre of Cyprus, and the main port for Cyprus's import and export trade.²² Larnaca was the home of Cyprus's powerful merchants, influential politicians, petit-bourgeoisie, foreign representatives of embassies and banks, and a hub for many of the first nationalists.²³

In 1899 Chamberlain's development policy finally gave impetus to develop relatively backward Famagusta port. It acquired a place in transport policy and was defined as a naval and railway centre. The Colonial Development Welfare Act of 1899 would grant money to the Island to improve its inner and outer communications, and agricultural production. The general plan was to improve Cyprus's

agricultural capabilities and boost its grain and fruit exports to neighbouring countries, Egypt being the most important. Irrigation and railway infrastructure was intended to facilitate the trade of products from the fertile Messaoria plain in the centre of the Island to these neighbouring countries. The choice of Famagusta was straightforward because the British colonial mind was biased from the first days of island's occupation. As a city, Famagusta had historic and symbolic meanings to the British, and the derelict harbour also possessed 'natural potentials' for its development into a modern infrastructure. In the early days of the British administration, the harbour was considered comparable to the great ports of Alexandria and Valetta.²⁴

Thus the technocratic policy of 'one railway-one harbour' was developed as a means of applying the experience and expertise acquired in West Africa and matching the technocratic vision with Chamberlain's policy agenda. In the late 1880s and 1890s, Britain's West African colonies experienced the implementation of mass monoculture and the construction of railways terminating at particular ports. As in Cyprus, these port constructions were mainly undertaken by Coode, Son and Matthews Consulting Engineers working for the Crown Agents. The famous Coode, Son and Matthews had been involved in colonial harbour projects, especially in West Africa. In the majority of these places where a railway was constructed by Shelford & Son, the connecting harbour was constructed by Coode, Son and Matthews. It shared the fame of best known engineering firms with Shelford and Son which undertook the same role in Cyprus for railway construction.²⁵

The Director of Public Works in Cyprus, Frank Cartwright, had been studying the issue of the expansion and improvement of Famagusta Harbour since September 1897.²⁶ He had prepared a report for Walter Sendall, the High Commissioner.²⁷ The Colonial Office sought the opinion of the Crown Agents who hired Coode, Son and Matthews as the consulting engineers for the harbour scheme and were ordered to prepare a report.²⁸ Mr P. M. Crosthwaite, an assistant engineer in Coode, Son and Matthews, conducted the survey of the harbour during the summer of 1898. By January of the next year the consultants' report for the Colonial Office specified the infrastructural characteristics, which differed from previous technical reports. They suggested several minor design changes that would result in a harbour would otherwise be unable to host two 400-foot iron ships.²⁹ This design detail was not given much attention, but in reality it resulted in a harbour with an inner basin too narrow to accommodate prospective naval traffic. The consultants also suggested the construction of a railway line from Famagusta to Nicosia, advice typical for Coode, Son and Matthews. In West Africa, this consulting company had designed many harbours which were also served by railways that connected them with the hinterland.³⁰ Chamberlain was quick to follow the technocrats' advice and by January 1902 he ordered the initiation of the works with Coode, Son and Matthews as consulting engineers.³¹

The Famagusta harbour project proceeded smoothly and in accordance with the engineers' specifications. However, politics in Cyprus were becoming increasingly

complex and tense. Wealthy and influential Larnacans, mostly the elected members of the Legislative Council, were agitated by the news that their city would be denied both a railway branch and harbour improvements. This was perceived as a threat to their vested interests. Larnaca had a competitor which would supposedly have superior and safer facilities, Government support, and a railway line terminating there.³² In spite of this, no one could guarantee – even with the optimism of British officials – that Famagusta would attract much of the trade for the island and a share of the Levant trade by being the *entrepôt* of the region.

High Commissioner Haynes Smith, an active and interventionist colonial officer/politician, began negotiations to ameliorate the discontent and demands for a railway, and hoped to achieve a resolution that would be acceptable to both Chamberlain and the Larnacans.³³ In October 1900, Haynes Smith wrote to Joseph Chamberlain about the situation in Larnaca. He conveyed the general dissatisfaction amongst its townspeople and merchants, and the Elected Members, both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots alike, about Larnaca's exclusion from the railway scheme. The letter was part of a policy strategy: Haynes Smith was building a case for the improvement of the Larnaca harbour because he could foresee the consequences of inaction on the subject. He understood the grievances among local society and also perceived – rightly it proved – the high potential of a governance crisis.³⁴ Haynes Smith claimed that his proposal of improving the harbour at Larnaca would both satisfy the demand for British ports in the region, and placate the Larnacans and the Elected Members. He went on to argue that if the improvements at Larnaca were added to the Locust Destruction Bill which would allocate funds for paying the railway and Famagusta Harbour loans, Elected Members would not object to passing the Bill.³⁵

Chamberlain needed little persuading. He understood that the colonial power would suffer heavily if the conflict with one of the most influential classes on the Island persisted. As Chamberlain later explained to the Treasury, 'it would be so hard [for the Government] if Larnaca were to be excluded altogether from the proposed schemes'.³⁶ A compromise was reached between the Colonial Office, the British Government, the local authorities and local elites. Elected Members of the Legislative Council agreed to create funds from unpopular and non-nationalistic sources, such as additional taxation of immovable property in the town of Larnaca. On the one hand the Elected Members were making their first compromise to the Government in the Larnaca Harbour case; on the other hand they were engaging the Government and Colonial Office in the bargain.

In 1902, Larnaca's political authorities and elites raised further complaints about the exclusion of the city from the planned railway line.³⁷ Earlier discussions in the Legislative Council (of late 1890s and 1900–01) concerning the projects of the railway and Famagusta Harbour had repeatedly brought up this issue of Larnaca's exclusion from the railway. This changed from 1902 to 1903 and Haynes Smith took the initiative to extract some kind of promise from Chamberlain. Yet still the tensions and local complaints about the necessity of Larnaca's port improvements persisted.³⁸

Haynes Smith showed his intentions concerning Larnaca port to Chamberlain in his long despatch dated 7 September 1903. His objective was to persuade Chamberlain to implement the Larnaca port improvements. The despatch finished with the hot topic of local 'resentment and annoyance' which had been evident throughout. It must be noted that this despatch had been a product of Haynes Smith's close contacts, consultations and communications with the local elite at Larnaca. As he discussed the estimates with the merchants and 'those interested in shipping', he had come to terms with the political and economic leaders of the region. These people within the social and economic hierarchy of Larnaca could effect and mobilise people from the lower classes. Haynes Smith reminded Chamberlain that the Famagusta Harbour and Railway had been perceived as developments prone to severely injure Larnaca, the 'ancient' and the 'best known' port of Cyprus, and he noted that exclusion would 'leave a sore feeling' in the community.³⁹ Accordingly, the 'Larnacan interests' would secure better means for their trade; the Government would contain and depress both a potential political and social crisis, what Haynes Smith described as '... bitterness and hostility to the British Administration'.⁴⁰ The result of this canvassing was that a figure of £15,000 was granted for the improvement of the Larnaca harbour, which would be spent on lengthening the pier by 450 feet and adding a T-end. This would provide more space for loading and unloading with slightly improved protection from the surf whipped up by the winds. The design was trade-oriented rather than passenger-oriented. It gave priority to trade activities by creating more space in the harbour rather than being concerned with the security of passengers and labourers.

Fusing localism with the Unionist agenda

In the meantime, Greek nationalists of the Legislative Council incorporated Government finances and expenditures at Famagusta Harbour into their nationalist agenda. In April 1903 the first official demand for 'enosis' (the union of Greece and Cyprus) was made in the Legislative Council. The summer of 1903 witnessed the offensive against the Government from the Legislative Council. The figure who stood forward in the offensive was Dr Philios Zannetos, the Elected Member of the Larnaca-Famagusta region.⁴¹ Zannetos was a notorious nationalist and a Greek subject. In May 1903 the Legislative Council discussed the Famagusta Harbour scheme for which the Elected Members had a series of complaints and demands. Zannetos accused the Government over the character and design of the infrastructure while the colonial establishment viewed the accusations as 'adverse criticism' of the Government.⁴²

On 21 July 1903 Zannetos presented a detailed and well-prepared complaint against the Famagusta Harbour works. He claimed that the harbour would be a 'sea-tank' of no use. His complaint was twofold: first was the concern about whether the design of the works would enable the harbour to serve the object for which it was constructed, and the second was the cost of the project. Zannetos argued that the design of the harbour would not allow harbouring of

more than one steamer, of lengths ranging from 350 to 433 feet. He concluded by accusing the Government of spending people's money on a sea-tank – given increasing vessel sizes, they should rather have invested in a harbour that could become an emporium of the Levant.

Zannetos' own calculations for the cost of the scheme were far lower than the actual contract. He calculated £16,536 for the project and added, rather scathingly, that he was ready to allow 50 per cent profit for the contractors. Zannetos built his case to make a certain point; the Government was stealing from the people of Cyprus. This was a provocative accusation at a time of severe economic hardship and mass rural indebtedness. He said that the Government was generously giving away the island's money to British contractors who were making astronomical profits while taxes were burdening the people of Cyprus. He stressed that the Government would face consequences if it prioritized the harbour over possible alternative schemes like the establishment of an Agricultural Bank. He further argued that the establishment of an Agricultural Bank could be used in populist politics in the face of the rural indebtedness ravaging the Cypriot peasantry. Cyprus was an overwhelmingly agricultural economy in which usurers and moneylenders were the only creditors, contributing heavily to indebtedness and dispossession of the agriculturalist population. Zannetos' criticisms gain yet more importance when one considers that the majority of Cypriots farmed their own land.⁴³

By Zannetos' implicit utilisation of nationalist-populist politics, the story of harbours in Cyprus began to shift between the spheres of technocracy and politics. The governmental response came instantly. The High Commissioner asked for the opinion of the Colonial Office which unsurprisingly sought a technocratic solution. Coode, Son and Matthews were asked to report on the 'ill-informed criticism' of the Government.⁴⁴ The aim was to use the engineering report as an objective defence of the situation and thus to shift away from the sphere of politics, the direction in which Zannetos and the nationalists were driving the debate. Engineering authority and expertise would have a mediating function in shaping and legitimizing the government's policy to politically split the local and nationalist pressures. The consulting engineers argued that not only was their tender one of the lowest in the Empire's records, but that they had specifically received instructions to keep expenditure low. The Famagusta harbour had been purposely designed on a minimum-cost basis. Furthermore, Coode, Son and Matthews supported their design priorities and practices by arguing that an area of 9 acres (500 feet by 800 feet) would provide ample room for the expected traffic and that any further extension was possible with infrastructure changes. They argued that the Famagusta port had been designed as an open technological system that would accommodate future commercial and shipping activities. The design foresaw only the satisfaction of the traffic of Messaoria agriculture; it was neither Levant nor pan-Cyprian. This was a departure from the visionary promises of the Colonial Office and the Administration that the Famagusta scheme would create an entrepôt or emporium of the Levant. Consultants framed the scheme along pragmatist lines in relation to the expected traffic and mercantile load.⁴⁵

In a separate confidential letter, Haynes Smith informed Chamberlain about the political agenda of Zannetos. Chamberlain's technocratic visions collided with the nationalist and financial interests. According to the High Commissioner, the attack led by Zannetos on the Famagusta Harbour Works was a combination of local interests and general policy among the unionists [enosists]:⁴⁶

... the "unpleasant consequences" ... are intended to mean an organized resistance to the payment of the Locust Destruction Fund taxes, which are appropriated for part of the charges of the Harbour and Railway Loan. They hope, I think, to unite all classes in opposition to payment of any of the taxes which are in excess of the amount expended in the Island ...⁴⁷

Haynes Smith understood what was being attempted in the Legislative Council. The Locust Fund Tax and Tribute were sources of irritation for the whole population of the Island. For a politician like Dr Zannetos it was an easy matter to lump together the Locust Fund Tax, the Tribute and these projects in order to pursue his objectives. This threat was one of the first attempts to use mass politics against the British colonial administration.⁴⁸ Famagusta Harbour was an easy target because there were, as the High Commissioner noted, not only nationalist agendas but 'also strong local opposition of the Larnaca interests'.⁴⁹ In the end Zannetos was not articulating a purely *enosis* politics. Nationalist agenda and vested trade interests in Larnaca were alternatively utilising one another's ideas.

However, by 1904, just one year after Zannetos' memorandum, Haynes Smith had also come to the same conclusion: the new Famagusta harbour was too small for 'a convenient place of call' for the steamships.⁵⁰ He noted that different steamship lines calling at Cyprus or engaging in trade in the Levant would not be willing to dock at Famagusta unless its port was 'somewhat enlarged'. The general opinion, he continued, was in favour of making an extension 100 ft wide and 200 ft long. He proposed these extensions together by bringing the railway onto the quay, prolonging the wharf on iron piles from the quay to the land and dredging a channel sufficiently deep to allow sailing vessels to use it.⁵¹ The Crown Agents requested the advice of the consulting engineers once more. The latter also confessed that the original design was 'undoubtedly somewhat more cramped than is desirable'.⁵² Their proposal, like that of the High Commissioner, was to lengthen the quay and deep-water area by 100 ft, to widen the dredged area from 500 ft to 600 ft, to dredge a basin 15 ft in depth, and 450 ft × 200 ft in size for small local vessels at a new iron-jetty, in order not to interfere with steamships manoeuvring inside the inner harbour. The design was accepted, the work was given to the contractor CJ Wills, and the whole harbour project was completed by late 1906.

Confronting the contestation: Improvements at Larnaca's Port

The Government's scheme to ease the discontent about Larnaca and the contestation of its policy priorities by locals was to propose action which facilitated the

repayment of a possible loan for improvements at the Larnaca port.⁵³ The Larnaca Port Loan Bill caused differences to surface between the Elected Members, but the majority were in favour; even Zannetos was on the side of the Government.⁵⁴ Zannetos, who alongside his political activities owned a tobacco factory in Larnaca, acted in this instance for his business interests which overwhelmed his nationalist sentiments. The Bishop of Kitium, a defender against the exploitation of the Locust Destruction Fund and an influential populist figure in Larnaca, also supported more taxation.⁵⁵ Voting showed that those who were politically or economically invested in Larnaca (including Zannetos) voted in favour, while those opposed shared a more nationalist, anti-British profile, and generally belonged to the cities of Nicosia and Limassol.⁵⁶

The Larnaca Harbour improvements became part of the agenda of the new Secretary of State for the Colonies, Alfred Lyttelton, in early 1904. By February 1904 Haynes Smith was sending Lyttelton his proposal with a design and estimates from his Director of Public Works, E. H. D. Nicolls. The Government, the Municipality and 'certain inhabitants' of Larnaca all had their proposals ready to be submitted for consideration by the Colonial Office. Since Lyttelton was new to the Office, Haynes Smith, in his long despatch, had to refer to the necessity of the improvements and their relation to the development of the Famagusta Harbour and the funding of the project. In comparison to his dispatches to Chamberlain, Haynes Smith was more honest with the new Secretary of State. He considered that 'to carry out what they do not want [would] only... be an additional grievance and would be more resented than doing nothing'.⁵⁷ Accordingly, he set the objective of the improvements for the facilitation of trade and to giving the community of Larnaca what they required for the commerce of the town. Merchants wanted the improvements, so the improvements would be trade-oriented. On the question of whether Famagustan trade would suffer from the improvements in Larnaca, Smith believed that Famagusta's success depended only on whether 'proper facilities' are afforded to large ships to make the city an entrepôt of the Levant trade.

Haynes Smith, eager to complete infrastructural improvements at Larnaca to avoid the impending crisis, had enclosed both Nicolls' and (Mayor of Larnaca) Rossos' memorandum. For the latter, he also asked Nicolls to calculate estimates indicating his open willingness to forward the proposal of the Municipality attached to its petition. The Government was now translating Larnacan interests in technical terms as well. Nicolls, in his report, foresaw the extension of the pier and the construction of a breakwater.⁵⁸ He reported that heavy gales were never experienced thus the anchorage was good and there was hardly a single day that work had not been carried out at ships' sides. According to Nicolls the difficulty was the traffic arising from the in-shore surf, especially from winds blowing from north or northeast.⁵⁹ As the depth at the bottom of the port would not increase by more than one to two feet, which did not make a significant difference to enabling the anchorage of larger vessels, Nicolls did not propose a long extension of the pier deep into the sea. Instead he added that the off-shore system of anchorage and

carriage of merchandise and passengers by lighters to the pier during bad weather should become more secure. Nicolls' design prioritized the safety and security of the trade.

Since the necessity was to protect lighters from bad weather, Nicolls' proposed to lengthen the pier by 200 ft (it was already a 450 ft long T-head) and, at a distance of 75 ft from the end, construct a 430 ft breakwater at a distance of 125 ft seaward from the pier.⁶⁰ This would enable the T-head of the pier to be carried seaward where a shoal existed, thus increasing protection, and the breakwater would enable easier discharge to lighters and shelter to the latter at the pier. The whole project was estimated to cost £15,000.

Mayor Rossos' proposal had a different approach. As the situation became more tense, even the length of the pier acquired meaning.⁶¹ Informed by published Government data, previous reports and surveys and experience, Rossos' memorandum asked for the fulfilment of two objectives: to clear the broken water and avoid the surf which occurred at a distance of 1200–1250 ft from the shore, and to obtain a depth of water of about 12 ft in order to allow small vessels and lighter to work in any weather. Rossos' design primarily provided greater capacity and depth, together with increased security and an extension to the length of pier.⁶² He left the calculation of the length of the pier and breakwater to the engineers' 'experience'. The memorandum ended with threatening language that expressed the possible feelings that would be provoked by refusal of the proposal. Rossos warned that if the breakwater was built at a depth of nine feet, as in Nicolls's plan, the people would perceive this as 'parsimonious and an unjust disregard of the town'.⁶³

Nicolls modified his plans, based upon the memorandum of Rossos, and created a hybrid design. He proposed extending 450 feet further seawards (as proposed by Rossos) and slightly altering the direction of the breakwater which he had previously drawn.⁶⁴ The estimated cost of these plans was £25,300, a fact which Lyttelton disliked.⁶⁵ Haynes Smith negotiated the plans; the result was a third plan from Nicolls that had the scope to satisfy both the Larnacans in design and Lyttelton in economics. Nicolls explained that his first plan was designed to give as much as accommodation while keeping the cost within £15,000. However, in the opinion of Mayor and the merchants of port of Larnaca, this did not give enough space behind the breakwater. Thus, in order to satisfy the demand of Mayor and merchants, who also had asked for comfort and safety for lighters, he increased the length of breakwater from 550 ft, and placed it 50 ft further into the sea. This would give an extra 50 ft between the breakwater and the pier head.⁶⁶ Coode, Son and Matthews were hired and directed to prepare the designs and estimates. Consistent with their business conduct which typically erred on the side of caution when financial estimates were involved, they estimated £28,000 for Nicolls' third design. They suggested accepting this design in principle with alterations to the breakwater; they wanted to conduct an examination of the sea bed by special boring, but the design included an extension of the pier by 200 ft with a T-head and the construction of an isolated sheltering arm – breakwater – of 550 ft.⁶⁷

The Secretary of State was hesitant about continuing the scheme because he had the dogma of one harbour-one railway in mind which demanded the concentration of the flow of products/trade through the Famagusta Harbour, and so he prevented the commencement of the Larnaca works.⁶⁸ Amid rising tensions within the Legislative Council and the political climate in Cyprus, Haynes-Smith was replaced by the mildly philhellenic Sir Charles King-Harman who was more sympathetic towards Greeks and their claims. His orders from the Colonial Office were to persuade local politicians to co-operate and avoid a breakdown of governance on the Island.⁶⁹ The new High Commissioner, King-Harman, was as clear as his predecessor Haynes Smith on the subject and followed his predecessor's state policy. He explained briefly that there was a general consensus that part of the trade would always go to Larnaca. But, as far as the Mayor and the local merchants were concerned, this story had become excessively prolonged. King-Harman told Lyttelton that the disallowance was a major blow to Government efforts not just in managing the Larnaca issue but in avoiding a governance crisis. He added that this decision would cause consternation in the town, which had since laid eloquent and indignant claims for the matter.⁷⁰ The decision resulted in a Memorandum from the Mayor of Larnaca on behalf of all Larnacans.⁷¹ The High Commissioner presented this petition to the Colonial Office as 'a temperate expression of a strong feeling of bitterness and disappointment'.⁷²

The Chamberlainian policy promoted the construction of the Famagusta Harbour and the railway to secure an end to the island's crisis. However, this policy proved to only increase tensions on the island. The potential improvements at Larnaca exacerbated the situation to a point the colonial establishment was forced to reflect on and even question certain institutions, functions and practices of island's occupation. Two founding pillars of British presence were put on trial: the Tribute and the Constitution (thus the Legislative Council). This former founding pillar, the most important term of Ottoman-British agreement, was an institution which caused a source of burden and complaint for the entire population. The Colonial Office took the initiative to negotiate with the Treasury a kind of financial relief from the burdens of the Island, suggesting doing 'something' with the Tribute. British official opinion saw these two as inter-connected. The Colonial Office laid down two options for a solution to the crisis: an intervention in the working of the Legislative Council in favour of official representation, or changing the regime of Tribute.⁷³ The Government had to do something: either to reward the local political establishment by diminishing the Tribute, or punish it by diminishing the local political representation on the Legislative Council. The issue of Larnaca harbour improvements now pushed the British establishment to the point of a possible governance breakdown. Only a few months before the petition, the former High Commissioner Haynes Smith had suggested bringing in troops and dissolving the Legislative Council.

As the stakes got higher, High Commissioner King-Harman made an emergency official visit to Larnaca to meet, first, Mayor Rossos, and second, the 'leading people' of the city: merchants, Elected Members of the Council and shipping

agents.⁷⁴ After his visit, King-Harman was yet more convinced about the need for the improvements at Larnaca port. He noted that all parties agreed on the last design proposed by the engineers.⁷⁵ Lyttelton's choice was between the further escalation of the tension and making the position of the new High Commissioner tenuous, or to approve his proposal. Lyttelton sanctioned the scheme in January 1905 on the condition that funding had to be negotiated for its type and source.⁷⁶ His aim was to convince the Treasury to approve the scheme. This would be the main discussion in 1905 about the Larnaca harbour improvements.

Still no material progress was made in Larnaca's case. A whole year had passed since the Colonial Office approved the improvements, but since 1899 Larnaca had been subject to discussions of railway and harbour building. Protests over the delay were gathering speed. Agents of shipping companies were the first to complain.⁷⁷ King-Harman, having met privately with Mayor Rossos and G. Pierides (both elected members of the Legislative Council), wrote again to Lyttelton for immediate action in the summer of 1905. This petition letter had been a joint production by Rossos, Pierides, and King-Harman, who noted that the insistence of Pierides (also a shipping agent) had been the major motive. These were big trade interests not just in Larnaca but on the whole Island. The High Commissioner had nothing to add to his arguments, but just emphasized the possible outcome of a governance breakdown in Cyprus:

... delay in the commencement of a work which received your approval so far back as January last is fostering a spirit of resentment and discontent very detrimental to the peaceful government of the Island.⁷⁸

In the meantime, by December 1905 Lord Elgin of the Liberal Government had become the head of the Colonial Office.⁷⁹ The Secretary of State, Lord Elgin, motivated by the ambivalence of the Treasury, requested a report by the consulting engineers Coode, Son and Matthews. The issue at stake was how to reduce the cost of the scheme. The consultants suggested a cheaper scheme that might omit the covering breakwater or adopt some form of T-head to the pier instead of a breakwater to afford sufficient protection.⁸⁰ In April 1906 the consulting engineers conducted a new survey in Larnaca.⁸¹ In order to evaluate the situation and understand the local dynamics, politics and priorities, they met with various interested parties and social groups. These included the Director of Public Works (Nicolls), the Collector of Customs of Larnaca, High Commissioner King-Harman, Mayor Rossos, and agents of the principal shipping companies using the port. The visiting engineer, Wilson, had to develop a design to the satisfaction of all. His design did not differ greatly from Nicolls's hybrid. It recommended lengthening the existing jetty by 450 ft, which would give an additional depth of two feet, or eight feet in sum, and to construct an outer sheltering arm 250 ft long to afford protection to the outer end of the jetty.⁸² The cost was estimated at £21,500. This was the only feature that concerned Lord Elgin. Elgin gave his approval on the condition that the project would only take a small sum from the General Revenue; the London

loans market now had disadvantageous terms of crediting. King-Harman ruled out making Larnaca paying for the improvements, arguing that Elected Members and people saw the payment as an obligation of the General Revenue, as in the cases of Limassol, Famagusta and Kyrenia ports. He preferred the General Revenue to pay the whole amount, a proposal, he considered, which would be agreed by the Elected Members. As a direct consequence of the Larnaca improvements crisis, Cyprus now had an increased amount of Grant-in-Aid from London. For the year of 1908–1909 Cyprus was expecting £50,000 Grant-in-Aid.⁸³ Consulting engineers Coode, Son and Matthews had the difficult task of persuading the Treasury of the feasibility of the scheme, arguing that Larnaca was no danger to Famagusta harbour's interests. Both infrastructural projects had to be pursued as no real competition would emerge from the two harbour schemes.⁸⁴ The Earl of Elgin approved the scheme on the lines of Coode, Son and Matthews' report, with the cost being covered by an increased grant-in-aid during the next three years.⁸⁵ By the end of April 1907, plans were drawn up. Nicolls was appointed as the head of works under the supervision and instruction of the Consulting Engineers.⁸⁶ Tenders were also accepted.⁸⁷ By January 1908 the Larnaca harbour improvements ended with a full execution of the contract. In the long-term, Larnaca got neither modern port facilities nor a railway line. By 1926, Famagusta became the major port for all imports and the main export route for agricultural products, the key objective of its construction.⁸⁸

Conclusion

Technological infrastructure and socio-political order were co-produced in early-twentieth-century Cyprus through the agency of multiple actors: engineers, politicians and members of Cyprus' economically and politically most influential classes. The Colonial Loans Act 1899 was a tool of Joseph Chamberlain's 'constructive imperialism', aiming primarily to overcome the crisis of legitimization of the British colonial order. Unlike colonies and protectorates in West Africa and the West Indies, the policy in Cyprus primarily aimed at solving the crisis rather than boosting economic growth for the British metropolitan welfare. The Famagusta Harbour project, accompanied by railway and irrigation schemes, was part of this policy but it faced resistance from the local political elite. Instead of resolving or relieving growing dissatisfaction and crisis within the island, Chamberlain's harbour and railway scheme exacerbated the crisis to a point that Cyprus became ungovernable. For this reason, the two basic pillars of British colonial establishment, The Tribute and the Gladstonian Constitution, were put under scrutiny to manage this situation. The answer to this ongoing issue of governability came in the form of an improved harbour in Larnaca. It was the material agency of the improvement that finally made the local political elite give their consent to the political structures of British colonialism.

Despite the strong technocratic visions and imperial experience, the emerging port infrastructure in colonial Cyprus acquired specific technical characteristics

through a continuous socio-political process of public negotiations with lobbies, local politicians and authorities. Planning and developing colonial policies on trade and transport, and building the relevant infrastructures, were not simple matters of an unquestioned transfer of expertise and diffusion of technologies. The colonial order based upon agricultural production and trade via modern infrastructures, as conceptualized by Chamberlain's policy, was enacted through tensions, pressures, privileged local politics and understandings. Different conceptions of the future of the Island emerged at a local level when Larnacans questioned the 'rationality' of imperial technocratic plans. Coastal engineering plans and harbour design were shaped by colonial policies and power struggles.

The improvement of Famagusta harbour was part of the colonial development policy for Cyprus which, as a protectorate, was facing a socio-political and economic crisis. It was decided to improve Famagusta Harbour and build a railway terminus. Famagusta port possessed natural potentials of a grand harbour, and the city filled British imagination with its past glory. It also stood at the eastern end of the Messaoria plain which was to be served by the railway and supplied by irrigation projects. In the British mind, financial constraints and technocratic visions privileged Famagusta over Larnaca. Thus, if Cyprus was to be an 'emporium' of the Levant, Famagusta needed to be enlarged to accommodate large steamers. This policy targeted the concentration of the bulk of the Island's export products at one port: Famagusta Harbour. Accordingly, this policy excluded the Larnaca railway branch, leaving powerful interested groups such as ship owners, merchants and politicians in Larnaca feeling threatened. According to Chamberlain's agenda the railway and Famagusta Harbour projects were designed to answer Cyprus' ongoing political and economic crisis. Yet the interpretation of these projects by the colonial and imperial politicians and officials differed from the interpretations of elites in Larnaca. Consequently, the colonial administration had to manoeuvre between local elites and the Colonial Office in order to reach a consensus that would satisfy both these parties. The consolidation of the colonial regime in Cyprus depended also upon the reproduction of the local power relations that were threatened by the modern infrastructures of the Nicosia-Famagusta railway line and Famagusta Harbour. The consensus had to be translated into technical improvements at Larnaca Harbour. The political compensation resulted in the alteration and transformation of the 'one harbour-one railway' policy. Harbours in the making reflected the techno-politics of the period. In this context visionary technical solutions were translated into functioning infrastructure through contestation, argumentation and negotiation among the interested parties and the relevant social groups within Cyprus.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. S. Moon, 'Place, Voice, Interdisciplinarity: Understanding Technology in the Colony and Postcolony', *History and Technology*, 26:3 (2010), 189–201, 189–90; D. Arnold, 'Europe, Technology, and Colonialism in the 20th Century', *History and Technology*, 21 (2005), 85–106.
2. B. Porter, *The Lion's Share: a Short History of British Imperialism, 1850–2004* (Harlow, Longman, 2012), p. 187; M. A. Havinden, *Colonialism and Development: Britain and Its Tropical Colonies, 1850–1960* (London, Routledge, 1993), p. 90.
3. R. E. Dumett, 'Joseph Chamberlain, Imperial Finance and Railway Policy in British West Africa in the Late Nineteenth Century', *English Historical Review*, 90:355 (April 1975), 287–321; Porter, *The Lion's Share*, p. 87; Havinden, *Colonialism and Development*; Michael Worboys, *Science and British Colonial Imperialism, 1895–1940* (PhD, University of Sussex, 1979).
4. A. Varnava, *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878–1915: The Inconsequential Possession* (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2012), pp. 34–38.
5. The governance of the colonies was the job of governors. The Colonial Office's role was to supervise the colonies and especially their finances. The post of Secretary of State for the Colonies was usually not as demanding a role within the Cabinet in comparison to the Treasury or Foreign Affairs. He was answerable to the Prime Minister and Houses of Parliament. A governor's appointment was difficult if the Secretary of State did not approve his name politically. G. Ure, *Governors, Politics and the Colonial Office: Public Policy in Hong Kong, 1918–58* (Hong Kong University Press, 2012), pp. 22–24. For the Crown Agent system in engineering issues, see Chapter 7 'Miscellaneous Roles' in David Sunderland, *Managing British Colonial and Post-Colonial Development: the Crown Agents, 1914–74* (New York, Boydell & Brewer, 2007).
6. A. Varnava, 'Cypriots Transforming their Identity during the Early British Period: From a Class, Religious and Regional Identity to a Hellenic Ethno-Nationalist Identity', in M. N. Michael, T. Anastassiades and C. Verdeil (eds), *Religious Communities and Modern Statehood: The Ottoman and Post-Ottoman World at the Age of Nationalism and Colonialism* (Berlin, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2015), p. 160; M. N. Michael, 'From the Ottoman Meclis-i İdare to the British Legislative Council: Representative administration between the Ottoman and the British Perception of Modernity', in Michael, Anastassiades and Verdeil (eds), *Religious Communities and Modern Statehood*, (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2012) pp. 123–124.
7. Varnava, *British Imperialism in Cyprus*, pp. 27–28.
8. Varnava, *British Imperialism in Cyprus*, p. 190.
9. Major historians of the period agree that it was a time of socio-economic crisis. In his emblematic work R Katsiaounis draws a vivid picture of the situation of the labouring poor and adds dissolution of traditional social paternalism and social banditry as several symptoms of the crisis. *Katsiaounis Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century* (Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1996).

- Varnava points out the substantial weight of the Tribute in front of the island's development by draining local sources. He also points to the collapse of the traditional socio-political structure of Muslim-Christian communities in the early 1900s as a result of the application of modern politics by the British. Similarly, Bryant in this period illustrates the cultural crisis and conflicts between both community's traditional conservative and populist elites. A. Varnava, *British Imperialism in Cyprus*, pp. 139–46 & 177–83; Rebecca Bryant, *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus* (London, I.B. Tauris, 2004), pp. 79–98 & 100–120. Georghallides gives us data about the rural dis-possession and indebtedness in the island in the late 1890s and early 1900s. S. Georghallides, *A Political and Administrative History of Cyprus, 1918–1926: With a Survey of the Foundations of British Rule* (Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1979).
10. For a detailed account of the internal finances of the British administration see Chapter Two, 'Financial Questions 1878–1914', in G. S. Georghallides (ed.), *A Political and Administrative History of Cyprus, 1918–1926*, (Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1979) pp. 15–36.
 11. For a detailed account of this decade's political conflicts, manoeuvrings and construction of alliances see Chapter 1 and Chapter 3 from Bryant's *Imagining the Modern* and Chapter 6 in Varnava's, *British Imperialism*.
 12. Gladstonian Liberal, Sir C. Dilke of Gloucester, and Conservative Robert Pierpoint of Warrington repeatedly led these conversations. *Hansard*, House of Common Debates, vol. 44, cols 521–57.
 13. 11 August 1896, *Hansard*, House of Common Debates, vol. 64, cols 502–22, 8 August 1898.
 14. The Liberal Unionist Party was created by the faction that broke from the Liberal Party in 1886. See. M. Worboys, 1979; *Hansard*, House of Common Debates, vol. 44, cols 521–57, 11 August 1896 Worboys, *Science and British Colonial Imperialism*; Porter, p. 187. See also M. Havinden, *Colonialism and Development*.
 15. Worboys, *Science and British Colonial Imperialism*, (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Sussex, 1979) pp. 31–36.
 16. T. L. Crosby, *Joseph Chamberlain: A Most Radical Imperialist* (New York, I.B. Tauris, 2011), p. 115.
 17. For example, the Treasury had refused the first attempts of Chamberlain. See Havinden, *Colonialism and Development*, p. 88 and Porter, *The Lion's Share*, p. 187.
 18. For the process of the occupation of Cyprus and the British plans for Famagusta and its strategic value, see Chapters 2 and 4 in Varnava, *British Imperialism in Cyprus*.
 19. The Cyprus Convention of 1878 between Britain and Ottoman Empire stated that Cyprus, while remaining under the sovereignty of the Sultan, should be administered by the British government. The Cyprus Convention foresaw an annual payment of a certain amount to the Ottoman Sultan. This was the infamous 'Tribute'. The terms stated that Britain would pay an amount from the excess of Cyprus' revenue over expenditure. The amount was approximately £92,000. In fact, the Sultan never saw this money because it was being canalised to the British and French bondholders of the Turkish Loan of 1855. In 1878 it was calculated to cost 10s. for every man, woman and child in Cyprus. G. Hill, *A History of Cyprus* (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 299, 464–67; Varnava, *British Imperialism*, (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2012) pp. 129–30. It has been reported that Famagusta was surrounded by swamps that contributed to a high-rate of malaria infections in the city's

- population. The city was inhabited by 300 men and showed no significant economic activity.
20. See UK National Archive (Kew) [hereafter NA], CO 67/121, Famagusta Harbour, Cyprus: Report by Messrs. Coode, Son & Matthews, 2 January 1899. For the reconstruction of Kyrenia port see Varnava, *British Imperialism*, pp. 135–39.
 21. Larnaca with its 7,883 inhabitants (according to the census of 1881) was the second largest city after the capital Nicosia with 11,536 inhabitants. Only by 1901 had its population of 7,964 been superseded by Limassol's 8,928, while Nicosia reached 14,752. Cyprus' Blue Books for the years 1881–1901.
 22. Cyprus' Blue Book for the year 1889–1900, pp. 475–99.
 23. Throughout his emblematic work, Katsiaounis also gives accounts of persons, class relations and ideas that Larnaca hosted in the nineteenth century. For radical ideas and the riots that occurred in Larnaca, see Katsiaounis, *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*, (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2012) pp. 18–19, 49.
 24. S. Karas, *Between Politics and Techno-politics* (Unpublished PhD dissertation, National University of Athens, 2014), pp. 157–66, 169–75; Varnava, *British Imperialism*, pp. 95–100.
 25. C. Andersen, *British Engineers and Africa, 1875–1914* (London, Pickering & Chatto, 2011), pp. 65–9. For the role of Crown Agents within the Empire see D. Sunderland, *Managing the British Empire: The Crown Agents, 1833–1914* (Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 2013).
 26. NA, CAOG 10/11, Report of Director of Public Works Frank Cartwright, 7 February 1898.
 27. The High Commissioner (i.e. Governor after annexation) was the highest-ranking British official in Cyprus' Government. He ruled the Island through the Legislative and Executive Councils. The Legislative Council, resembled a parliament, was comprised of appointed British official members, and Muslim and Christian elected members who could not overrule the British vote arithmetically. In those cases in which Cypriot votes won legislation, the High Commissioner could seek refuge at the Colonial Office which could pass any decision by issuing an Order-in-Council. The Executive Council was an advisory organ for the High Commissioner. Cyprus' Government had several departments for its basic administrative functions such as Public Works, Receiver-General, and Forestry, etc.
 28. NA, CAOG 10/11, Bertram Cox to Crown Agents [hereafter CA], 12 March 1898.
 29. NA, CO 67/121, Famagusta Harbour, Cyprus: Report by Messrs. Coode, Son & Matthews, 2 January 1899, p. 9.
 30. NA, CO 67/121, CA to Under-Secretary of State [hereafter USoS], 11 January 1899, p. 6.
 31. NA, CAOG 10/11, Bertram Cox to CA, 19 January 1899; NA, CAOG 10/11, Coode, Son and Matthews [hereafter CE] to CA, 9 February 1899; NA, CAOG 10/11, Ommaney to USoS, 15 February 1899; NA, CAOG 10/11, USoS to CA, 24 October 1899.
 32. NA, CO 883/6/5, Haynes Smith to Chamberlain, 8 August 1900.
 33. He had a drastic policy which showed itself both in the coordination of relief works against famine of 1901–03 and the Archiepiscopal issue. Varnava, *British Imperialism in Cyprus*, pp. 145, 152.

34. On discontent about the Tribute see Varnava, *British Imperialism in Cyprus*, p. 181
35. The Locust Destruction Fund, like the Tribute, was a heavy tax burden for the people of Cyprus, and the Legislative Council had relative control over it. It was meant to be used for destroying locusts, which had proved to be a successful campaign. At the time of these discussions Cyprus no longer had a locust problem but the Fund was being allocated as a pool for different subsidies and special payments. Since it was not controlled by the British Exchequer but by the Council, the Elected Members of the Council had a say upon this policy and the policies shaped around it.
36. NA, Colonial Office to Treasury, 5 October 1900.
37. The demands for Larnaca's inclusion to the line revived in 1908 when elected members such as Theodotou regularly brought petitions from the surrounding villages. See Legislative Council Minutes in State Archives (SA 1/ 4) or NA, CO 67.
38. In May 1903 Haynes Smith laid the Memorial of the Municipal Council of Larnaca which urged 'the improvement of the shipping facilities at the Port'. NA, CO 67/136, Haynes Smith to Chamberlain, 7 September 1903.
39. *Ibid.*
40. *Ibid.*
41. Φίλιος Ζαννέτος Filios Zannetos (1863–1933), was born in Peloponnese, Greece, into a family with a history in the 1821 Greek Revolution. He studied Medicine at the University of Athens, and in 1888 he moved to Larnaca. He became one of the leading personalities of the town, known as 'the doctor'. He was elected twice, in 1901 and 1916, as the representative member for Famagusta – Larnaca District. He also served as Mayor of Larnaca twice, in 1917 and 1922. Παπαπολυβίου, Πέτρος, Φίλιος Ζαννέτος (1863–1933), *Ο Φιλελεύθερος*, 1 June 2013.
42. NA, CO 67/136, Extract, Chief Secretary to CA, 21 May 1903; *ibid.*, CA to USoS, 25 May 1903.
43. Katsiaounis has written in detail about the relations of elected members with money-lending and their actions against modernisation of credit relations (until the early 1900s). See Chapter 4 'Changes in Landed Proprietorship and the rural crisis' in R. Katsiaounis, *Labour, Society and Politics in Cyprus*. Georghallides on the other hand has documented (c. 1910–1920) the nationalist account of elected members' struggle for the Agriculture Bank, a supposed remedy to indebtedness. The case of Zannetos stands as a different case to these accounts. See Chapter nine in Georghallides, *A Political and Administrative History of Cyprus*.
44. NA, CO 883/6/5, CA to Colonial Office, 27 August 1903; *ibid.* CA to CE, 18th august 1903; *ibid.*, CE to CA, 22 August 1903.
45. *Ibid.*
46. Haynes Smith explained to Chamberlain that Dr. Zannetos who led complaints about Famagusta Harbour was "a Greek subject, and the agent in Cyprus of the Central Association in Athens of the Hellenic Propaganda. He is also a resident in Larnaca, where his interests lie. He is an active leader in the agitation for union with Greece". *Ibid.*, Haynes Smith to Chamberlain, 21 July 1903.
47. *Ibid.*
48. Rolandos Katsiaounis dates the start of the mass politics in Cyprus to the 'Archiepiscopal issue' in 1900.
49. *Ibid.*
50. NA, CO 67/139, Haynes Smith to Lyttelton, 17 August 1904.

51. *Ibid.*
52. NA, CO 883/6/ 6, CE to CA, 17 August 1904.
53. Larnaca had been repeatedly described as an 'open roadstead', thus technically inferior, by almost every engineer that surveyed or reported on Cyprus' ports. The port was open to south and east winds; at bad weather landing was impracticable causing delays; large vessels anchored off-shore; transfer of goods/passengers were done by lighters prone to accidents causing loss of merchandise or life. Samuel Brown, Admiralty surveyors, and Coode, Son and Matthews are among the surveyors and engineers who shared this opinion.
54. NA, CO 69/18, Session of the Legislative Council 16th June 1904.
55. Larnaca was his city and he had been involved in a battle over the 'Archiepiscopal issue', a fierce competition for the throne of the Cyprus Church. He won this major political event and became the Archbishop, a spiritual and political post.
56. Theodotou, Dervish Pasha, Sozos, Siakallis, and Kyriakides were against the Bill. Dervish Pasha was a Young Turk supporter merchant in Nicosia and was engaged in mass politics on the issue of *Evkaf* and Moslem education. Theophanis Theodotou was a lawyer in Nicosia. During his first election, he had been touted by the local press as the man who would struggle for the people. George Siakallis was a graduate in law from Athens and English literature from England. He had been referred to by the famous Greek poet Konstantinos Kavafis, in 1893, for his book on Cyprus and her fate in enosis. Christodoulos Sozos and Ioannis Kyriakides were leading nationalists and two leading *Kytiaki* after the Bishop of Kitium, both were law graduates from Athens, freemasons and entrepreneurs. They were both active in the political and economic life of Limassol: Kyriakides had set up the first iron foundry on the island and Sozos later became Mayor of Limassol. Sozos would prove his nationalism by getting killed in 1912 in the Bizani fighting against Turks as a volunteer of the Greek Army.
57. NA, CO 883/6/6, Haynes Smith to Lyttleton, 17 February 1904.
58. Larnaca port was exposed to all winds between east and south; the waves never exceeded four feet in height.
59. *Ibid.*, Report of Director of Public Works on proposed improvements, Port of Larnaca, 27 January 1904.
60. *Ibid.*
61. *ibid.*, Memorandum, N. Rossos, Mayor of Larnaca.
62. Rossos was a member of the upper class, a lawyer who had devoted his salary over 22 years at the post to the revenue of the Municipality. He was known as a devoted Mayor and man of daring politics.
63. *Ibid.*
64. *Ibid.*, Nicolls to Chief Secretary, 10 February 1904.
65. *Ibid.*, Lyttleton to Haynes Smith, 3 March 1904.
66. *Ibid.*, Nicolls to Chief Secretary, 9 June 1904.
67. *Ibid.*, Coode, Son and Matthews to CA, 8 October 1904.
68. *Ibid.*, Lyttleton to King-Harman, 21 October 1904.
69. Before his replacement Haynes Smith requested an increase of troops in Cyprus' garrison and radical changes to the 1882 constitution that established the Legislative Council. His request was a bid to counter the growing crisis and forthcoming breakdown that he had diagnosed years earlier. R. F. Holland and D. W. Markides, *The*

- British and the Hellenes: Struggles for Mastery in the Eastern Mediterranean, 1850–1960* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 171–73.
70. NA, CO 883/6/6, King-Harman to Lyttleton 19 November 1904.
 71. The agents of regular lines of steamers calling at Larnaca also sent a petition to the High Commissioner. *Ibid.*, Beraud, Mantovani, Pierides, Cirilli, Rahbe Khedival Agent to High Commissioner, 8 November 1904.
 72. Petitions and memorandums were frequently used as means of expression, demand and discontent by rich and poor alike. Villagers or townspeople would write their petition and hand it to their district's elected member to be submitted to the Legislative Council. In the aftermath of the railway's completion, the town of Lefka and nearby villages sent petitions frequently asking for their inclusion to the railway. Similarly, in the 1910s railway workers signed petitions to the Chief Secretary for salary increases. See SA1 556/1917/1, Railway Workmen-Application for increase of wages. *See also* King-Harman to Lyttleton, 22 November 1904.
 73. *Ibid.*, Colonial Office to Treasury, 29 December 1904.
 74. In many cases, the 'leading people' had all these identities together as exemplified by the Mayor and the Elected Members.
 75. *Ibid.*, King-Harman to Lyttleton, 16 December 1904.
 76. NA, CO 883/6/7, Lyttleton to King-Harman, 13 January 1905.
 77. *ibid.*, Girilli, Mantovani, Beraud & Fils, Pierides, Mavroidi's Son, Rahbe & Cie to Colonial Secretary, 15 August 1905.
 78. *Ibid.*, King-Harman to Lyttleton, 28 November 1905.
 79. Havinden claims that especially for the tropical colonies, the period of 1905–1914 witnessed "most effective advances". Havinden, *Colonialism and Development*, p. 91.
 80. NA, CO 883/6/9, Treasury to CO, 3 January 1906; *ibid.*, CO to CA, 4 January 1906; *ibid.*, Earl of Elgin to King-Harman, 4 January 1906.
 81. *Ibid.*, King-Harman to Earl of Elgin, 26 April 1906.
 82. NA, CO 67/147, CA to CO, 24 July 1906; NA, CO 883/6/9, CE to CA, 14 July 1906; *ibid.*, Earl of Elgin to King-Harman, 16 August 1906. The jetty would be provided with a three foot gauge of railway track in case of extension of Cyprus' Government Railway to Larnaca.
 83. One week before the despatch, a lighter full of goods was wrecked when trying to unload from a steamer. This provoked a wave of complaints and protests; the local press cried out for the 'inactivity of the Government in the face of dangers to life and property at the central and most important port in the Island'. CO 67/146, King-Harman to Earl of Elgin, 7 November 1906.
 84. CO 67/146, CE to CA, 14 July 1906; *ibid.*, Earl of Elgin to King-Harman, 21 December 1906.
 85. *Ibid.*, Earl of Elgin to King-Harman, 21 December 1906.
 86. NA, CO 883/7/1, Earl of Elgin to King-Harman, 20 April 1907; *ibid.*, CE to CA, 25 March 1907.
 87. *Ibid.*, CA to Colonial Office, 20 November 1907; Earl of Elgin to King-Harman, 27 November 1907; *ibid.*, CA to Colonial Office, 30 January 1908.
 88. Karas, *Between Politics and Techno-politics*, pp. 214–215.