Front Line and Home Front:

The Legacy of the Empire and Re-Envisioning Englishness in Sadie Jones's *Small Wars*

Immo Syrjäläinen
University of Tampere
School of Language, Translation and Literary Studies
English Philology
Pro Gradu Thesis
Spring 2012

Tampereen yliopisto
Englantilainen filologia
Kieli-, käännös- ja kirjallisuustieteiden yksikkö

SYRJÄLÄINEN, IMMO: Front Line and Home Front: The Legacy of the Empire and Re-Envisioning Englishness in Sadie Jones's *Small Wars*

Pro gradu -tutkielma, 108 sivua + lähdeluettelo

Tarkastelen tässä Pro gradu -tutkielmassani kuinka Sadie Jonesin romaani *Small Wars* (2010) muokkaa käsityksiä englantilaisuuden ja brittiläisen imperiumin keskinäisestä suhteesta. Lukuun ottamatta lyhyttä prologia ja viimeisiä lukuja, Jonesin novelli sijoittuu Kyprokselle vuoteen 1956, jolloin maa oli vielä siirtomaa ja täten osa hajoamistaan vastaan taistelevaa Brittiläistä imperiumia. Kasvavista jännitteistä ja kyproslaisen vastarintaliike EOKA:n lisääntyneestä aktiivisuudesta johtuen siirtomaaisäntä lisää sotilaallisia joukkojaan alueella. Eräs komennuksen saaneista on nuori majuri Hal Treherne, joka vaimonsa Claran ja kahden tyttärensä kanssa saapuu saarelle. Kirja kuvaa kuinka Halin ja Claran avioliitto ajautuu vaikeuksiin ja kirjan henkilöhahmojen mielenterveys järkkyy imperiumin taistellessa ympärillä vellovia dekolonisaation voimia vastaan.

Siitä huolimatta että kirjan tapahtumat kuvataan yksinomaan sen englantilaisten henkilöhahmojen näkökulmasta, väitän että teos voidaan lukea anti-imperialistisena romaanina, sillä se kuvaa kuinka imperiumin palveleminen ja sen ihanteiden noudattaminen on vahingollista henkilöhahmojen elämälle ja hyvinvoinnille. Väitän, että *Small Wars* kritisoi sitä vahvaa asemaa, joka imperiumilla on englantilaisuuden rakentamisessa, ja että romaani muotoilee imperialismin vahingolliseksi myös alistajalle. Imperialismin kuvataan tuhoavan niin englantilaiset perheet kuin englantilaisten ihmisten moraalin ja henkisen hyvinvoinninkin, ja koska Iso-Britannia on edelleen vahvasti mukana Yhdysvaltojen johtamassa imperialismissa, romaanin viesti kantaa myös nykypäivään.

Teoreettiseksi viitekehykseksi tähän tutkimukseen olen valinnut jälkikolonialistisen teorian. Vaikka se on perinteisesti keskittynyt tutkimaan kolonialismin vaikutuksia kolonisoituihin, sopivat jälkikolonialismin kansallisuuden ja identiteetin suhdetta kolonialismin prosesseihin eritteleväät tutkimustavat myös englantilaisuuden tutkimiseen. Olen valinnut nimenomaan termin ”englantilaisuus” enkä esimerkiksi ”brittiläisyys”, koska Englanti oli johtavassa asemassa kolonisaatiokehityksessä. Olen myös halunnut eksplisiittisesti sulkea pois keskustelusta muut Iso-Britannian merkittävät perinteiset etniset ryhmät kuten skottilaiset ja walesilaiset.

Merkittävä rooli tutkimuksessani on myös sillä, että *Small Wars* on historiallinen romaani. Tällä kirjallisuuden lajilla on tapana keskustella ja uudelleen muokata menneitä tapahtumia, mutta myös kommentoida nykyisiä kehityskulkuja – kuten sitä, kuinka englantilaisuutta edelleen määritellään imperiumin hengessä. Osa jännitettä muodostuu Kyproksen valinnasta tapahtumapaikaksi. Kyproksen erikoinen asema siirtomaiden joukossa altisti sen kritiikille jo siirtomaavallan aikana, ja sen nykytila myös vahvistaa yhteyksiä brittiläisen kolonialismin ja modernin imperialismin välillä.

Tutkimukseni rakentuu teoriaosiosta, jossa esittelen jälkikolonialismia, historiallista romaania, englantilaisuutta ja Kyprosta tutkimukselleni relevantteina aiheina, sekä kahdesta analyysiluvusta. Ensimmäinen niistä keskittyy englantilaisuuden rakentumiseen suhteessa imperiumiin ja sotaan sekä ennen että nyt, jälkimmäinen puolestaan imperialistisen englantilaisuuden vaikutuksiin kotiin ja parisuhteeseen, sekä kotiinpaluuseen ja englantilaisuuden etäännyttämiseen imperiumista.

Avainsanat: englantilaisuus, jälkikolonialismi, Britannian imperiumi, Kypros, Sadie Jones

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In this thesis, I will discuss the ways in which Sadie Jones's novel *Small Wars* (2010) re-envisions the relationship between the British Empire and Englishness. The events of this twenty-first century historical novel unfold at the twilight of the empire in the British Colony of Cyprus during the escalating military unrest in 1956, except for a short prologue and the last chapters of the book which are located in England. It portrays the 1950s England as a nation desperately clinging on to its colonies and the notion of imperial greatness, while the tide of international politics and mounting public opinion are working against it. An increasing number of British troops are deployed on Cyprus due to the heightened tensions between the occupying power and the local inhabitants. Among the troops is a young English Major, Hal Treherne, whose wife Clara and their young twin daughters Meg and Lottie follow him to the island. The book describes how Hal and Clara's marriage falls apart and their mental well-being is endangered, when the grumbling Empire that Hal is determined to serve is engaged in a desperate struggle against the forces of decolonization around it. Eventually they give up the fight and return to England: Clara wounded and Hal a deserter – a family both physically and mentally injured.

Despite the fact that *Small Wars* is narrated exclusively from the point of view of its English protagonists, the book can be read as an anti-imperialist novel, because it describes the ways in which the service of the empire is detrimental to the lives and well-being of the characters. The point of view is somewhat exceptional, since such stories have often tended to be imperialist narratives that support and justify colonialism; anti-imperialist novels are usually told from the perspective of the colonized. Nevertheless, I will argue that *Small Wars* criticizes the role that the empire plays in the construction of Englishness and in the lives of English people and re-envisions imperialism as harmful not only to the colonized, but to the colonizer as well. In Jones's book, the English people, their families and their national identity are in the line of fire in the colonial conflict

of the island – and by extension of all the colonial wars and skirmishes all over the British Empire in mid-twentieth century. Imperialism is portrayed breaking English families and corrupting English morals, and since the nation is still involved in imperialist ventures around the world in the twenty-first century, the criticism has a present-day dimension as well. The recovery only becomes possible when the imperial project is abandoned, manifested in *Small Wars* by Hal and Clara's return home to England.

To address these matters, I will focus my research on two main topics: the sphere of military and colonial war on one hand, and the domestic sphere and home on the other. I will argue that *Small Wars* sees colonial warfare and imperialism as a threat to English people, their moral and mental well-being. Particularly detrimental the effects are on English men, whom the imperial machinery turns into violent brutes and highlights the negative and cruel sides of masculinity at the expense of justice, honour and humanity. Despite themselves and the good intentions that they may have when they set out to defend England and her empire, the imperial project dehumanizes English men and turns them into something they do not want to (and should not) be. Furthermore, I will argue that the imperial project jeopardizes English homes both in England and in the colonies by invading them with fear and uncertainties that are beyond the control of English families and threaten to break up the constituents of domestic life.

What comes to terminology, despite the fact that I am discussing the formation, modification and characteristics of the ruling national identity in relation to the British Empire, I have chosen to use the term "Englishness", rather than "Britishness". This is because, as Nyman (2005, 36-37) has pointed out, Britishness tends to be seen as a "supranational identity uniting or exceeding the . . . nations" within Great Britain. I have also wanted to explicitly exclude the Scottish, Welsh and other groups within Great Britain from the discussion. What is more, Nyman (2005, 37) continues, the major events and developments in the British life tend to be seen as English, while the other nationalities are left with minor roles. In the scope of the present study, it is

also significant that in Jones's novel the characters identify themselves first and foremost as English rather than British.

Because the focus of my study is on how *Small Wars* addresses the issues of nation, identity and colonial circumstances, the theoretical background of my thesis will draw mainly from the field of postcolonial studies. Despite the fact that this field of study has traditionally concentrated on the cultural products of the former colonies and the effects imperialism has had on the colonized peoples, cultures and identities, I believe that the same tools can be used in a research that addresses the effects of colonization and decolonization on the English culture, identity and ideas of Englishness.

It is true that the effects of colonization must have been radically different on the culture and identities of the colonizers than they were on those of the colonized. However, even if the English were on the other side of the divide, it can hardly be questioned that Englishness was (and is) thoroughly influenced by the colonial processes. Such prominent critics as Frantz Fanon have, in fact, stressed that Europe can be seen as "literally the creation of the third world" (Fanon 1968, 102). Not only did the colonies furnish the motherland with wealth and exotic produce, but the world-wide spread of the British Empire, foreign cultures and unfamiliar situations that the English people had to face both home and away inevitably had profound influences on the English identity and what it meant – and still means – to be English. The empire profoundly changed the face of England ethnically, politically, economically and culturally – creating the multiethnic Western nation we know today.

Due to the interdisciplinary nature of postcolonial studies, some of the theoretical tools used and critics cited in the thesis may often be readily connected with other fields such as cultural studies, sociology and history, because they all discuss nations, identities and cultures as well. In fact, the boundaries between the fields are often blurred and the same critics and works – such as Benedict Anderson and his influential *Imagined Communities* (2006) – are considered to

form central criticism in postcolonial studies as well as in cultural studies, for example. This is understandable, since while culture is a key topic in postcolonial studies, according to Barker, "the cultural legacy of colonialism" (2008, 247) on the other hand plays an important role in cultural studies.

In addition to its postcolonial theme, *Small Wars* is a fruitful source for research on the issues of the relationship between Empire and Englishness because of its genre. As a story written in the twenty-first century about the events that took place more than sixty years earlier, it is easy to classify Jones's novel as historical fiction. The historical novel opens up a range of possibilities to discuss the issues of nation, culture and identity. As de Groot (2010, 49) points out, this genre is often used to express national character and it functions as a tool of self-definition. Importantly, the historical novel not only reinvents the past, but can also use the historical settings to address contemporary issues (de Groot 2010, 10-11). Major contemporary issues that *Small Wars* arguably responds to are the "war on terror", and what Drayton (2011, 681-683) has seen as the rise of imperialist attitudes in Britain during the past decade.

Furthermore, in his discussion on anti-colonial historical fiction de Groot (2010, 159, 161-162,164) maintains that the genre can be productively used to discuss the effects of the empire, contest and critique imperial power, challenge the mainstream views on history, and reveal the "insubstantiality of the discourse of history itself" (170). Thus, in addition to using the past as the mirror of present developments, a work of historical fiction can aim at changing – or at least reformulating – the conceptions of historical events. In the case of *Small Wars*, this can be seen in the way in which it challenges the traditional views which stipulate that the empire either had little effects on Englishness or that it merely functioned as a stage for English gallantry and the spread of Western civilization. The novel addresses the idea of national character through the spheres of the domestic and military, and describes the atrocities of colonial wars and imperialism as fundamentally harmful not only to the oppressed but to the oppressor as well.

As often in historical fiction, the scene of the events in *Small Wars* is anything but irrelevant in the way it discusses the relationship between Englishness and the empire. At first glance Cyprus might appear to be an unlikely choice for a colonial narrative, since it is hardly a typical example of the areas controlled by the British during late nineteenth and early twentieth century: Cyprus was not a colony inhabited by "pagan savages" of an "inferior race" that needed to be educated, converted and civilized, but a Christian majority island with Hellenic traditions and thus closely connected to European history despite its location at the edge of the Orient. In addition, Cyprus could not be considered to be of any actual economic worth to Britain either. As a result, Morgan (2010, 5) notes, the importance of the colony was questioned in England from the moment the British troops landed on Cyprus in 1878. Furthermore, judging by the popularity of such recent works as *Small Wars*, various questions of imperialism in relation to Cyprus seem to trouble the English public to this day.

The incompatibility of the traditional explanations used to legitimate the oppression of the local people render the occupation of Cyprus more readily vulnerable to the criticism of the imperial project. During the British rule, attempts were made to justify the colonization through modification of traditional discourses by stressing that Britain's role as a civilizing nation was to restore Cyprus to "its former prosperity" (Morgan 2010, 5), but this legitimation strategy did not prove to be a particularly credible one. Morgan (2010, 3) notes that Cyprus was purely a strategic acquisition – a pawn in the game of imperialism – that had very little to do with the British interests on the island, or its inhabitants. "Racially" European and economically of little worth, its fate as a colony was always dictated by external international developments in political relationships between Britain and other major powers in the Middle East (Morgan 2010, 21). Due to its present-day repercussions the role of Cyprus as a pawn in the game of international politics also emphasizes the connection between Jones's novel and twenty-first century international politics, imperialism, and the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere. The unconventionality of colonial Cyprus

arguably makes it a good setting for the anti-imperialist reading of *Small Wars*. The questionable role of the empire on the lives of English people is also parallel to the role of Cyprus as a British colony: just as the imperial project is a confusing and de-stabilizing force to Englishness, so was the position of Cyprus to the British Empire.

Given the interesting and relatively special historical role of Cyprus, it is somewhat surprising that postcolonial studies on Cyprus are all but non-existent, while the relationship between the island's Greek and Turkish populations has been a major topic of research. Of course, the atypical role that the island had in the British Empire might also be a reason why it has not been eagerly taken up as a topic in postcolonial literary studies before. As a complex historical hybrid of Greek Culture, a base of early Christianity, a crusade stopping point, part of Lusignan kingdom, a Venetian fortress, a periphery of the Ottoman Empire, and eventually a still-divided member state of the European Union – in addition to its colonial history under the British – Cyprus is anything but an average former colony.

But while the tangled web of Cypriotness is well beyond the scope of my study, Cyprus as the setting of Jones's novel in my research on the relationships between Englishness and empire does provide me with a sufficiently fresh approach on the topic. In addition, as I already mentioned, postcolonial studies have previously tended to focus mainly on the cultural effects on the colonized, not the colonizer. Furthermore, academic studies on Jones's work appear to be virtually inexistent.

What comes to the structure of my thesis, I will divide the theory section into two subchapters. In the first one, I will discuss the field of postcolonial studies by concentrating on the key issues of identity, nation and nationalism in relation to colonialism and imperialism, introduce how these matters are addressed in the genre of historical fiction, as well as focus on the concept of Englishness in connection to the empire. The second subchapter, on the other hand, will be dedicated to Cyprus as a demographically and culturally special colony among the British

possessions, some historical background, the island's strategic location and its relevance in the international politics during (and after) the colonial period.

The main body of my analysis will consist of two chapters, first of which will focus on the issues of colonial wars and military action in relation to the ideas of Englishness, while the second one addresses the issues of home and family and the ways in which the imperial project infiltrates the domestic sphere in *Small Wars*. These main chapters will be further divided into subchapters. The subchapters of the former will address such issues as British martial masculinity and the construction of English (male) identity, the ways in which the ideals of Englishness crumble down in the colonial context, and how *Small Wars* can be read as a commentary on the modern British wars waged overseas. The latter analysis chapter will be divided into subchapters discussing the ways in which the empire affects English homes in England as well as in the colonies, the strain that the colonial projects puts on relationships, and lastly the importance of returning "home" to England and distancing oneself from the imperialist definition of Englishness.

2. Postcolonial Studies and the Historical Novel

In this chapter, I will address the theoretical and historical background of the study. In the first subchapter, my aim is to introduce the tools of postcolonial studies to address such key issues as identity, nation and nationalism in relation to postcolonialism, as well as to explore the ways in which the genre of the historical novel can be – and has been – used to discuss these matters. I will not attempt a thorough discussion on postcolonialism, but will rather concentrate on the topics that are relevant in reading *Small Wars* from a postcolonial perspective. In here I will also pay attention to the concept of Englishness and its relationship to the imperial project. In the second subchapter, on the other hand, I will focus on Cyprus, its history, particularities, and on its role as a part of the British Empire. Because colonial and postcolonial situations vary extensively depending on the location, I attempt to avoid overgeneralizations as well as point out how the peculiarities of Cyprus undermine the legitimation of colonization and support the anti-imperialist reading of the novel by highlighting the falsity of the colonial doctrine.

2.1. Postcolonial Studies, the Historical Novel and Englishness

Postcolonialism, the topic of postcolonial studies, is much more than a term for a certain time period in the history of mankind. Certainly, as Childs and Williams (1997, 1-3) among others[1] state, the term "post-colonialism" (particularly in this hyphenated form) can be used to refer to the historical period in a former colony/colonies, but even then it is often unclear about whose colonialism we are talking about (since there have certainly been more than one colonizer and several expanding empires in the history), and whether the period starts from the moment of colonization or from the end of the formal colonization of a given area. Nevertheless, as researchers such as Nayar (2010, 4) and Young (2003, 2, 6-7) suggest in their discussion of the term, the sphere

[1] See for example Ashcroft et al. (1989, 2), Loomba (1998, 7) and Slemon (1991, 3).

of postcolonial studies and post(-)colonial theory focuses on the relations that follow from colonialism and imperialism as both historical and ongoing process between the West and the Rest.[2] Furthermore, Childs and Williams (1997, 3) have stressed the importance of cultural production in the field of postcolonial studies, but have also pointed out that cultural production can hardly be studied without considering the social, political and economic relations as well. Thus, despite the seemingly obvious suggestion of something that comes after colonialism, McLeod (2000, 2-3) emphasizes that postcolonialism is an immensely complex term, whose variety renders single-sentence definitions "impossible and unwise" (34) (see also Loomba 1998, xii, and Young 2003, 7).

On the other hand, as McLeod continues, from the very variety of the term "comes possibility, vitality, challenge" (2000, 3). Arguably it is the variety and multifacetedness of the concept that renders it useful for the study of complex issues around the repercussions of colonialism and imperialism, and Lazarus (2004a, 1) notes that this has led to the founding of many postcolonial studies centres in the universities around the world since the emergence of the field in the late 1970s. As Lazarus (2004a, 5) continues, the reasons for the emergence of postcolonial studies at this particular time, and the increase of interest in the field ever since, are multiple. Not only was it chronologically close to the decolonization process that had seen its climax in the previous decade, but it was also a reaction to the downturn in the fortunes of "national liberation movements and revolutionary socialist movements" (Lazarus 2004a, 5) in the newly independent ex-colonies in the early 1970s. In a way, as Lazarus (2004b, 35-36) argues, referring to the writings of Samir Amin among others, the demand for the complex field of postcolonial studies rose from the long phase of structural crisis in the world system that started with the Western economic difficulties in the 1960s and 1970s, and gained momentum with the collapse of the Communist East and serious regression in many former colonies.

[2] For further definitions and discussions on colonialism, imperialism, postcolonialism and neocolonialism, see for example Loomba (1998, 1-13, 18-19), Said (1994, 7-9) and Young (2001, 16-17).

As a field responding to the new global situation, Childs and Williams (1997, 22) maintain that even though postcolonial studies is in many ways an offspring of literary studies, the work done in the field is inherently interdisciplinary. Critics from the fields of cultural studies, sociology, anthropology and history, among others, have made significant contributions to the topics of postcolonialism (Childs and Williams 1997, 22). Literature-wise, the late 1970s is often mentioned as the starting point of postcolonial theory and postcolonial studies largely because of the publication of "one of the most influential books of the late twentieth century" (McLeod 2000, 21), Edward Said's *Orientalism* in 1978. While Nayar (2010, 5) reminds us that the origins of postcolonial studies are "in the thoughts and theories of anti-colonial movements" and McLeod (2000, 23) stresses that important anti-colonial critique did exist also before *Orientalism* (for example *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961) by Frantz Fanon, one of the leaders of anti-colonial struggles), its publication effectively brought postcolonial studies into existence. According to Chew (2010, 3), *Orientalism*, together with Said's later publications – particularly *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) – guaranteed Said "a central place in postcolonial discourse". Other important studies often referred to as classics in the field are Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* (1983), Gayatri C. Spivak's *In Other Worlds* (1987), Bill Ashcroft et al. *The Empire Writes Back* (1989) and Homi K. Bhabha's *Nation and Narration* (1990) (see for example Childs and Williams 1997, 90, and Chew 2010, 3). Of course the list of significant contributors in the field of postcolonial studies could be extended much further than this, and while Lazarus (2004a, 1) adds V.Y. Mudimbe and Peter Hulme to the list, other critics include yet other names.

Postcolonial studies is indeed a varied field, that has generally concentrated on topics such as colonial legacy, neocolonialism, race, gender, sexuality, place, space and cosmopolitanism. However, for the purposes of the present study, it will suffice to focus my discussion on the topics of nation, identity and culture in relation to the colonial experience, and these topics have also been among the focal points of above mentioned theorists, and postcolonial studies in general. I

understand postcolonialism in Simon Gikandi's (1996, 14-15) terms as a "state of undecideability" (14), as well as of "transition and cultural instability" (15), where the culture and influence of colonialism continues its existence after the official decolonization, since, as Young (2001, 5) reminds us, the political and economic interdependencies between the former colonizer and the former colonized remain strong.

Before addressing the matters of identity and nation, however, it is worth a mention that the main focus of postcolonial studies has typically been on the experiences, cultures and problems faced by the formerly colonized. In fact, Ashcroft et al., the writers of *The Empire Writes Back*, have explicitly used the term "post-colonial literature" to refer exclusively to the literature of the formerly colonized countries (1989, 1-2).[3] More generally, as McLeod (2000, 33) states, postcolonial literary studies usually involve reading either colonialism-related texts by authors from formerly colonized countries, texts by writers migrated from the periphery to the centre of the empire and dealing with diasporic experience, or re-reading Western texts produced during colonialism from the perspective of the theories of colonial discourses (which show the pervasiveness of colonialism in the Western cultural products). While it is not my intention to downplay the problematic position of the formerly colonized in any way, my study will differ from the main body of postcolonial studies by focusing on the effects of colonialism on the colonizer. Even though Sadie Jones's father is Jamaican (Wiseman 2009, 21), she does not write about diasporic experiences of the formerly colonized, and the novel completely ignores the extensive immigration from the Caribbean to Britain that started in the 1950s, the time in which Jones places her narrative. Thus, in its focus on the English experience, *Small Wars* does not fit into any of the above mentioned categories.

However, it can hardly be argued that the colonial period and decolonization did not have profound influences on the colonizer as well, and Young (2001, 4) stresses that "both Europe

[3] Interestingly, Ashcroft et al. also fail to mention Cyprus in their long list of countries whose literature, according to their definition, is postcolonial, even though Malta – another small ex-colony at the borders of Europe – does make the cut.

and the decolonized countries still try to come in terms with the long, violent history of colonialism" (see also Loomba 1998, 19). In addition, as Nayar (2010, 4) notes, when examining the repercussions of colonization, postcolonial studies need to take into account the psychological effects on both the colonizer and the colonized, while Sivanandan (2004, 41) argues that the post-Second World War decolonizations were an immense loss for Britain economically, politically and – most importantly for literary studies – culturally. Thus, Childs and Williams (1997, 65-66) maintain that also the imperial centre can be considered postcolonial, since it has been significantly affected by colonialism and decolonization. As Said states in *Culture and Imperialism* (1994, 191-192), there are always two sides to colonialism, and since the experiences of the dominant party depend on and overlap with those of the weaker one in profound ways, the colonial relationship is a fruitful entry point into "studying the formation and meaning of Western Cultural practices" (Said 1994, 191) as well. Since "history of all cultures is the history of cultural borrowings" (Said 1994, 217), Childs and Williams (1997, 75) point out that Englishness is just an identity among others within the interdependent postcolonial network grounded in difference. It is not a force that controlled and dictated others for centuries without being constantly modified and redefined in the process itself, and, as Baucom (1999) argues, its empire "is less a place where England exerts control than the place where England loses command of its own narrative of identity." (3).

Thus, I will now turn my attention to the role that (post)colonial experiences play in the formation of identities. Hall (1996, 339-340) generally defines "identity" as a concept that describes "something like 'true self'", an element of continuity that tells us who we are and where we come from in the ever-changing world. Hall (*ibid*.) continues that the popular understanding of identity assumes a stable and relatively fixed subject, and while people often recognize that they change over time, they believe that this happens in a slow and controlled manner. However, Hall (1996, 340-341) questions the stability of identity by introducing several factors that continuously disrupt it, while Barker understands identity "*not as fixed entity but as an emotionally charged*

discursive description of ourselves that is subject to change" (2008, 216, italics original). According to Barker (2008, 217-218), identities are at the same time personal self-descriptions and social constructions, because while we form our own identities as individuals, our individuality is constituted "in a social process using socially shared materials" (2008, 218). In other words, Barker (*ibid*.) argues that identity is always socially constructed and dependent on the ever-changing cultural context in which it is created.

While identities are dependent on their cultural context, Barker (2008, 229) further maintains that cultural identity is "a continually shifting set of subject positions" negotiated through similarities and differences, rather than an essence of some kind. An important manifestation of these collective cultural subject positions is National identity, which according to Barker (2008, 252) is continuously "reproduced through discursive action". The ideas of national specificity, origins and continuity are continuously created, narrated and maintained through the idea of a "unique" national identity. Precisely because cultural and national identities are constructed through similarities and differences in relation to other people(s), colonialism and colonial encounters cannot be ignored when discussing the identities of the people involved in colonial processes. Furthermore, Childs and Williams (1997, 125) stress that (post)colonial identity-construction happens in between the colonizer and the colonized, and thus concerns people on both sides of the colonial divide. Ignoring the effects of colonial and postcolonial experiences on the identities of either of the parties would be to ignore a great deal of the complexities of postcolonialism.

Before discussing the ways decolonization shook the foundations of cultural and national identities, it is worth remembering that the colonial period was far from being an era of stable and unproblematic identities. As both Loomba (1998, 173) and McLeod (2000, 54) point out, the imperial machinery confused the issues around identity, for example, by trying to modify and "civilize" the colonized and impose upon them the "English opinions, morals and intellect" (McLeod 2000, 54). However, according to Bhabha who refers to this process as creating "hybrid

identities", while the colonizer sought to Anglicize the colonized subjects, it was stressed that they were "*emphatically* not . . . English" (125, italics original). As a result, Loomba continues, these "hybrids" were fixed "into perpetual 'otherness'" (1998, 173). Understandably, the presence of colonial others who thought and behaved like the English, but were not considered to belong to the ranks of the colonizer, created confusion about what English national identity actually meant. Thus, Gikandi (1996, 31) argues, in claiming to spread enlightenment and European civilization around the globe, the British Empire did not only "mess" with the identity of the colonized, but with that of the colonizer as well by blurring the boundaries between the colonizer and the colonized while simultaneously attempting to maintain them.

Colonial and postcolonial developments do not only relocate people to new areas and force them into contact with different cultures, but they also change people's everyday lives through the globalization of produce, economy and cultural products. Precisely because postcolonial studies is not merely interested in a historical period that comes after colonialism, but with the implications of the entirety of colonialism, Childs and Williams (1997, 13) argue that "identity traverses post-colonial thinking". The problem of unsettling and unsettled identities that the empire created – and still creates – is an issue fundamentally central to postcolonialism (*ibid.*). In his book *The Location of Culture*, first published in 1994, Bhabha describes this unsettledness with the term "ambivalence", which applies to colonial identity on both sides of the power structure. As Bhabha (2004, 88) puts it, not only the colonized, but also "the colonizer himself is caught in the ambivalence of paranoic identification". While both the colonizer and the colonized identify with the colonial experience, they have difficulties in pinning down all the different ways in which it affects their identities.

Because identities were in many ways harnessed, meddled with, constructed and confused by the empire, it is hardly surprising that decolonization further complicated the issue. It is no coincidence, Hall (1996, 339) notes, that the questions of identity have resurfaced in recent

decades simultaneously with the growth of postcolonial studies and have become a significant topic of the work done in the field. Hall (1996, 342) continues that "[t]he great social collectives [of class, race, gender and nation] which used to stabilize our identities have been, in our times, deeply undermined by social and political developments". Major forces behind these developments certainly were, as Weedon (2004, 1) among others has mentioned, the legacies of colonialism and the decolonization process that re-drew the political map of the world and led millions of peoples to reconsider the building blocks of their culturally constructed identities.

For the scope of this study the main focus is on national identity, but it has to be kept in mind that national identity can never be studied as a completely isolated entity, but, as Hobsbawm (1990, 11) states, it is always combined with other things that people identify themselves with. According to Hall (1996, 342) and Giddens (2001, 29), identity is constructed of several other components such as class, gender and "race", and these constituents are always interconnected in identity formation. For example, as Childs and Williams (1997, 188-189) point out, race and nation became significant terms in classifying large groups of people around the same time at the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and largely for the same reasons. Nation and race were utilized in order to create communities of people who shared the same racial and national identities and thus felt that they belonged to the same group without actually knowing each other personally (see also Hobsbawm 1990, 10).

In addition, Benedict Anderson, an influential postcolonial critic particularly on the questions of national identity, nationalism and national self-representation (Webster 2005, 5) and the father of the idea that "all communities larger than primordial villages . . . are imagined" (Anderson 2006, 6), has further argued that the ideologies of race and racism are in a way extensions of class. Where "English lords were naturally superior to other Englishmen . . . these other Englishmen were no less superior to the subjected natives" (Anderson 2006, 150). To complete the web of interdependencies, while class and race are in many ways intertwined with

national identity and nationalism, Chrisman (2004, 188 and 195) draws attention to the fact that gender cannot be ignored either. Several critics, among them Hall (1992, 297), have argued that national identities are strongly gendered. For example, "Englishness" – particularly in relation to the British Empire and English imperialism – tends to be strongly associated with masculinity with women given only secondary roles (297). This matter is clearly present also in *Small Wars*, where female characters are almost exclusively soldiers' wives who follow their husbands to the colonies.

As Hall (1992, 291) argues, nation plays a big role in the intricate web of identities, because "the national cultures into which we are born are one of the principal sources of cultural identity". For example, Renan (1990, 9) and McLeod (2010, 99) suggest that the idea of "nation", and with it the emergence of the concept of the "nation-state" as a political community inhabited by the people who supposedly share a common "nationality", as we know it today is fairly new and in many ways related to the rise of capitalism, industrial production and, importantly, colonial expansion. Nations – imagined political communities, as Anderson (2006, 6) defines them – and identities constructed around them are of particular interest to postcolonial studies. This is partly due to the fact that, as Hall (1992, 292) argues, national culture and the emergence of nation-states was a crucial feature of modernity and industrialization, and the process of decolonization further complicated the matter since it created a large number of new nations, and national identities. Although the ideas of nation and nationality may never have been unambiguous concepts, the postcolonial condition certainly further highlighted what Bhabha in *Nation and Narration* (1990, 1) calls the "particular ambivalence that haunts the idea of the nation". While the concept of nation tries to offer a firm ground for an identity, no postcolonial nation is stable enough and sufficiently clearly defined for the purpose.

The title of the book edited by Bhabha, *Nation and Narration,* indicates a common way of understanding the concept of nation in postcolonial studies. Anderson and Bhabha see nations as narrated and imagined entities, because their members do not personally know all the

other members, but still feel that they belong together on the basis of a common national narrative in which they identify themselves. But as Chrisman (2004, 193) points out, Anderson and Bhabha are by no means the only postcolonial critics who treat nation primarily as narrated. There seems to be a general consensus on the fact that "[s]torytelling . . . is integral to the formation of national identity", as Nayar (2010, 70) puts it. Even critics such as Easthope (1999, 9, 11-12), who has criticized Anderson's view on how the differences between nations rise from the different ways they are imagined or narrated, agrees that while national cultures are material, they are reproduced through narratives as well. In fact, as Nyman (2005, 28) argues, it is precisely because "the nation is constantly and culturally reinvented" and the self-definition of a nation is accessible to us through symbols and stories that form the "narratives of the nation", that the nation is such an important object for literary – and postcolonial – studies.

While the imagined and narrated community called nation is "clearly at the forefront of postcolonial thought", as Nayar (2010, 100) states, the discussion of nation and national identity would be very much incomplete without addressing nationalism as well. Akin to many other terms in the field of postcolonial studies, "nationalism" is, according to Sivanandan (2004, 45), a somewhat vague concept, because it "signifies all sorts of undifferentiated beliefs and practices". Despite the vagueness surrounding the concept, however, nationalism can be understood in broad terms as "a set of symbols and beliefs providing the sense of being part of a single political community" (Giddens 2001, 421). For the purposes of this study, we will use the term along these general lines to refer to the ideological forces behind the concept of nation that, in Bhabha's (1990, 1) words, attempt to "produce the idea of the nation as a continuous narrative of national progress".

In a discussion on the topic, Nayar (2010, 70-71) has argued that nationalism narrates the story of nation by enabling people to "*perceive* themselves as connected to distant people whom they have never met" (70). It is a populist process of identification and differentiation that draws the line between *us* and *them*. It stresses the common cultural features and makes people classified

within the group of "us" feel that they belong together, while other people who do not share the same myths, images, great historical leaders (or founding fathers), cultural practices and national symbols, which Nayar (2010, 71) refers to as the language of nationalism, are classified as "them".

Nationalism is of interest to postcolonial studies and to the present study in particular, because it is inescapably linked to the high and low tides of colonialism. According to Kumar (2001, 47-48), the nineteenth century was not only the heyday of imperialism and the British Empire, but the age of the rise and development of nationalism in the UK as well as elsewhere in the Western World. Kumar (2001, 48) argues that nationalism "developed to its most intensive point" during the latter part of the nineteenth century – simultaneously with the rapid extension of the British Empire over the globe (among others to Cyprus in 1878). On the other hand, as Said (1994, 218) has stressed, it is a historical fact that nationalism was the driving force behind the decolonization processes of the former colonies across the board.

But even if nationalism did present the colonized peoples with the imaginative and political tools to contest the legitimacy and authority of the European colonial rulers, as McLeod (2010, 97) has suggested, it is not universally celebrated as the eradicator of colonialism. Chrisman (2004, 183) remarks that postcolonial studies emerged in a political environment where the brief era of anticolonial nationalism in the former colonies was at an end and many of these countries were under the control of oppressive regimes and the violence between different ethnic groups in the newly independent nations started to become an issue on a global scale. Instead of the liberator it was hoped to be, many critics see nationalism as only a continuance of European cultural hegemony, because under the national regimes the new nations continue to exist economically, politically and culturally in a subordinate position in relation to the former colonial masters, Chrisman (2004, 183-184) continues. The failure of national movements to free the people of the former colonies from the doctrines of racism, imperialism and Eurocentrism has led many critics, such as Gikandi (1996, 6-7), to conclude that "nationalism cannot seriously be considered to be the

alternative to imperialism" (7). Without addressing the issue further here, it has to be mentioned that other critics, for example Sivanandan (2004, 47), have stressed that although nationalism may originally be a European and elitist concept, the people of the former colonies have managed to use the nationalist ideologies also for their own needs and have thus benefitted from it.

No matter whose interests nationalism is ultimately considered to serve, nationalist ideologies have been driving forces when people or groups have furthered their own ends on both sides of the colonizer-colonized divide. But as Anderson (2006, 36) argues, nationalism can only bring the narrative of the nation about in favourable conditions, where nationalist sentiments can spread in the large imagined communities whose members know only a fraction of the people in the group they feel they belong to. A crucial component of these conditions is the spread of the written word. While Anderson (2006, 36) stresses the importance of the emergence of print capitalism for the initial emergence of nationalism, Nyman (2005, 32) maintains that to this day the narratives in books and other media are crucial components in creating and maintaining nations and other imagined communities.

Even though publicly circulated written word and books of all kinds have certainly contributed to the formation of national identities and advances of nationalism, many postcolonial critics have seen the novel as a particularly fruitful literary form for the study of postcolonial issues (Nayar 2010, 70). As Said (1994, xii) argues, the novel is a cultural form that is "immensely important in the formation of imperial attitudes, references and experiences", and it has also been used by the colonized people to assert their own identities and histories. In its own way, *Small Wars* participates in this discussion in addressing the role of the empire in the construction of the colonizer's national identity. Within the scope of this study, we will take a closer look at the historical novel, the subgenre that *Small Wars* represents.

Considering the central position of the novel in the creation of European nationalism and Nayar's (2010, 72) view of history as the most important single theme in the scope of

postcolonialism, the genre of the historical novel certainly deserves attention in the field of postcolonial studies. According to "the most influential . . . critic of the historical novel" (de Groot 2010, 24), Georg Lukács (1981, 19), the historical novel came into being in the early nineteenth century along with the publication of Sir Walter Scott's *Waverley* (1814). Both de Groot (2010, 6-7) and Lukács (1981, 19) point out that novels with settings in the past times had been published earlier as well, but they do not conform to the mode we today call "historical fiction". In them history is merely a backdrop and they do not make any comment on the "authenticity" of the events described in the story, as works of historical fiction are commonly expected to do – usually in the form of a note from the author.

Critics such as Lukács (1981, 23) and Green (1999, 123) argue that the birth of this traditionally European genre was a reaction to the awakened interest in national histories. It is thus closely related to the formation of national identities during the century of emerging nationalism (see also de Groot 2010, 26, 46, and Lee 1997, 537). For a genre which emerged in the wake of European nationalism, it is hardly surprising that, as de Groot (2010, 49) stresses, expression of national character and self-definition have been major elements throughout its existence.

Throughout its history, the genre has been actively involved in the discourses of nation, nationalism and identity. According to de Groot (2010, 2), the historical novel – and historical fiction in general – is inherently characterized by flexibility and intergeneric hybridity, which helps it to address these complex issues. It often addresses such a topic as "the articulation of nationhood via the past" (de Groot 2010, 2), which is an important theme in *Small Wars* as well. Indeed, as Chapman (2005, 1) argues in his discussion on historical feature film, historical fiction tends to be a commentary of the present at least as much as it is a narration about the past. De Groot (2010, 11, 140) continues that literary work done on historical topics often has significance particularly for the present conceptions on national identities.

Although the historical novel emerged as a European genre and can be a valuable means in furthering nationalism (de Groot 2010, 49), as perhaps is the case with modern writers of historical novels such as Bernard Cornwell,[4] it is not merely an ideological tool for maintaining the status quo and promoting Western supremacy. In fact, according to de Groot (2010, 10, 139-141), the historical novel tends to do exactly the opposite, and is often used to challenge the mainstream. By "offering multiple identities and historical storylines" (de Groot 2010, 139) it fundamentally challenges subjectivities and normalities, reinvents the past, and seeks to "destablish cultural hegemonies" (139). De Groot (2010, 140) further argues that historical fiction provides a space for innovation, destabilization, reclamation and political intervention.

Even if the historical novel can be (and certainly has been) used to advocate dominant ideological positions as well (de Groot 2010, 140), it is the potential to challenge the mainstream and destablish the dominant ideologies in discussing national identities that render it a particularly relevant genre for postcolonial writers. De Groot (2010, 161, 164) notes that the historical novel has been used by authors from around the world to criticize the colonial project and authority of the imperial powers. In Latin American context, for example, there has emerged a field called New Historical Novel,[5] which is, according to Bowsher (2005, 132), characterized by "a revisionist, anti-hegemonic orientation". In addition, Bowsher (2005, 131-132) states, historical fiction often not only questions the legitimacy of colonialism and Western supremacy, but also incorporates the perspectives of the marginalized groups and individuals into the historical narratives. According to Mezey (2006, 178-180), the genre of the historical novel can also be used to better understand the implications of postcolonial history and traumas caused by it, a case in point being *Midnight's*

[4] Cornwell's best-selling historical fiction concentrates on the lives and deeds of English soldiers of the past centuries. His Saxon stories, for example, take place in 9th-century Britain and could perhaps be seen as an attempt to build the idea of English nation via older, pre-imperial, national myths.
[5] A term propagated by Seymour Menton in the book *Latin America's New Historical Novel* (1993).

Children (1981) by Salman Rushdie – a prominent figure among the postcolonial authors contributing to the genre.[6]

Despite the fact that postcolonial historical novels have often – understandably – taken up the viewpoint of the colonized, the legitimacy of colonialism and its official narratives can be challenged and alternative voices made heard from the perspective of the colonizer as well, as de Groot (2010, 168) has suggested. This is what Sadie Jones arguably does in *Small Wars*. Colonialism was – and certainly is – criticized among the (former) colonizers as well, and groups such as misbehaving soldiers and deserters, as Jones's protagonist Hal, were marginalized in the official narratives of the British Empire. Because the historical novel is historically and thematically often positioned between nation and empire, "two of the big coordinates of postcolonial theory" as Simpson (2005, 127) has formulated, the genre provides a solid platform for discussions on the British Empire and the national identity closely connected to it: Englishness.

Englishness is a curious case for postcolonialism. As I mentioned earlier in this chapter, some postcolonial critics have ignored the effects of colonialism on Englishness by explicitly excluding the experiences of the colonizer. This is certainly a major reason why, as Easthope (1999, 4) notes, postcolonial studies on Englishness have been relative rare. Furthermore, Webster (2005, 1-2) stresses that the conceptions on the relationship between Englishness and the legacy of the Empire were dominated for a long time by what is known as "the minimal impact thesis". This stipulates that the existence of the British Empire and subsequent loss of imperial power had very little or no effect on English culture or identity.

However, as I have mentioned above, and as studies such as Easthope's show, postcolonial theory can be applied to the experiences of the colonizer as well (see also Gikandi

[6] Another influential novel by Rushdie, *The Satanic Verses* (1988), is also discussed by Baucom (1999, 3-4, 26, 36-37, 39-40) in connection with the ways Englishness was constructed in relation to the British Empire.

1996, x). A body of recent studies has also challenged the minimal impact thesis.[7] As MacKenzie (1999, 212-213, 230-231) stresses, the presence of the empire was pervasive in the lives of practically every English person in one way or another, and the legacy of imperialism is strongly present in contemporary British and English cultures. The British Empire did not affect only those who served it in the colonies, but the empire penetrated all levels and classes of society in the mother country as well. As Kumar (2001, 43) argues, "England and Englishness have to be seen within the framework of this imperial history". Given the prominence of the empire in the English way of life, it would be hard to justify the claim that colonial history and decolonization had no effect on Englishness.

Several recent studies on Englishness have agreed with Kumar's statement quoted above, and taken the argument even further. For example, Nyman (2001, 206) sees Englishness as "site of power . . . racial superiority [and] of colonial authority", Gikandi (1996, x, 7, 28-29, 33) argues that Englishness was in many ways "a product of the colonial culture that it seemed to have created elsewhere" (x), and Baucom (1999, 4) suggests that "a postimperial England is itself resident to lingering zones of imperial confusion", while Hall (2001, 32) stresses the importance of the colonial encounter by stating that the identities of both the colonizer and the colonized were equally "made" by the experience. For Hall (2001, 37), then, the nation is integrally linked to the empire, because it was the narrative of the imperial task and the "civilizing mission" that came to define Englishness, while the very empire was considered to be a proof of "the conquering and colonizing genius of the Anglo-Saxon race."

Both Kumar (2001, 47-48) and Nyman (2005, 39-40) locate the rise of Englishness in the second half of the nineteenth century, and even though forms and manifestations of English

[7] For example: Baucom (1999); Simon Featherstone, *Englishness: Twentieth Century Popular Culture and Forming of English Identity* (2009); Catherine Hall, "British Cultural Identities and the Legacy of the Empire" in *British Cultural Studies: Geography, Nationality, and Identity*, ed. David Morley and Kevin Robins, 27-39 (2001); Stephen Howe, "Internal Decolonization? British Politics since Thatcher as Post-Colonial Trauma" in *Twentieth Century British History*. 14, 3: 283-304 (2003); John MacKenzie, *Imperialism and Popular Culture*. (1986).

national identity can be traced further back in history,[8] it was in this age of nationalism that Englishness rose as a consistent cultural and popular ideal. This was, of course, also the heyday of the British Empire. It was largely due to the increased mobility created by the empire that, as Nyman (2005, 39) notes, "idealized ways of being English were needed" in order to counter the threats posed by economic crises, urbanization-related problems, and – importantly – various external and internal others such as the colonized peoples and the constant presence of the empire in the everyday lives of the English people.

This is not to say that the rise of Englishness was created through a carefully masterminded political agenda or that it would be any more artificial than any other national identity, but as Nyman (2005, 41-43) suggests, in creating the notion of Englishness that would serve the purposes of the empire the English, schooling system played a crucial role. English history and literature emerged as prestigious subjects and the rural space of England was idealized as the source of true Englishness while courage, discipline, honour, masculinity and patriotism[9] – values in many ways essential to the interests of the expanding British Empire – were promoted as the core of what it meant to be English. Furthermore, according to Gikandi (1996, 8), this national self-definition was conducted through the journeys into the space of the other particularly in such literary forms as travel writing and the novel (see also Nyman 2005, 54). In other words, the rise and prominence of Englishness from late nineteenth century onwards was fuelled by the educational system and public culture that aimed at producing "gentlemen ready to take up important positions" (Nyman 2005, 42), as well as to explore and "civilize" the world, in the service of the monarch and the empire.

Given the cultural interdependency between the empire and Englishness, added to the fact that both history and literature emerged as academic disciplines during the height of British

[8] For example, Easthope (28) defines the latter half of the seventeenth century and the writings of Milton, Dryden and Pope as "the great foundational moment of Englishness".
[9] All these values are pronouncedly present in the character of Hal, the protagonist of *Small Wars*, when he takes on the mission to serve the mighty British Empire he admires, but their truth-value turns out to be quite questionable later in the novel.

imperial power in the nineteenth century and were centred on the "Imperial story" (Blake 2001, 15), it is inevitable that the loss of power and subsequent decolonization undermined the dominant narrative of Englishness. Gikandi (1996, 3-4, 19 and 33) argues that while the postimperial Britain has sought to separate Englishness and its own national history from that of the empire, this has not been successful and "imperial legacies have come to haunt English . . . identities " (19) and cultural formations. Similarly to the colonized, the colonizer has had to reinvent itself and try to find its place in the new world order. McLeod (2000, 21-22) stresses that "decolonizing the mind" is a challenge on both sides of the former colonial divide.

Thus, the Englishness founded on colonial relations and the position as the nub of an empire has to be re-envisioned and updated in the twenty-first century world. As Featherstone (2009, 2) remarks, this is a matter that concerns a great deal of people in the postcolonial England, and a whole genre of publishing has grown up around the topic with numerous recent titles including *The Progressive Patriot: A Search for Belonging* (2006) by Billy Bragg, *Watching the English: The Hidden Rules of English Behaviour* (2004) by Kate Fox, and *Unmitigated England: A Country Lost and Found* (2006) by Peter Ashley. These titles seem to suggest that there is a constant process of searching for definitions of Englishness not directly dependent on the role of the colonial master, but according to critics such as Baucom (1999, 5) and Drayton (2011, 683), the imperialist ways of defining Englishness are anything but dead in the modern world. I will return to the topics of this process and Englishness later in the present study when discussing how they are manifested in *Small Wars*.

A sign of the ongoing process of re-envisioning Englishness and its relationship to the legacy of the empire is arguably the popularity of historical fiction and the historical novel as a genre in contemporary England – accompanied with the general popularity of the postcolonial novel exemplified by the works of Salman Rushdie, Zadie Smith and Hanif Kureishi, for example. This is the discussion in which *Small Wars* takes part as an anti-imperialist novel. It challenges the

premises of Englishness and English nationalism based on the imperial mission and ethnic superiority – as well as raises questions about the modern role of Britain and the wars it wages overseas. It depicts how the characters are finally disillusioned by the colonial practices that have very little to do with the high ideals they imagine to be forwarding and defending in the name of Queen and country. "Small wars" was a term used for the colonial wars by the people in the imperial metropolis (Hall 2001, 38), and while they may have been petty issues for the imperial machinery, they were life-changing and often traumatic experiences for the people involved. But because not all the "small wars" are the same, and location has prominent importance in historical fiction, I will turn my attention to the peculiarities of Cyprus as a colony and the historical small war in which Jones's characters take part in the novel, before discussing in depth the ways in which *Small Wars* re-envisions the relationship between Englishness and empire.

2.2. The Colony of Cyprus – a Strategic Pawn and an Imperial Anomaly

As mentioned in 2.1, location is far from irrelevant in postcolonial historical fiction. In the case of *Small Wars*, Cyprus as the main scene of events lends strong support to the anti-imperialist reading of the novel: its unusual political, economic, and cultural features emphasize the falsity and self-contradictory nature of the colonial doctrine, and thus render the imperial mission readily susceptible of criticism. Because Englishness is constructed through imperialism and in relation to the colonies, it is also important to discuss the position of Cyprus in this framework. Hence, this chapter will focus on the role and peculiarities of Cyprus as a part of the British Empire. Primarily I will concentrate on the special nuances that made Cyprus stand apart from the other British colonies. I will also discuss some general developments in the history of the island and the importance it had (or did not have) in the British imperial project.

Cyprus fell under British control during the heyday of the British Empire in 1878. The acquisition was a part of its rapid expansion between the years 1815 and 1902, an era that Porter

(1999a, ix) calls the "British Imperial century". According to Porter (1999b, 4), the nineteenth-century empire consisted of three distinct components, with a degree of overlapping. These components were the white settler colonies, such as Canada, Australia and New Zealand; the all-important empire in the Indian subcontinent, Indian Raj; and the "Empire of conquests or wartime acquisitions" (Porter 1999b, 4), also known as dependent empire that was constantly growing between 1780 and 1914. The dependent empire included such colonies as the Caribbean, Malaya, Hong Kong, Fiji, and the British colonies in Africa.

In this division to three components, Cyprus would also have to be placed within the dependent empire, even though it stands out from the other colonies in the category. As Connery and Seth (2006, 227) point out, Cyprus was not acquired through conquest. Neither did the population consist of non-European subjects, which according to Louis (1999, vii) was a common feature for the "Crown Colonies and Protectorates". As I will discuss later in this chapter, not only was Cyprus and its "white" population culturally predominantly European, but its role within the empire was also connected to the importance that India had for the empire. Thus, the small Mediterranean colony connects the three components of the empire to one another.

If the British Empire was strong and expanding in the late Victorian era when Cyprus became a part of it, the situation could not have been different in 1960 when it ceased to be a British colony. The white settler colonies had practically become independent through several agreements since the first years of the twentieth century, and India, the crown Jewel of the empire, was "lost" in 1947, and while trying to maintain control over its dependent empire against the rising tides of African, Asian and Caribbean nationalism, the British, as Louis (1999, 329) puts it, merely "lurched from one crisis to next". In other words, the independence of Cyprus was a part of the peak of the large decolonization process in the two decades that followed the Second World War. According to Louis (1999, 330), by 1965 the number of colonized people under British rule had fallen to 5 million (3 million in Hong Kong alone) from 700 million two decades earlier (see also Brendon

2007, 599). Before discussing the British colonial period of Cyprus, however, the earlier history of the island is worth illuminating.

Despite the colonialist discourse that can sometimes attempt to claim the opposite, the history of an area, or the people inhabiting it, never begins from the moment the occupying force arrives in the place. In the case of Cyprus it would have been particularly absurd to even suggest that the history of the island began in July 1878 when Sir Wolseley's men landed in Larnaca Bay (Morgan 2010, 2). Unlike many of the British colonies in Africa, the Americas or Asia, Cyprus could not be considered a wild, exotic and unknown land inhabited by "pagan savages", since the history of the island had been closely linked to the events in the histories of the European and Middle Eastern civilizations for thousands of years.

As Luke (1957, 17, 23) traces the history of Cyprus to the second millennium BCE, he observes that already in classical times the island was one of the most popular sites of pilgrimage in the ancient world, since it was considered to be the birthplace of Aphrodite, the goddess of love in ancient Greek mythology. Whereas history places Cyprus in close relationship with ancient Greece – commonly considered as the cradle of "Western civilization" – the island's connections to the major constituents of European cultural history are even more extensive. In *The Holy Bible*, Cyprus features in several instances, for example as a part of the itinerary of St. Paul and his colleague Barnabas on their journey to spread the gospel (Acts 13: 4-6), and as the birthplace of Barnabas (Acts 4: 36). What is more, Luke (1957, 17, 32) continues, during Roman times Cyprus prospered and while it was famous for the luxurious lifestyle of its people, it also became the first country in the world to be governed by a Christian ruler, Sergius Paulus in CE 45.

A thousand years after Christianity arrived on the ancient island, Cyprus experienced the first English occupation in 1191, when the king of England, Richard I (alias Richard the Lionheart), half-accidentally landed in Limassol and, according to Luke (1957, 37-39), conquered the island from the ruler of the short lived Empire of Cyprus. Luke (1957, 40) notes that this

conquest of Cyprus soon ended when Richard I handed the island over to his nephew Guy de Lusignan. While the first English occupation was "but an episode in the history of England, it was no mere episode in that of crusades" (Luke 1957, 40), since from that moment on, "the base of Western Christianity", as Luke (1957, 20) calls it, became an important base for the military campaigns directed at the holy land. What is more, the first conquest sets the island apart from the "conventional" colonial possessions of the British Empire of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and *Small Wars* does not fail to notice the earlier occupation, since Hal and Clara live on "Lionheart Estate" (104). The existence of the previous England-lead occupation did not go unnoticed in later colonial times when, according to Morgan (2010, 161-162), during the Second World War *The Times* wrote how "Along the roads where English crusaders of Coeur de Lion once trod, there now march British and Australian troops".

Between the Lionheart's visit and the second British occupation, Cyprus continued its existence in the "cross-roads of the civilizations of Europe, Asia and ancient Egypt" (Luke 1957, 17) under foreign control. The Lusignan rule that lasted until 1489 was followed by eighty-two years of Venetian occupation, during which time the fortifications of Nicosia and Famagusta were built. After a bitter struggle over Famagusta in 1571 (Luke 1957, 70), the Venetians were forced to hand the control of the island over to another major power of the region, the Ottoman Empire, from whom the Britons eventually assumed the role of the occupying power in 1878. Thus, Childs and Williams's (1997, 1) statement, "there has been more than just one period of colonialism in the history of the world" becomes tangible in the case of Cyprus. When the island entered British hands in the late nineteenth century, foreign rule was nothing new.

The international developments that led to the second British occupation began earlier in the nineteenth century, when, according to Bilgin (2007, 13 and 39), Britain felt the need to strengthen its position in the area, because it did not trust the weakened Ottoman Empire anymore as a political barrier against Russia. The fall of Turkey would not have been such a major issue for

Britain, unless the interests of its own empire had not been at stake. Porter (1999b, 12) emphasizes that the acquisition of Cyprus was a strategic move in order to contain the Russian expansion into Turkey and towards Eastern Mediterranean, because Britain needed to secure its own communication route to India. According to Holland and Markides (2006 164), in case of Russian mastery in the region, routes both through the Suez Canal and by land to India would be compromised. Holland and Markides (2006, 164) continue to highlight the importance of India and the role of Cyprus as merely a pawn in the game of imperialism with a quotation from the British Prime Minister Beaconsfield who, at the time, declared that "in taking Cyprus, the movement is not Mediterranean, it is Indian".

The Ottoman defeat in the 1877-1878 war against Russia thus pushed the British to take action. As Morgan (2010, 3) points out, only nine days before the Ottomans and Russians were to re-negotiate their bilateral treaty in Berlin, a secret Cyprus Convention – in which Britain promised military aid to the Ottoman Empire in case of further attacks by Russia in return for the right to occupy and administer Cyprus – was signed in Istanbul between the British and the Ottoman Empires on 4 June 1878. However, even though Britain gained control of Cyprus, Holland and Markides (2006, 163) note, the ruler of the Ottoman Empire in theory maintained the juridical right to sovereignty in the area. What is more, Morgan (2010, 3) explains, the Convention further stipulated that if Russia were in future to return the Ottoman territories it had conquered, the island would be returned to the Ottomans.

The terms of the Cyprus Convention created confusion about the future and the political status of Cyprus as a part of the British Empire for decades to come. The uncertainties surrounding the island were aptly demonstrated nearly a quarter of a century later by a statement in a Colonial office minute from November 1901: "We are hampered on all sides by the peculiar position of Cyprus" (Holland and Markides 2006, 162). As Morgan (2010, ix, 3, 20) stresses, the

fact that the island did not officially became a fully-fledged British colony until 1926 seriously hindered the development of Cyprus by making long-term strategic planning practically impossible.

The ambivalence of the status of the island set it apart from the other possessions of the British Crown and the terms of the Convention sparked criticism among the British about being "mere tenants" rather than "proud owners of a new acquisition" (Morgan 2010, 20). Usually, the set-up was clear: despite the various degrees of resistance across the empire, the colonizers came to a colony to rule and take advantage of its resources without any third-party agreements. In no other colony (for the sake of clarity I will use the term from now on to refer to Cyprus throughout the British occupation, not merely of the post-1926 era) there existed such a continual uncertainty over the future of the place than there did in Cyprus throughout the colonial period (Morgan 2010, 21, 24). Holland and Markides (2006, 12, 188) further stress that Cyprus was special also among the Hellenic (ethnic Greek majority) Mediterranean islands occupied by Britain during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. While Ionian Islands constituted a British protectorate and both Crete and the Dodecanese were occupied by the British under international authority, Cyprus, despite the ambiguities surrounding it, eventually did become a Crown colony.

A reason for the prevailing ambivalence of Cyprus as a colony was that it was acquired purely on political and military basis and had no economic value for Britain. In fact, Morgan argues that while the colonies were usually expected to sustain themselves and in addition provide wealth for the metropolis, Cyprus, throughout its colonial period, proved to be "a drain on treasury's resources" (2010, 23). Cyprus did not have remarkable natural resources, nor did it develop into a commercial hub in a way that the early optimists had hoped it would. Certainly Cyprus was not the only colony maintained with primarily political and military strategic goals in mind, but compared to the Gibraltar, for example, it remained in the shadows because the location itself was never considered to be of much worth. Morgan (2010, 21) stresses that the colonial policy towards the Mediterranean island was always provisional, determined by external political issues

and shifting regional alliances. While the island did not have any clear advantages *per se*, it might turn out to be useful in a possible military crisis in the future. Largely due to the uncertainty about its future, despite the strategic location it never became a real stopover point on the way to India either.

As a matter of fact, the strategic relevance of the island was questioned among the political opposition in Britain from early on. Holland and Markides (2006, 164) as well as Brendon (2007, 611-612) discuss how, while the contemporary British Prime Minister stressed the island's relevance as a "key to Asia", its value as a safeguard of the route to India was doubted from the very first days of the British rule. Morgan (2010, 21) notes that particularly after 1882, when British troops secured a stable base in Egypt and gained control of the Suez Canal, British interests in India could be safeguarded far more efficiently from the Egyptian bases than from Cyprus. What is more, because the ports of Cyprus were too shallow (Holland and Markides 2006, 164), they were not even used in the 1882 Egyptian campaign, which further undermined the strategic value of the new acquisition. According to Morgan (2010, 21), at this time a British MP called Cyprus "the whitest of the white elephants", and the description followed the colony ever since (see also Brendon 2007, 612).

As Morgan (2010, 22) claims, Cyprus was unlike any other colony, because while other colonies that were of no clear strategic value were still considered to be important additions to the empire, the peculiar terms of the Cyprus Convention and the ambiguities following it gave criticism a strong leverage. In any case, Cyprus did remain a part of the empire for over eighty years, although the existence of the colony was characterized by criticism and fluctuating views on its importance. For example, during the Second World War the role of the island changed several times from an unnecessary base ready to be evacuated before the enemy would even attack, to a vital fortress to be defended with a strong military force (Morgan 2010, 162, 167, 183, 187). In

addition, due to its Greek-Turkish population structure and Ottoman history, Cyprus was always to play a significant role in both Anglo-Hellenic and Anglo-Turkish relations.

As a case in point, according to Holland and Markides (2006, 176), in 1912 the British chiefs of staff considered that "the sole use of Cyprus is its possible value as an asset wherewith to negotiate [with the Greeks] for more important requirements elsewhere". As Holland and Markides (2006, 177-178) continue, in 1915 Cyprus was actually offered to Greece on the condition that Greece would join in the war against the Central Powers, but Greece declined the offer (see also Luke 1957, 86). On the other hand, according to Balfour-Paul (1999, 494), the official British annexation of Cyprus the year before had been a reaction to the Ottoman state joining the First World War on the side of the Central Powers.

Not only do the developments of the World Wars highlight the role of Cyprus as a pawn in the game of colonialism, but they also point to what makes Morgan (2010, 18) call the island a "political anomaly" in the context of the British Empire. Although the colonizer attempted to place Cyprus in the framework of the Orient and emphasize the oriental nature of not only Turkish, but also Greek Cypriots – particularly in the field of sexuality, as discussed by Clarke (2000, 126) and Stavros Stavrou (2004, 11) – this was not always easy or successful. As discussed above in relation to the earlier history of the island, Cyprus was in many ways connected to the European cultural heritage. Unlike the colonial subjects in a great majority of the British colonies, dispersed mainly in the tropical locations around the world, the great majority of native Cypriots were Christians – and early ones at that. What is more, they spoke Greek – a "civilized" language with the roots firmly in the classical origins of Western civilization. Understandably, Morgan (2010, 18) stipulates, the attempts of the colonizer to simultaneously recognize the history of the island while placing it firmly in the Middle Eastern context of exotic Orient created contradictions and difficulties in positioning Cyprus within the empire.

As the main proponent of Orientalism, Said, notes in *Culture and Imperialism* (1994, 10), the British imperial project usually faced very little domestic resistance. However, as discussed above, in the case of Cyprus this was not always the case. Not only did the ambiguities surrounding the future and the role of the island cause debate in the metropolis, but demographics and history of the colony effectively excluded the traditional legitimatization – that of a civilizing an inferior race and bringing the superior European culture to the local people – of the colonizing project. According to Morgan (2010, 5), the supporters of the colonization of Cyprus attempted to fill the void by stressing that instead of bringing civilization to the Cypriots, as a civilizing nation Britain was morally obliged to return the island to its former glory. However, due to the lack of interest in investing in the colony, also this argument lacked substance.

In addition to the fact that the island's eighty per cent Christian population (Holland and Markides 2006, 163) ruled out the possibility of missionary activities, the strong position of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus was an unusual challenge to the colonists as well. The interests of the Orthodox clergy and the colonizers collided from early on, and the relationship could hardly be described as warm. According to Holland and Markides (2006, 167), the profound disparities rose because the Orthodox clergy sought to maintain its role as both civic and religious leader (as the case had been during the centuries of Ottoman rule), while the British regime attempted to implement the ideology of strict separation of Church and State. As it turned out, "the ambitious and intelligent Greek race", which Reginald Stuart Poole writing in *Contemporary Review* in 1878 hoped to be happy to give "the difficult task of government . . . to safe [British] hands" (quoted in Morgan 2010, 13), did not easily succumb to the colonizer's rule. Instead, the Orthodox Church maintained its prestigious position among the Greek Cypriot population; a fact that became particularly tangible in the Cypriot anti-colonial struggle.

In accordance with many other factors, the anti-colonial struggle of Cyprus stands out as a somewhat special case in the history of the British Empire. The forms of resistance through

political action, non-cooperative means and violence did not significantly differ from the tactics used in other colonies, but the leading figures and the ultimate goal of the struggle did render the opposition to colonial rule a peculiarity within the empire. According to Holland and Markides (2006, 185), the Orthodox Church emerged not only as an opinion leader, but the real centre of leadership and the driving force of the Cypriot resistance (see also Demetriou 2007, 175, 178).

Thus, despite the fact that Cyprus had a secular colonial government that comprised of Greek Cypriot, British and Turkish Cypriot representatives (Holland and Markides 2006, 168), the most powerful man on the island was the Archbishop of the Orthodox Church. Holland and Markides (2006, 185-186) note that while some of the earlier archbishops of the colonial period at times sought peaceful cohabitation with the colonial rulers, their subsequent followers tended to be more radically anti-colonial. The role of the archbishop as the leader of Cypriot resistance to British colonial rule eventually culminated in the persona of Makarios III (Morgan 2010, 205). While EOKA – the militant Greek Cypriot resistance organization responsible for the guerrilla warfare waged in Cyprus in 1955-1960 – was led by a retired Greek army officer General George Grivas (Clayton 1999, 300), Makarios III was seen as the head of the struggle. What is more, EOKA was believed to enjoy full support of the Church and, according to Morgan (2010, 206), the Britons commonly viewed Grivas as the "darker alter ego" (206) of the archbishop.

In addition to the well-organized political role of the Orthodox Church as the leader of anti-colonial struggle, what makes Cyprus special among the British colonies is the goal that the Cypriot anti-colonial movement was pursuing. As Connery and Seth (2006, 227), as well as Demetriou (2007, 174-175), point out, while the colonized around the world were struggling for freedom from the colonizers' grip in the form of independence, that was not what the resistance movement in Cyprus was seeking. The anti-colonial struggle aimed for *enosis* (Greek word Ένωσις, "union"), union with Greece. What complicated the situation, however, was the presence of the strong Turkish-Cypriot minority. While the Greek Cypriots rebelled against the colonizer with the

union of Mother Greece in mind, the Turkish minority opposed the prospect. According to Holland and Markides (2006, 232-234) they initially supported the British rule and later saw the partition of the island between ethnic Greeks and Turks as a favourable outcome of decolonization. This resulted in a situation much more complex than a straightforward struggle for self-determination – a situation that would eventually lead to formation of independent Cyprus in 1960; a compromise that was not the aim of any of the three parties involved. As Holland and Markides (2006, 233) put it, everybody needed to make sacrifices: the Greeks of enosis, the Turks of partition, and the British of their sovereignty.

The way Cyprus eventually became independent befits it as an anomaly within the empire. Morgan (2010, 252) emphasizes that the decolonization of the island, and particularly the way Britain was marginalized in the crucial stages of the process, was exceptional in the context of the empire. According to Morgan, the question of Cyprus that had so far been a typical colonial dispute between the island's inhabitants and foreign rulers, "became progressively internationalized and moved beyond the control of either party" (2010, 240) during the last two years of colonial rule. Britain's global influence had significantly diminished since the beginning of the Cold War and the new bi-polar world order was organized around the interests of the Soviet Union and the United States. As Husemann (1970, 420-424) argues, this was aptly illustrated by 1956 Suez Crisis and its aftermath, where American-Soviet interests forced the crumbling empire to give up its vital base in Egypt and Britain's interests in the Middle East were overshadowed by the interests of the American superpower and its attempts to contain Communism.

While the Greek Cypriots continued to demand *enosis* and the Turkish minority had set their minds on partition, politically weakened Britain lost control over the matters (Morgan 2010, 242). According to Holland and Markides (2006, 233), the idea of an independent Cyprus as a compromise was to a large extent masterminded by the United States, whose regional interests would not have suffered a war between Greece and Turkey, an outcome feared to result from the

British attempts to implement Greek-Turkish "co-sovereignty" (a form of partition where the British rule would nevertheless continue) on the island. Clayton (1999, 313) continues that eventually it was US diplomacy through NATO that resulted in the 1959 Zurich conference, where the fate of the island was sealed.

As Morgan (2010, 251) stresses, without consulting the residents of the island, Turkish and Greek foreign ministers reached an agreement on the future of the British colony in Zurich and drafted a paper that was presented to Makarios III and the British as fait accompli. Under the strong pressure from Turkey and Greece – the two motherlands of this peculiar colony – both the British Prime Minister and Archbishop Makarios III signed the document and the new Republic of Cyprus came into being. Clayton (1999, 301) notes that while Makarios III eventually embraced independence as a lesser evil than partition, Britain found the deal satisfactory, since it guaranteed the fading global power the right to maintain sovereign military bases on the island. After all, for the purposes of rapidly shrinking British Empire and equally diminishing global power of the nation, two bases on the island were sufficient to replace the colony that had always been but a strategic pawn and a source of discord.

Thus, when Jones wrote *Small Wars* half a century later, the colonization of Cyprus was still not entirely over. The two military bases on the island, comprising 99 square miles, (Morgan 2010, 254), are still sovereign British territory, despite the many things that have happened during the past decades. Most importantly, as a result of a civil war, the Turkish-majority northern part of the island broke away from the republic in 1974 and has ever since formed a de facto independent Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (recognized only by Turkey). The area is separated from the rest of the country by a UN-controlled buffer zone and has no political ties with the Greek-majority south, a fully-fledged member of the European Union since 2004.

The British presence on the island was once again a topic of discussion among Cypriots when I lived on the island in the spring 2011. Even if the colonial history does not seem to

cause resentment and there are no hard feelings between the Cypriots (of either ethnicity) and the English (Morgan 2010, 253), the possible use of the bases in Cyprus against Gaddafi's troops and potential retaliations by the Libyan ruler did cause concern among my fellow students. What is more, Cyprus is a highly popular tourist destination among British holidaymakers, and as Morgan (2010, 254) reminds us, due to cheap travel and properties, there are more British residents on the island now than there ever was during the colonial period.

As Connery and Seth (2006, 227) note, Cyprus does offer a "full spectrum of colonial and postcolonial problematics", but yet it is special in a variety of ways. As a predominantly white Orthodox colony with Greek historical roots, Cyprus was a political anomaly in the empire culturally built on the doctrine of educating and converting savages. In an empire where the subjection of other peoples was rarely questioned by the public, Cyprus caused controversy from the beginning. Yet, half a century after it gained independence (that it did not even want) part of its territory remains under the control of the colonizer.

In a variety of ways, Cyprus did not seem to fit in, and the colonizers tried to force it into the mould of colony they had created for their empire. Similarly, in *Small Wars* the English characters try to force themselves into the mould of Englishness modelled on the imperial project. In the following discussion I will address the ways in which *Small Wars* uses the peculiar colony of Cyprus as a setting to approach the problematic relationship between empire and Englishness.

3. Colonial Wars Invading the Hearts and Minds of English People

In this chapter, I will begin my analysis of *Small Wars*. Drawing from the way the novel depicts and questions the legitimacy of the colonizing mission of the British Empire and the colonial wars in Cyprus and around the world, I will attempt to tackle the problematics of Englishness as a national identity constructed around the role of the colonizer. Jones's novel both introduces Englishness as a national identity grounded on the imperial mission, and challenges the viability of imperialism as such by portraying it as harmful to the English people caught inside the oppressive machinery – in the past as well as today.

I will begin with a subchapter addressing the ways in which Englishness is intertwined with the empire, and how the "English values" such as patriotism, discipline, justice, morality and masculinity are promoted and harnessed for the uses of the imperial machinery in *Small Wars*. Although it can be also seen as a leading value from which ideals such as discipline and patriotism stem from, masculinity is classified here as a "value" among others – following Nyman's (2005, 42) example. In *Small Wars*, the society steeped in imperial Englishness is clearly a patriarchal one. Patriarchy in here is understood in Jokinen's (2000, 17) terms as a system of social relationships where women are in a subordinate position in relation to men. Due to the patriarchal nature of Englishness mentioned by Hall (1992, 297), the values stemming from the masculine ideal can be treated as the values of Englishness as such – especially since the female characters of the novel seek to actively play out the roles assigned to them by the patriarchal imperial mission. The second subchapter will then focus on how the ideals and identities built on this form of Englishness crumble down. The main focus here will be on the English soldiers, who face a severe identity-crisis and behave in a way they normally would not, as the service of the empire proves to be anything but the well-intended and good-hearted righteous "service of their fellow men" in "the cause of peace" (Jones 462) that it was supposed to be. Following these topics, the final subchapter

will discuss Jones's depiction of the colonial war in Cyprus in relation to modern day imperialism and the "small wars" that Britain fights overseas today.

3.1. Imperial Englishness – the Empire in Constructing National Identity

As I have mentioned earlier, Englishness emerged as a consistent cultural and popular idea during the high tide of nationalism in the late nineteenth century. Since this was also the heyday of the British Empire, the realities of the empire and the role of Great Britain (with England on its lead) as ruling not only the waves, but also hundreds of millions of people in the colonies, inevitably had a profound influence on the English national identity. This is a topic that transgresses the lives of all the main characters in *Small Wars*, and in this subchapter I will analyse the ways in which the identities of the English characters – and particularly that of Hal, the protagonist – are built entirely around the notion of the empire and the service to their country. I will pay attention to how patriotism, discipline, morality, justice and masculinity – which in official and popular discourse that supports the patriarchal standpoint were (and often still are) promoted as essentially "English" values – serve to connect Englishness to the empire. I will also briefly discuss the ways in which Englishness is constructed against Cyprus and Cypriots – the colonial others in *Small Wars*.

The novel begins with scenes from Hal's Sovereign's Parade in the immediate post-war Britain of 1946, where "The sound of the commands of the cadets and of the marching feet seemed to promise a bright future that was grounded in England and discipline; the love of one made strong by the application of the other." (1). Thus, while the very first lines of the novel introduce a patriotic and disciplined Englishness, with the destinies of individual English people inseparably intertwined with the destiny of England, the interconnectedness of the national identity and the empire is highlighted early on as well. When the soldiers discuss their future posts abroad

during the Sovereign's Ball, it is clear that their love of England will take them overseas. The young men – the embodiments of English nation – are ready to take up the imperial service.

As Nyman (2005, 43) argues, national identity is always a historical and discursive construct that aims to promote the values considered important by the ruling social groups. This is recognised in Jones's novel by stressing how the parade was not only "designed to be emotional" (2), but also managed to fill even George – Clara's father and an anti-imperialist – with "pride that was almost beyond his control" (7). According to Cain and Hopkins (1993, 275-276), the British rulers sought to rebuild, and even expand, the empire after the ordeals of the Second World War. For this purpose, disciplined, dedicated and patriotic young men were undoubtedly needed.

At the beginning of *Small Wars*, Hal is this kind of a young man. Nayar (2010, 69) defines "patriotism" as "love and loyalty towards one's country", and Hal is, in many ways, the embodiment of the patriotism connected to Englishness. In the parade, Hal "is not choked with feeling"; he only wants to succeed and feels "immense pride" (2) in his country and his role as a soldier in the service of the empire. He is a determined, disciplined and dedicated man for whom revenge is "an empty concept" (53), and whose feelings towards England have a strong religious undercurrent in them. This is explicitly expressed later in the novel, when Hal contemplates his relation to his native country while studying his cap badge, which he calls "the very picture of his country made small, and worn proudly" (207). In his thoughts "England and the air above" make "God and country one", and he concludes that "[t]he deep quiet land that had bred him was as close as he might ever feel to God, and he served it" (207).

In other words, Hal's patriotism goes to the extent that it practically replaces religion (or becomes one), while England takes the place of a celestial authority. The way in which England pushes God aside in Hal's mind is further highlighted when British soldiers commit serious crimes such as rape and murder, and Hal considers that "their essential damning was not against God –

although it was against Him – but England" (206).[10] Interestingly enough, though, it does not seem to cross his mind that the crimes are against the victims, the colonized.

Hal's idealistic patriotism, however, would not survive alone, and as the earlier quotation states, love of England was strengthened through the application of discipline. The idea of disciplined and orderly Englishness that stems from the English patriarchy is constantly present in *Small Wars* in the form of neat order in English-controlled spaces, clear distribution of duties and appreciation of controlled behaviour.[11] As Baucom (1999, 4) argues, order and control have been understood as crucial building blocks of Englishness ever since the rise of national awareness and nationalism in the nineteenth century. Since, Anderson states, the British Empire was "a grab-bag of . . . possessions scattered over every continent [where] only a minority of the subjected peoples had any long-standing . . . ties with the metropole" (2006, 92), it is understandable that order and discipline were needed for the empire to function. Rigid hierarchies and disciplined command chains were constructed to maintain control in the hands of the people in the imperial centre. Thus, because Englishness was (and still is) to a large extent constructed in relation to the empire, and the imperial project needed to harness the sentiments of the English people on its side, order and discipline were established and celebrated as essentially English qualities – grounded on the masculine ideals of patriarchy. While the colonies were readily associated with disorder, the empire (epitomized by strong English males) was thought to represent order.[12] When there was disorder in a colony, it was the national duty of Englishmen to restore the order.

This is exactly what Hal sets off to do when he leaves for Cyprus in the novel: he is going to serve England that is "fighting to hold her territory" (34), "protect" a "long-held part of the Empire having a little trouble with a few insurgents" (20-21) and restore the order by disciplining these insurgents. In leading his unit to conduct searches in Cypriot villages, Hal reminds his

[10] In here, it is precisely *British* soldiers who commit crimes against *England*, which seems to lend support to the argument that the imperial project was strongly England-lead and that it was particularly English national identity that was constructed against the framework of the British Empire.
[11] See for example pages 104-105, 109, 205, 208, 358, 374, 389-393, 413, 437.
[12] See for example Baucom (1999, 4), Drayton (2011, 683) and Hall (2001, 35-37).

subordinates of the phrase "hearts and minds" that has been "bandied about in regard to this campaign" and is "the back-bone of what we're trying to achieve here" (39). According to Upstone (2009, 4), the phrase "hearts and minds" was often used in the colonial campaigns throughout the world. Hal stresses the legitimation of British disciplinary actions and the forcing of the order by stating how "This island is under British sovereignty – that means protection as well as rule. We are here to root out terrorism and to protect the population from it" (39).

Furthermore, to win the "hearts and minds"[13] of the colonized and to legitimize the role of the English colonizer as the one who maintains order throughout the empire, Englishness needed to be endowed with values other than mere patriotism. For this purpose, values such as moral strength and justice were often promoted as essential constituents of Englishness, as Webster (2005, 136-137), Holroyd (1969, 202-203) and Drayton (2011, 676), for example, have argued. Since the English were occupying a vast number of colonies around the world supposedly "in the cause of peace and the service of their fellow men" (Jones 461), the narrative of Englishness aimed at convincing people both at home and abroad of the righteousness and moral superiority of the English nation. As McLeod (2000, 8) claims, convincing the people of the colonizing nation that it is justified to rule over other peoples is an important feature of colonialism. One attempted explanation is a divine mandate, hinted at in *Small Wars* during one of the first military campaigns in Cyprus, where it seems to Hal that even the heavens "were on the British side" (122). Furthermore, as Hall (2001, 37) notes, during its heyday, the very existence of the British Empire was seen as a proof of the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race; it was argued that an amoral and unjust nation would not be able to create and run a world-wide empire, and because the English people were capable of doing this, they must be just and morally superior to other peoples on earth (see also Webster 2005, 53, and Nyman 2005, 45).

[13] As Holland and Markides (2006, 230) mention, the slogan "hearts and minds" was indeed used also during the colonial war in Cyprus, but the counterproductive rough methods and heavily resented house searches prevented the colonizer from winning the Cypriots on their side.

Small Wars, however, does not subscribe to the logic of the empire as a proof of English righteousness, superiority of Englishness, or the English people as essentially good and just. In fact, the novel increasingly questions these assumptions as the story unravels but, particularly during the early events, the ideals of justice and morality are present in the thinking and actions of many of the English characters. In addition to the highly questionable justification of the empire, the interplay of morality and order is manifested through tactful and disciplined behaviour of the soldiers. A case in point is a scene early on in the novel, when English soldiers are searching a village for Greek Cypriot terrorists. The search conducted by the soldiers is described as "methodological and polite, embarrassment rather than belligerence characterising their entry into people's homes" (37), while Jones stresses how "[m]ost of the lads showed an instinctive tact in the dealings they were required to have with the locals" (39).

Later, during a search of a house that belongs to one of the "terrorists", the third-person narrator of the novel describes how there was "some screaming and panic as the men tried to fight, as if they thought there was something to protect the family from" when "Hal had the woman taken into the other room" (75). The passage seems to reflect the official chivalrous view of Englishness in stressing how unthinkable it is that English soldiers could behave in an amoral or unjust way and possibly hurt the woman. This event and the emphasis placed on the tactfulness and decency of the soldiers clearly foreshadows the events later in the novel, when English soldiers do actually rape two defenceless women and shoot an unarmed man at point blank range (an issue discussed in more detail in the next chapter). But even after these atrocities, the behaviour of the English soldiers is at times described as honourable, moral and just.

For example, in the case of rioting school children, the narrator explains how the English soldiers were reluctant to take action against "little girls": "They took injuries they shouldn't have . . . just to avoid clashing with them. It was an ugly sight: the embarrassment and polite professionalism of his men, forced into slowly mounting retaliation by the angry, taunting

children" (274). But despite the "reluctant" way in which they attempt to calm down the riots, the Greeks complain about the actions taken and say that the behaviour of the soldiers was "not fair" (274). It is worth noting, that during this scene, as well as in many other parts of the book, there is a focalization from Hal's perspective – i.e. the events are presented as the character perceives and interprets them (Niederhoff 2009, 116) – and thus the account cannot be considered as objective and unbiased, but the colonial world is viewed through Hal's eyes.

By granting the reader the access to the minds of its main characters (Hal, Clara, Davis, and even Grieves),[14] *Small Wars* arguably wants to make it clear that it is colonialism and the colonizing mission – not the individual English people per se – that is in stark contradiction with the principles of justice and morality, which Holroyd dubs as "the root ideals upon which English civilization was based" (1969, 203). The characters are not cruel and heartless individuals, but merely people who try to cope under the pressures created by imperialism that prevents them from acting out their ideals. The principles of morality and justice are certainly worth pursuing for, but as long as Englishness is tied to the oppressive machinery of the British Empire, they are beyond the reach of the English people. Far from proving the just and superbly moral character of the "English race", the empire in fact prevents Englishness from pursuing these values. This incompatibility of the empire and the values that the English nation presents can be regarded as a reflection of what Anderson has called the "contradiction of English official nationalism" (2006, 93). It is the "London-style" (Anderson 2006, 93) official Englishness grounded on imperial greatness that *Small Wars* seeks to re-envision.

In addition to the soft values of justice and morality, the imperial machinery needed to harness Englishness for its own purposes with more aggressive qualities such as courageous masculinity that served its purposes in conquering and maintaining control around the globe. As Carr (2008, 104) has argued, hegemonic masculinity is usually closely connected to patriotism and

[14] Interestingly, focalization does not happen from the perspective of the Cypriots, except for the scene where an EOKA marksman is attacking the English soldiers. This emphasizes the focus on the colonizer. Thus *Small Wars* can hardly be seen as a champion of the colonized perspective, but draws its anti-imperialism from elsewhere.

used as a constituent of national identities, creating masculine-orientated nationalism. Since, as McLeod (2000, 114) further suggests, nationalism is often a gendered discourse that uses women as icons of the nation, the official Englishness called for patriotic Englishmen to fulfil their manly duties and defend England when "she" needed them (see also Nyman 2005, 34). This is precisely the call Hal answers when he is commissioned to Cyprus (34).

At the beginning of the novel Hal fully subscribes to the masculine "heroism and an idealism that links Englishness and empire" (Webster 2005, 29). In his "desire to do well" (2) the male protagonist is eager "to meet his future and conquer it" (2), thus epitomizing what is often referred to as "martial masculinity". Martial masculinity is thought to consist of such qualities as discipline, courage, loyalty, and physical strength (see Webster 2005, 10 and Carr 2008, 109), and, as Carr (2008, 102-104, 118) argues, particularly in the case of the British imperial identities and Englishness it is also closely connected to the ideal of the "refined gentleman" (102). Webster (2005, 182) mentions, for example, the public image of Winston Churchill as a prime example of martial masculinity, and further suggests that martial masculinity also has "a long history as a prominent image of empire that focused on the soldier hero" (2005, 30). Hal's family is without a doubt a part of this history. His patriarchal bloodline is full of English male heroes – refined gentlemen who have excelled in the military service: his father and surviving uncles have received several promotions "in the big conflicts of big battles", while the medals of his grandfather who "fought in both Boer wars" adorned Hal's room when he was just a boy (34).

In many ways, Hal has been brought up immersed in imperial history and patriotism to become one of these masculine English heroes. His childhood home stands at the edge of Salisbury Plain close to Stonehenge (5, 384) – a place that has, according to Chippindale (1993, 5-6), followed the historical developments of England throughout the centuries. *Small Wars* reveals how, in his childhood, Hal had thought the stones of this mysterious monument were raised by King Arthur (384) – possibly a reference to a medieval example of martial masculinity – and how he had

watched from his bedroom window onto the plain, where the cavalry had run their drills with scarlet coats and glimmering swords accompanied by battle cries (433-434).

What is more, the house itself is portrayed as a tribute and a gallery to the English martial masculinity. Not only does the old and orderly house with large cold rooms and Victorian windows feature a boot room and guns that speak for a masculine sport of hunting, but – more importantly – *Small Wars* repeatedly mentions the "gilt-framed pictures" of military heroes that the walls of the house are adorned with (5-6, 349, 435). When growing up, Hal had been surrounded by these "faces in the frames, the uniforms, plumes, grey moustache of old soldiers, hands on swords of young ones, gleaming of oil-painted medals, resolute expressions of unerring valour. Faces that had fought, had lead, and served" (436). In other words, Hal is completely surrounded by the ideals of patriotism and martial masculinity, encouraged on his way "to a distinguished future" (7) in the military service of England and her empire by his father who, like so many other members of his family, "was a soldier, had been a soldier, and would always, whatever he wore or wherever he went, be a soldier in every aspect" (7).

After his Sovereign's Parade, Hal is sent to Krefeld in Germany where he is promoted to captain and, despite the fast progress of his career in the quiet post-war duties and happy marriage with Clara, he feels frustrated for the inaction and endless paperwork. When Hal is eventually posted to Cyprus in January 1956, he feels that he can finally start fulfilling his role as a soldier in his father's footsteps, do the job he was trained to do, and take his place in the line of masculine English heroes. During the first campaigns aimed at capturing high-profile EOKA members in Cyprus, Hal is portrayed as a cool and calculative soldier who, instead of panicking or losing his temper, retains control and only becomes more focused in action. He is not only courageous, calculated, disciplined and strong, but he also behaves like Carr's "refined gentleman" (2008, 102) by being polite and treating the civilians as well as the "enemy" respectfully (see 43, 98-101). Finally, in the victory celebrations after a successful campaign, the imperial masculinity is

knitted together with the domestic English one, by comparing the atmosphere in the officer's mess to "having mud on your boots after hunting but standing in the drawing room" (137).

However, as I have suggested above, and as Hobsbawm (1990, 10-11) argues, national identity is not a one-dimensional construction from "above", but it is also constantly defined in opposition to "others". When defining national identity, it is not only important what it is, but also what it is not; in the case of Englishness constructed in connection with the British Empire, it is the colonial other against whom Englishness is defined. While *Small Wars* portrays how the British Empire, in myriad ways, constructs Englishness to serve the purposes of the imperial machinery, and thus defines what Englishness is, it also pays some attention to how the national identity and national narrative of the colonizer is constructed against Cyprus and Cypriots, defining what Englishness is not. At times this is very explicit, as in the case of Colonel Burroughs' office, where the picture of the Queen (earlier dubbed as "the embodiment" of Hal's country (3)) is placed opposite the pictures of the most-wanted EOKA (the militant Greek Cypriot resistance organization)[15] fighters (66).

Thus, the traditional image of the colonized as brutal and violent savages – and opposite to the civilized, polite and orderly English (see Webster 2005, 147) – is at times present in the thinking of Jones's characters, despite the colonizer's overall difficulty to justify the colonial mission because of the exceptional history and demographics of the island. Although it has to be said that the images of savagery are strictly limited to people active in military resistance, especially Clara appears to be dismayed by the brutality of Cypriots when she comments on the bombs and booby-traps, set by the EOKA fighters, with questions such as "how could anybody do that?" (183) and "what sort of a terrible mind thinks up a thing like that?" (29). What is more, in a battle against Hal's unit, an EOKA marksman is portrayed as a blood-thirsty enemy who "felt a curious delight that even in the face of a terrible defeat he could have his triumph" (126) and kill a few Englishmen.

[15] For an overview of EOKA, its members, and its activities during the Cyprus anti-colonial struggle of the 1950s, see Demetriou (2007, 175-165).

In addition to occasional hints of the savagery of the colonized, the English characters of the novel also sometimes adhere to the view of the locals as incapable children or even animals who needed firm control from the "adult" masters, an attitude expressed also by the real-life colonial administrators in Cyprus (see Brendon 2007, 615-617) at the time. According to Shohat and Stam (1994, 137-141), these racial tropes of infantilization and aminalization were widely used by the colonizers to construct and maintain European supremacy and Eurocentric hierarchies throughout the colonized world. Because it was "proven" that the colonized were less capable to know what was best for them, the superior colonizer was entitled (or even obliged) to rule over them. The attitude of superiority is spelled out in a scene where the soldiers are talking to the Cypriot civilians (in English, regardless of the fact that the people do not understand them) "as you might talk to animals, conciliatory and threatening at the same time" (40). While the Englishmen are mapping the world[16] and covering roads with smooth asphalt in their quest to "safeguard the world" (Jones 447), Cypriots – of both Greek and Turkish ethnicities – are given service trade professions including waiters, hairdressers and maids in the service of the colonizer.[17] Furthermore, even when there is a mention of a Greek doctor looking after wounded Clara, Hal is upset and dismisses the man on the basis of his ethnicity wondering why the hospital does not have "a proper doctor" (340), rather than someone who does not even "address him properly" (340).[18] To question Hal's view, the novel later describes the doctor as a highly competent professional.

While *Small Wars* does indeed introduce and recognise the ways in which Englishness is constructed both within the framework of the British Empire and in opposition to the colonized, it cannot be considered an advocate of imperialism. Rather, the matters discussed above function as a base that the subsequent events in the novel start eroding. In the following chapter, I will move on to address the ways in which Jones's novel challenges the legitimacy and truthfulness of this

[16] On mapping the colonies and maps as the tools for keeping the areas under colonial control and defining them, see for example Anderson (2006, 169-175, 177-181) and Upstone (2009, 4-5).
[17] See *Small Wars* 26-27, 29, 31, 56-57, 311.
[18] On the way how Cypriots were considered to be incapable of more challenging professions by the British colonial rulers, see Brendon (2007, 617-618).

version of Englishness, and portrays its negative consequences, as the English soldiers of the novel lose themselves in the service of a ruthless and cold empire.

3.2. Ideals and Identities Crumbling Down – Raping and Pillaging the Colonies

In this chapter, I will investigate how *Small Wars*, after introducing the ways in which Englishness is intertwined with the British Empire, portrays how the ideals based on this connection crumble down as the story of Hal and others goes on. The manner in which the book first lays out Englishness as intimately connected to the colonial narrative, and then questions the legitimacy of it, is typical for an anti-imperialist historical novel, as de Groot (2010, 139-141, 162, 164) argues when discussing the genre. I will now move on to analyse how Jones's novel, as an advocate of this potentially "disruptive genre" that involves "complex and dissident readings" (de Groot 2010, 139), criticises the influence of British imperial power and colonialism on the colonizer. It challenges the officially held views of English benevolence as well as the minimal impact thesis, seeks to destablish cultural hegemonies, reveals untold atrocities, and attacks the mainstream view on British imperial history (see de Groot 2010, 139-140, 162, 164).

While introducing the imperial narrative of Englishness, the beginning of *Small Wars* offers only subtle hints about the anti-imperialist nature of the novel. Criticism seems to lie in wait when, as mentioned above, even Clara's pacifist father cannot help feeling pride mixing with his fear and distaste when watching the Sovereign's Parade. Similarly, the fact that the parade "lacked opulence" (2) is attributed to the short time elapsed since the end of the Second World War, not the approaching twilight of the British Empire. Later, when Clara and the twins arrive on the island and settle down in the foreign surroundings, the close relationship between the patriotic, disciplined, righteous, masculine and honourable Englishness and the empire it serves remains unchallenged; and when Private Francke destroys Cypriot property in the first British raid described in the novel

(37-40), it is portrayed as an act of a single troublemaker, and Hal – as the defender of true Englishness – sets him straight.

The atmosphere of the novel takes the first turn to a more sinister direction, however, when Hal hands an arrested boy over to the SIB (Special Investigations Branch) and the issue of torture is spelled out. Torture performed by British colonial officers is introduced from the perspective of the interpreter, Lieutenant Davis. He is "a gentle young Englishman" who was "a classics scholar before his National Service" (62) and was sent to Cyprus after "a hasty language course" (62) to enable him to work in Modern Greek. Davis feels that he is under heavy pressure, because he does not want anybody to suffer. While he understands his role as "a necessary part of a larger process", and believes that harsh methods are justifiable, he still cannot "help feeling that violence was a little like cheating, and unfair" (64).

Even though actual torture is not depicted at this point, and Davis manages to talk the arrested boy out of bodily harm's way, the existence of violent interrogation methods does cast a dubious light on the shiny picture of the empire painted in the book so far. At the same time, torture is not an extreme move by the writer of the novel to slander the British Empire in a fictional narrative. Rather, it is a good example of what de Groot (2010, 140) calls the potential that the anti-imperialist historical novels have at revealing untold atrocities by placing actual events within a fictional narrative. The existence of torture performed by the colonizer is often systematically denied and covered up,[19] and Cyprus forms no exception. Both in *Small Wars* and in reality (Brendon 2007, 621-622, Holland and Markides 2006, 230, Morgan 2010, 235-237), torture is tolerated by the higher authorities of the colonial administration. For example, one of the reasons why Hal does not face charges over deserting his post is that the army fears that he might go public

[19] For further discussion on torture, British colonialism and imperialism, see for example David M. Anderson, "Mau Mau in the High Court and the 'Lost' British Empire Archives: Colonial Conspiracy or Bureaucratic Bungle?" in *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 39, 5: 699-716 (2001); Caroline Elkins, "Alchemy of Evidence: Mau Mau, the British Empire**,** and the High Court of Justice" in *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 39, 5: 731-748 (2011); Francoise Sironi and Raphaëlle Branche, "Torture and the Borders of Humanity" in *International Social Science Journal* 54, 174: 539-548 (2002).

with information about the torture taking place in Cyprus. Although *Small Wars* mentions a case in which some soldiers were court-martialled because they had caused bodily harm to a prisoner,[20] the anti-torture stance of the court and the colonial administration is anything but strong; because the SIB had gained important information through the torture case in question, it was encouraged rather than deterred in its methods (78-79).

In here, when the novel little by little builds its own case against imperialism, a form of water torture – one of the methods actually used in Cyprus according to Brendon (2007, 621) – is meticulously described taking place inside the guardroom while an English officer's wife is being given a polo-lesson and giggling on the nearby recreational ground (79-80), thus juxtaposing the English leisure with the Cypriot suffering. When Davis walks out of the guardroom, missing home and his study in Cambridge, he feels anxiety and partial responsibility for the violence and wonders "how he would ever forget" (80) or get over what he has witnessed in Cyprus. Unlike just a few days before, he is no longer sure of the justifiability of torture, and contemplates on reporting it to his commanding officer Hal, "who seemed to be a good man" (80). Eventually, though, he abandons the idea and goes on "excusing himself, condemning himself, lost in the notions of responsibility" (80). As a defence mechanism towards the atrocities he is subjected to, Davies tries to make himself believe that "torture was probably a silly word, an exaggeration" (80).

While Davis can be seen as a somewhat heroic character at this point of the novel, since his kind words manage to make a captive talk after beating him up had given no results (87), he is by no means an example of triumphant justice. He fails to actually do anything about the continuing torture, and the prisoner is reported to have died in captivity the following night (87).[21] Davis's own discomfort with the atrocities he witnesses, and their stark opposition to the British Empire's officially celebrated mission to protect the colonized while safeguarding the world (39,

[20] For a brief account on an actual case of British officers court-martialled on causing bodily harm at the time of the events of the novel, see Morgan (2010, 237).
[21] In reality, Brendon reports that "at least six men died under questioning and others were shot 'while trying to escape'" (2007, 621).

447), is exemplified in a scene at the Limassol Club,[22] where the army wives read Shakespeare's *The Tempest* out loud. Shakespeare's play, just like Jones's novel, takes place in a Mediterranean island ruled by an occupying force rather than the original inhabitants.[23] The Colonel's wife Evelyn Burroughs persuades Davis to read the part of Gonzalo, but Clara perceives that Davis would not want to read that particular role. Indeed, Davis tries, but "some sort of discomfort" that is not shyness (86), stops him from reading the words of joy spoken by a good and optimistic Shakespearean character whose role as a counsellor is not too far from his own position as an interpreter. Even though Davis is a kind-hearted and gentle character, who "couldn't easily give up the idea of himself as honourable" (273), the imperial mission – and the things it makes him do and witness – prevent him from truly identifying with the joyful virtues of Gonzalo.

However, torture of the EOKA captives is not the only form of history's silenced atrocities that Davis witnesses in his reluctant service of the British Empire. While some might wish to argue that torture – an unnecessary and unfortunate phenomenon as it is – is nevertheless only concerned with the terrorists and "real enemies" of the colonizers, the other forms of violence described in *Small Wars* are beyond excuses. The strongest case against the honourable, morally superior and just Englishness is the rape of a seventeen-year old Greek Cypriot girl and her mother, combined with the murder of an unarmed man the women were trying to help. The crimes witnessed by Davis are committed by three English soldiers (Lieutenant Grieves and Privates Francke and Miller) during an out-of-control chaotic raid in Limassol referred to as a "military reaction to a personal crisis" (174) where "rules were forgotten" (173) after an EOKA bomb had killed an English soldier and wounded another on a beach near the garrison.

[22] More details on these expatriate clubs in Cyprus, see Morgan (2010, 123-124)

[23] As a further similarity between Cyprus and the island in *The Tempest*, the first English occupation of Cyprus came about as a result of a storm that wrecked two of the English ships near the island (Luke 1957, 38), while King Alonso's group in which Gonzalo belongs also arrive on the island as a result of a storm and a shipwreck.

Although *Small Wars* does not portray Grieves as a particularly moral person and he is even referred to as "a fool and good for nothing" (168),[24] Francke is explicitly called "a bully" (39) and the three soldiers are repeatedly referred to as "rotten apples" and individual malefactors by the other characters of the novel (211, 236, 262), the serious crimes they commit are depicted first and foremost as a result of the colonial circumstances. For example, Grieves is a reluctant soldier who is constantly counting the days to "demob" (41) and would rather be anywhere but in the service of the empire in Cyprus. In an atmosphere where the fear of an ambush is omnipresent, he has just a few hours before "been crippled by fear and revulsion on the beach [with] the nonsensical pieces of bodies on the blazing sand around him" (175). In a raid to Limassol, he is ashamed of his own earlier cowardice, and gratefully replaces "weakness with rage and illusion of control" (176) and almost inadvertently joins the "outrage of the collective [that] frees the individual to commit terrible acts" (176).

In the blind violence of the raid where all the English soldiers have "forgotten themselves" (188) Grieves, comforted by his rage, feels "like a real soldier" (179) for the first time in his life. In his mind, the helpless victims have taken the place of the EOKA terrorists and he is punishing them with the power granted by his rank – both as an officer and a colonizer. Similarly, Francke and Miller are "exquisitely liberated by the others, the officer encouraging them [is] absolution" and they are "anonymous in the group, and entitled" (180). In other words, even if the conquering and dominating logic of imperialism may not free individuals from the consequences of their actions, it does – to a large extent – take over their minds, make them act despite themselves and lose "their identity" (176), as Jones's novel explicitly spells out.

The scene rolls on as if independently of the soldiers to the point in which "the rape of the women [is] inevitable" (180), made easy by the foreignness of the women, because the Cypriot women do not "smell like the English girls, but like the prostitutes they were entitled to anyway"

[24] See also 41, 154-155, 175.

(180). As Morgan (2010, 177-178) explains, Cyprus had a reputation as a notorious island, since there indeed were hundreds of prostitutes in the colony, and in addition to the cheap liquor, "the main attraction for soldiers on a night out . . . was cheap sex" (177). Thus, when Colonel Burroughs later mentions the existence of "a brothel on every other corner in Limassol" (240), the statement is not far from being historically accurate.

The widespread prostitution on the island and the suggestion that prostitution makes it easier for the English soldiers to rape Cypriot women seriously undermines the idea of English people as a morally superior and virtuous race that has been granted the right to rule over and protect other peoples (see Drayton 2011, 676). When the Colonel, supposedly in defence of the atrocities, states that "For a lot of the men, raping one or two of them is rather like shoplifting" (240), he inadvertently draws a disturbing parallel between the prostitutes and the ordinary civilians raped during the raid in Limassol – and proves that the moral justification of the British Empire is nothing more than empty words. When the soldiers "remembering themselves" (188) scramble out of brothels, bars and people's homes, they are hardly the image of a morally superior nation on a divinely justified mission to safeguard the world from evil. Rather, the novel suggests that they are the true face of imperialism and colonial conquest revealed from behind this glossy image of Englishness the empire has created for its own exploitative purposes.

Furthermore, it is described how, during the same raid, live bodies were stacked on top of each other on the floors of the army trucks to make space for a great number of captives (173). About this method, which is unfit even for the transport of animals, the novel tells us that "there were reports of suffocation . . . but later, the British, investigating, found no bodies" (173). As I will discuss later, in the light of the events that take place in the aftermath of the brutal raid, the stress on the fact that the investigation was carried out by the British colonial officials is significant.

When Grieves, Francke and Miller leave the scene of their crimes certain that even if the women were to try to report the cruelties they have suffered and witnessed, "no one would

believe them anyway. No Englishman, at least" (181). They fail, however, to take heed of the fact that there is an English witness to the events. Davis has been hiding in the adjacent room and seen everything. At this point, having been in the service of the imperial torture institution for a while, Davis has already lost his illusions concerning the benevolence of the British Empire, but he is still deeply shocked and disgusted by what he has just witnessed. When he dashes out of the house, "taking gulps of air into himself, as if he were drowning in what he had seen" (189), he feels that something needs to be done. Unlike in the case of the torture the EOKA captives are going through on a nearly daily basis, the interpreter runs out of excuses not do anything about the double-rape and murder of civilians.

A couple of days later, he confronts Clara and asks questions about her husband. Davis knows that according to the military procedure Hal, as his commanding officer, would be the person to talk to about these kind of matters, but he wants to know whether Hal is "*fair*", "will he listen" and "will he do something? Or is it all just a sham" (198, italics original). Encouraged by Clara, Davis finally decides to report the rapes and the murder to Hal despite the obvious lack of trust the young interpreter feels towards the chain of command of the Army as a tool for promoting justice.

Hal, as the epitome of just, honest and fair masculine Englishness that he tries to be, proves to be worthy of Davis's trust; he takes the matter with utmost seriousness, makes meticulous notes of Davis's story, decides to take immediate action, and starts the process of bringing the three soldiers to justice. But regardless of the professional coolness with which he receives Davis's account, the tidings of such atrocities carried out by English soldiers have a profound effect on Hal and this is the point in which his faith in the virtues of imperial Englishness starts to shake. As the following passage (205-206) suggests, what Davis tells simply does not fit in the idea Hal has fostered about England, the British Empire and the army:

> Davis's [sic] words painted a vicious picture: the torture of the women, the easy killing of the man, who was not a threat, the degraded collusion of the soldiers, excited by their violence. The details. He wanted to hide from it, un-hear it, and

> he wished he did not know, but he had crossed a boundary and could not go back. He had not known he was such an innocent.

If Davis's account shakes Hal's world "grounded in England and in discipline" (1) by profoundly undermining the righteousness, morality and discipline of both Englishmen and the imperial mission, what follows, as the process of bringing the culprits to justice rolls on, practically causes his world to collapse. When Hal starts the juridical process by going to speak about the matter with Colonel Burroughs, he is convinced that in the face of the "sin" (206) committed by the soldiers that infects "Hal, the company, battalion, regiment, army and country", the "only victory could be their trial and punishment" (206). This victory, as it turns out, never comes; after some elaborate developments of the plot it turns out that "all three men went through the rest of their lives with no moment at which they were discovered or punished" (260).

The ugly truth about the empire, and how the idea of just and righteous Englishness is just a facade for a brutal, selfish and heartless imperial mission, raises its head already when Hal first meets Burroughs about the crimes. The Colonel's initial worry seems to be who knows about the crimes and the fact that there is "not much space left in the guardroom" (212), and Hal feels "sudden anger" when the Colonel is trying to place the blame on Hal's Second in Command, Mark Innes, although it had been Burroughs's own sloppy orders that had, according to Hal, caused the chaos (213). However, nothing renders the selfishness of the imperial mission more explicit than the moment when the Colonel blames Grieves, Francke and Miller of stupidity and blurts out: "If Davis hadn't seen, they could've kept their depravity to themselves. As it is, the whole damn island will know about it, and the press too . . . So much for the bloody hearts and minds" (214).

In other words, from the perspective of the colonial administration, it is not a problem that an unarmed local man was shot dead at point-blank range and a local woman and her underage daughter were raped by two British soldiers while an officer encouraged them. Instead, it is a problem that another soldier – who still had some humanity in him – happened to see and report the incident. Burroughs's statement reveals how "hearts and minds" is just a slogan aimed to create a

positive image of the occupying forces; it has nothing whatsoever to do with the actual well-being of the colonized, but solely with the reputation of the colonizer. For the British Empire, *Small Wars* seems to suggest, a murder and a couple of rapes is not an issue. It only becomes an issue when the crimes threaten to become public and make "the lot of us look like murderous thugs" (214). Unfortunately, the reports of "wholesale rape", murder and lootings carried out by the British troops in Cyprus – mentioned by Morgan (2010, 248) – seem to suggest that, at times, the colonizing armies were not much more than that.

Eventually, as a result of Hal's active role in the far from glamorous chore to "root out the rotten apples" (262), the culprits are arrested and a hearing organized. During the arrest, Grieves protests to Hal how "This is absurd. I haven't done anything. Are they talking about that wog the other night?" and "This whole fucking place is a crime" (230). According to Brendon (2007, 620), "wog" is a derogatory and racist term that was also commonly used by English soldiers to refer to Cypriots (among others). Thus, Grieves's comment forms another statement against the Englishness constructed within the framework of the British Empire; when Englishness is understood as a superior master "race" in opposition to the animal-like savages, a murder and rape of some of these "wogs" amounts next to nothing. This mindset and the behaviour that follows turn the English men into ruthless tyrants in the service of the racist and inhumane empire.

The way in which the practices of imperial Englishness make it difficult to defend justice and further the interests of the colonized people – even if one were willing to do so – is exemplified during the aftermath of the Limassol atrocities especially through the characters of Hal and Davis. It seems that it is patriotism, loyalty to England, and to the service of the Empire, which make it hard for Hal to do what he knows is right when the reputation of the nation is on the line. On one hand, he knows that the crimes of the tree soldiers cannot go unpunished, but, on the other, he feels disgust with himself and resents that he has to turn against the men and thus face an uglier truth about the empire (206). The same invisible resistance to justice is present also when Hal has to

force himself through “a thick barrier” of silence on reporting the atrocities to Burroughs (211), when he feels “the repelling wrongness of the whole situation” as he sets out to arrest Lieutenant Grieves (229), and is “impatient with himself, and not proud” after the arrest (233). Even though – for once – he has actually been an advocate of a good cause in trying to bring justice to the Cypriots who had suffered in English hands, Hal does not feel good. His loyalty is torn between the two irreconcilable parties: the victims of the brutalities and the empire that causes them.

The case of Davis, however, is perhaps even more revealing. Even if the young interpreter has never subscribed to the ideas of martial masculinity and rigorous religion-like patriotism, he still feels “inexplicably ashamed of himself” (203) as he names the culprits to Hal. His faith in Englishness and in the justice of the British Empire is briefly restored when he sees Grieves arrested and believes that now the system will “deal with him” (224). Davis thanks Clara for encouraging him to speak to Hal, and says that “It was the right thing to do” (226), but the triumph of justice proves to be short-lived. What happens next entirely shatters the illusion of justice and honesty that the British Empire has built around itself in the form of the Englishness it publicly promotes.

When the summary hearings start, Hal feels “peace bordering on the blissful” (235) because he knows that justice will be served, criminals punished, and the honour of England saved by rooting out the rotten apples. After the accused give their false testimonies, it is Davis’s turn. He seems agitated, and – although he keeps his answers short and simple to Hal’s satisfaction – once his narration of the events moves inside the house, he changes his story, waters it down, gives no concrete account on the crimes and claims that he has not really seen anything. Together with a subsequent account by a RMP (Royal Military Police) Sergeant, who states that they could not find any witnesses to the crimes or persuade the raped women to talk to them, Davis’s “bare-faced lies” (243) effectively release Grieves, Francke and Miller from the risk of court-martial.

Hal is understandably dismayed by Davis's change of heart, and after being told off by the Colonel who accuses him of rashness (242) and stresses how disappointed he is with Hal who has "dragged everybody through the mud" (241), Hal, "cornered by honesty" (241), calls Davis into his office. As it turns out, Davis has been "persuaded" by all of his superiors in the SIB and in the regiment that "the good of the regiment would not be served by the public . . . trial of Grieves and of all of them" (244). As we commonly hear in connection with the atrocities carried out by military personnel, Davis breaks down and appeals to Hal: "I was following orders! They made it clear I had to!" (246). In addition, Davis tells how the witnesses and the victims had also been convinced not to come forward. Thus, the interpreter's account reveals how even the RMP Sergeant had given a false testimony, and points to the fact that, in the preliminary hearing, everyone had been lying.

The way justice and honesty are sacrificed on the altar of imperialism becomes even more obvious when Hal dashes to Colonel Burroughs's house after hearing Davis, and accuses the commander of initiating the cover-up. It is a remarkable change, indeed, from a time just a few weeks (and less than a hundred and fifty pages) before, when Burroughs, an old friend of Hal's father, was described as "a good soldier and a fair man" (104) whose leadership Hal "felt privileged" to have (105). Hal's image of England, order, discipline and justice falls apart when he realises that this good and "fair" man has, in fact, initiated the cover-up and asked "others to speak to Lieutenant Davis" (250).

This does not mean, however, that Hal would have been wrong about Burroughs. In fact, this explanation would be easier to accept, but precisely because the Colonel is not "a rotten apple" to be rooted out, but merely a man who is trying to be a good soldier and carry out his duties as well as he can, his behaviour speaks for the overwhelming power that the imperial system has over individuals. In reply to Hal's accusations, Burroughs stresses how he understands the severity of the crimes and is "disgusted with it" (248), but that in his position he cannot "drag us all through

the mud" (248). He knows that, in order not to drag the empire "through the mud", he must tread the ideals of justice and honesty deep into it.

The conflict of interest between justice and the imperial mission is further highlighted when Burroughs asks Hal "You'd throw us all to the dogs for your principles?" (249). The passage that follows the question is revealing: "'Not *my* principles . . .' Hal searched for the truths he'd never challenged '. . . not just me, the *civilized world*. You aren't above that.' Hal went at him in his anger. 'You have no fucking right!'" (249, italics original). But of course Burroughs has the "right". Hal does not realize that the entire concept of the "civilized world" is a facade of imperialism and a tool used to promote Western supremacy. As Chew (2010, 2) argues, the idea of England as the spearhead of the British Empire and the "civilized world" in a noble mission to "civilize" the savages around the globe is merely one of the myths employed to justify colonization. As such, even if principles such as justice may be officially promoted as a part and parcel of the "civilized world", they are adhered to only as long as they do not conflict with the expansionist and exploitative interests of the colonizer. When the interests of the British Empire demand it, they have to be pushed aside.

The meeting with Burroughs marks a crucial turning point; until now, even if the colonizer's actions are portrayed as far from solely righteous and just, at least Hal – the ideal soldier of the officially promoted imperial Englishness – has been there to speak for justice, honour and discipline. The story has reached a point at which even Hal's "absolute commitment" (14) to the high values of Englishness is broken and sacrificed for "the greater good" (257) of the empire. As Hal walks away from the Colonel's house, he ponders how "What was right, and what was proper had always been inseparable, but in this perhaps one, like a Siamese twin, must be severed and destroyed for the other's survival" (251-252). But even if *Small Wars* uses the words "in this", it is not hard to deduct that events like this are not isolated incidents. Burroughs's line "As long as lessons are learned, there's no need for public beating of breasts" (251), proves to be nothing more

than empty words, because the mal-treatment of civilians and torture of prisoners by the English troops continues.

Both Hal and Davis continue their service morally beaten, while Clara, familiar with both men and their good intentions but farther removed from the colonial frontline, wonders how her husband can "overlook the vicious crimes of his own men" (258), and how come Davis did not fight "for the principle of the thing" (258), as Clara was sure he would have. Davis, with his thoughts "battered to breaking" (273) and continuously disgusted with what he witnesses, tries to desperately convince himself that violence is within the limits of the acceptable. After Clara – his secret crush – moves to Nicosia, he is even more mentally adrift and, like Grieves, "simply counting the days until demob" (318).

As for Hal, the service for the empire that he had deeply committed to, the country which had made him immensely proud, and the job upon which he had built his entire life, all fail to live up to their promises. None of them corresponds to the glamorous image of imperial Englishness he has been immersed in throughout his life. When Hal writes a letter to the family of a dead soldier, he thinks how "in other wars, in real wars" (276), there would be "at least a country to fight against, or defend, not this small, dirty struggle" (276). Hal has come to grasp that colonialism and imperialism are neither about defending one's country nor about promoting the good of mankind, but a dirty, greedy business driven by economic profit and political influence.

Hal has learned to ignore the minor offences, such as a soldier hitting a civilian with the butt of his rifle, but his spirits are finally and permanently crushed when – almost by accident – he ends up in the guardroom and sees something he is not supposed to see. When left alone in front of the "shelves and shelves of misdeeds" (279), he wanders off to the direction of muffled voices, and comes to witness the horrors of the colonial torture institution. He sees a young boy lying on the floor with "blood on his chest", stomach and arms "marked with welts", face "bruised and split open in places, the eyes swollen closed" (282). He also meets disorientated Davis – the other

English victim of the brutal empire that kills justice and honour in men – who looks "as if he were a small boy who had lost himself somewhere in the dark" (282).[25] Hal, overwhelmed by the situation, leaves the place "blood pounding behind his eyes, his brain rushing to fight, save [the boy], act – but not doing that, doing nothing but trying to get away" (285). On driving away from the guardroom, Hal briefly considers reporting the torture to Colonel Burroughs, but the thought dies "before Hal even [has] time to dismiss it" (286). By now, it has become clear to Hal that "He had no ally. His country, his schoolboy land of just hierarchies, was defeated. It had no ambassador to send out any longer" (286).

Hal realizes that the model of imperial Englishness that he has grown into and tried to fulfil all his life has actually never existed. While some of the ideals might be worth pursuing per se, they are inherently incompatible with the Empire for whose purposes the illusion of a just, honest, patriotic and moral master-race of English people has been constructed. Hal is alone, and painfully realizes he has always been alone. He remembers how, when on holidays from school, he had been at home playing with his toy soldiers under the watchful eyes of the painted war-heroes: "They had seemed to smile at him. He had not felt alone. He had been surrounded by legions. But now it came suddenly and coldly into his head that, really, there had been nobody else there with him at all" (349).

Even Hal's relationship with God – which has always been manifested through his service to the empire and been more or less synonymous with England (see 3, 206-207) – is broken. From the moment Colonel Burroughs offers the words "God sees . . . He punishes" (251) as a consolation for the injustice of letting the three soldiers go unpunished, the connection between the empire and God is severed. When Hal receives the news that his wife has been shot at and seriously wounded in Nicosia, he sees it as "the work of a quick and vengeful God" (339) – a punishment for the crimes against humanity he has been part of since he came to Cyprus. When he prays by the side

[25] Davis does not participate in the actual torture, but witnesses it on a daily basis.

of Clara's hospital bed, his prayers are just begging as he tries to make "silent fearful bargains" (345) with God, but it is "too late for that. He already had God's answer: his wife torn in half, his baby killed" (345).

There, waiting beside his seriously wounded wife, it occurs to Hal "to thank his dead son for protecting his mother" (353). He realizes how "There was more honour in its sacrifice than in any action of Hal's since his own conception" (353). There is no honour in serving the empire that not only oppresses, tortures, and abuses the colonized, but also exploits Englishmen for its own selfish and brutal purposes turning them into inhuman savages who forget themselves and lose their identities.[26] Therefore, Hal becomes a deserter. As he puts it when he talks to a psychiatrist in England: in the service of the empire, "Whether or not I can *square* it with myself, the things that I was doing, allowing, agreeing to. Whether I can – *live with myself* doesn't matter" (425, italics original).

Back in England, however, Hal must learn to live with himself again in the world without the commitment to the British Empire. He has to start everything anew, because he is "thirty-one years old with no training or real education, no experience of any use to anybody" (443) and "straightening up was all he knew how to do and of precious little help to him in this wide world" (442-443). In a significant way, then, Hal is in the same situation as England is in facing decolonization, and their relation to the empire is very similar; as Baucom (1999, 3) argues: "[The empire] is the place onto which the island kingdom arrogantly displaces itself and from which a puzzled England returns as a stranger to itself". While Hal needs to find a place in his own post-imperial world, re-envision his relationship to his native country and reform his identity, England and the English people have to re-envision the building blocks of Englishness and find their place in the post-imperial "wide world" where the nation is no more the centre of a great empire. I will return to the ideas of homecoming and the attempts to distance Englishness from the empire

[26] See Jones 176, 188, 189, 232, 290, 340, 438.

towards the end of the present study, but for now, I will move on to discuss the ways in which *Small Wars* reflects the overseas military ventures and current events of the twenty-first century Britain.

3.3. The Colonial War in Cyprus and Modern-day Imperialism

It is widely agreed upon that the historical novel often has at least as much to do with the present as is it has with the past. [27] In *Small Wars*, this fact is tangible in many ways, and in this subchapter I will discuss the issues that connect Jones's novel to the forms of modern-day imperialism and the twenty-first century world. I will discuss how Cyprus as the scene of the main body of events in the novel reflects the world at the time the book was written, how the modern-day imperialism can be seen as the continuance of the detrimental colonial rule, and how the focal issues of the novel – such as the torture of captives and physical violence towards civilians – reflect the twenty-first century realities.

As I have mentioned above, choosing Cyprus as the setting of an anti-imperialist historical novel is by no means arbitrary. In fact, in an interview published in *The Observer*, Jones states that: "I thought that perhaps Cyprus could be a vehicle for me to say what I wanted about what's happening now and the difficulties soldiers face" (Wiseman 2009, 21). A major reason for this is that the author sees significant similarities between the Colonial Cyprus of the 1950s and the Afghanistan of the early twenty-first century, both in terms of geography and military circumstances (Wiseman 2009, 21).

While Cyprus is indeed described as a hot, dry, dusty and rocky terrain (see 112, 192, 365, 394, 460) – qualities readily associated with Afghanistan, and why not with Iraq and other countries in the Middle East as well – a major theme that links Jones's colonial narrative to the

[27] See for example Chapman (2005, 1), de Groot (2010, 2, 10-11, 34, 37, 103, 140), Mezey (2006, 180, 182) and Simpson (2005, 132).

modern day Afghanistan, and to many other countries, is the prominence of terrorism. Indeed, terrorism is a recurrent topic and the words "terrorism", "terrorist" and "terror" feature extensively in the vocabulary of *Small Wars*.[28] According to Nayar (2010, 199-200) and Zarakol (2011, 2311 and 2315-2316), while the emergence of "terrorism" is an old phenomenon closely linked to the formation of nation states, terrorism-discourse has gained momentum particularly in the post 9/11-world. Thus the extensive use of terrorism-related vocabulary emphasizes the modern-day repercussions of the novel. Michaels (2003, 106) argues that the reason to the war in Afghanistan and to the country's visibility in the world politics is the fact that it is associated with terrorism and it is considered a site that "harbours terrorists". The systematic visibility of "terrorism" in *Small Wars* seems to suggest that, though the novel takes place in the colonial Cyprus of the 1950s and reflects on colonial issues, it simultaneously is a commentary on the so called "global war on terror" – initiated by the United States, with Great Britain as its strongest ally, after the attack on the World Trade Center in New York, September 9, 2011.

When Jones's novel places a colonial war of the British Empire on a par with the modern "war on terror", it challenges the view – supported for example by Michaels (2003, 106) – that that the prominence of terrorism and large-scale military actions to counter it are something "importantly new". Even though the discussion on terrorism and the extensive visibility of the phenomenon might be characteristic of the present-day world, the events of the colonial war in Cyprus do bear significant resemblance to the "war on terror" being fought in Afghanistan, Iraq and around the world. As a case in point, Demetriou (2007, 172) mentions the notable similarities between Greek Cypriot EOKA and the insurgent groups during the recent war in Iraq – particularly in relation to their dealings with the local people. As de Groot (2010, 18) maintains, even the "official history" is not an ensemble of cold facts, but is always a simplified narrative constructed and told from a certain perspective. While the mainstream view on history stipulates that

[28] See 36-37, 78, 129, 163-164, 196-197, 219, 225, 265, 331.

colonialism is in the past and the fight against terrorism is in the present, and they have little or nothing to do with each other, Jones's novel introduces an alternative where the boundary between the two is blurred.

Thus, as Hal travels to Cyprus to participate in a campaign that is supposed to eradicate terrorism, *Small Wars* highlights the subjectivity of history and makes the reader think about the constructed nature of it by suggesting a profound similarity between a colonial conflict of the past and the modern "war on terror". As Drayton (2011, 671-672) argues, popular views on history tend to emphasize the separateness of the past from the present and see the past as static, but the perceptions about the past change continuously both temporarily and between people and nations. History is constantly re-written, and how the story is told is largely defined by the interests and the persona of the author; while some wish to see the British Empire and the modern "war on terror" as completely unrelated issues, others – such as Jones – want to emphasize the connections between the two. The images of roadside bombs and booby-traps (29), car bombs (67), terrorists creeping in the darkness and placing hidden bombs (197, 219), the use of human shields (36-37), random shooters disappearing into the crowd (335-336), and the nigh impossibility to catch the evasive enemy[29] (196) are a staple on the news from any country where the "war on terror" is being fought, but Jones's novel places the events smoothly in the colonial setting – with a considerable historical accuracy (as Demetriou's (2007, 175-176) discussion on the tactics used by EOKA suggest). In addition, events such as the death of an American government official (Jones 67) demonstrate the Anglo-American cooperation, an important and recurrent theme especially in the accounts on the "war on terror" given by the British politicians (Drayton 2011, 683). This episode in particular seems to have more to do with the present than with the Cyprus of the 1950s, since as I have mentioned earlier, British interests did not at the time coincide with the ones of the rising superpower.

[29] It is worth remembering that when the novel was written, even the "super terrorist" Osama Bin Laden had not been captured, even though nearly ten years had elapsed since the attacks on the World Trade Center in New York.

It is worth stressing, though, that while *Small Wars* draws parallels between the colonizing mission of the British Empire and the modern (Anglo-American) "war on terror", it would be hard to seriously argue that it does this to legitimize colonialism and portray it as a justified mission to eradicate global terrorism. Rather, the version of history put forward by the *Small Wars* questions the legitimacy and the benefits of the "war on terror". Even though the official colonialism is over, the role that Britain plays in the global politics and the imperialism of the twenty-first century is portrayed as a risk to Englishness and to the well-being of the English people by making them go through similar identity-shattering and morally destructive experiences as the mighty machine of the empire did.

This reading gains extra support from what Drayton (2011, 681-683) describes as the rise of imperialistic attitudes and the promotion of patriotic and superior Englishness that works for the good of humanity in the official and political discourse of Great Britain since the 9/11 attacks. As Drayton (2011, 681) continues, the narrative of the glorious British Empire had never really died among the public in England, but was entertained as a compensation for the diminished global influence of the nation. With many people continuously clinging on to the ideals of imperial Englishness, the political leadership used its rhetoric and ideas to legitimize attacks and gain public support for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, as Drayton (2011, 681-682) stresses. In this climate, the story of *Small Wars* reminds the reader of the darker side of colonialism and suggests that England and the English people should separate themselves and their national identities from the neo-imperial narrative.

Of course, the recurrent references to the Cypriot resistance as terrorism and the description of the tactics that they had in common with the present day "terrorists" – or soldiers "depending on your point of view" (Jones 67) – is not the only tool in the anti-imperialist repertoire of Jones's novel. Another major issue, which is linked to terrorism but also draws a parallel between Jones's colonial Cyprus and modern imperialism in countries such as Afghanistan and

Iraq, is the presence of torture. I have discussed the prominence and effects of this brutal activity in the novel earlier in the present study, and as anyone who has followed the news that report the events in Iraq and Afghanistan during the past years has noticed, the phenomenon is anything but unheard of in connection with the "war on terror".

The images and reports from detention centres such as Abu Ghraib in Iraq and Guantanamo bay in Cuba – where the "terrorists" are held in poor circumstances and systematically tortured – bear striking similarities to the conditions that the colonial enemies of the empire faced several decades earlier. In fact, as Gregory (2004, 323) argues, the images that have leaked to the media from these places are "saturated with a colonial past that is reactivated" in the present situation where imperialism and colonialism have not disappeared anywhere. Furthermore, Gregory's (2004, 318) account on the torture carried out during the neo-imperial age at the early twenty-first century suggests that – just like in Jones's novel (236, 262) – the atrocities performed by the occupying force are to this day treated as exceptions carried out by a few "rotten apples" (Gregory 2004, 318), although the "actions (and inactions)" are in fact "the fruit of a vast poisoned orchard" (*ibid.*).

Although the main gardeners of the poisoned orchard of imperialism may nowadays be found across the Atlantic, Britain's colonial past, the rise of imperialist rhetoric since 9/11, continuous promotion of imperial Englishness, and the nation's devoted subscription to the American-led coalition, which, among other things, runs torture centres such as the Abu Ghraib[30] prison complex, keep England firmly connected to the imperial narrative. While new information on the atrocities carried out during the decline of the British Empire in the 1950s and 1960s is revealed,[31] Philiposse (2007, 72) stresses how Great Britain has sided with the United States to maintain the "rightful leadership of the civilized world".

[30] Although this particular institution is not used by the Anglo-American coalition anymore.
[31] As a case in point, Drayton (2011, 684) mentions the secret archive of thousands of documents held by the Foreign and Commonwealth office, which allegedly report large-scale torture, murder and political manipulation in British colonies.

Thus it is clear that even several decades after the official decolonization, colonialism and imperialism are very much alive – with their ugly side effects – and Englishness is not free from their grasp. Towards the end of *Small Wars*, a man on a train in England comments on a newspaper article on the Suez Crisis and complains that the Prime Minister is "stuck in the 1930s, dragging this country into another colonial war" (453). A little later, Clara's father states that "there are very few wars worth the fighting, and none that I know of at this present time" (455). Similarly, England is in myriad ways still stuck in the colonial times and dragged through wars that are not worth the fighting, justified through Englishness that is constructed around imperialism through the ghost of the British Empire.

In addition to the prevalence of terrorism and torture, there are some other, smaller things that build up connections between past and present forms of imperialism in *Small Wars*. One important matter is the press. In both Jones's novel and in modern "war on terror" (Drayton 2011, 674-675), the forces behind imperialism tend to manipulate public opinion by covering up information about the atrocities carried out under the guise of civilization or democratization. Another issue worth mentioning here might be the importance of crude oil reserves in the Middle East to the global economy.[32] Since the oil supplies are often mentioned as an important motivator for the US-led invasion in Iraq, the fact that the threat to global oil supplies is mentioned as one of the biggest risks connected to the Suez crisis in *Small Wars* (164) echoes strongly with the imperialism of the post 9/11 era.

Furthermore, the relevance of Cyprus in connection with the "war on terror" and present-day imperialism is not limited to the island's past as a British colony. In here, it is worth remembering that the colonization of Cyprus is still not entirely over. Not only have cheap travel and the Mediterranean sun resulted in entire neighbourhoods of "Little Englands" – close knit communities of English people reminiscent of the community of army wives and other civilians in

[32] For a detailed discussion on the relation between the "war on terror" and Middle Eastern oil reserves, see Philippe Le Billon, "From Free Oil to 'Freedom Oil': Terrorism, War and US Geopolitics in the Persian Gulf" in *Geopolitics* 9, 1: 109-137 (2004).

Small Wars (88) – with a great number of English shops, pubs, and restaurants specializing in English breakfast and fish & chips, but the occupying military forces never left the island. There are still thousands of English soldiers garrisoned in Akrotiri and Dhekelia, the two large military bases inside sovereign British territory on the island, and the bases are an important link in the Anglo-American coalition in their military ventures of the twenty-first century. According to Smith (*The Guardian online* 2002), the Akrotiri base is "vital for US-led intelligence gathering on Iraq and Iran" and, despite the generally good relationship between Cyprus and Britain, Webster (2005, 257) notes that resentment against the continuing British military presence on the island does flare up occasionally.

As demonstrated in the case of protests against the British military presence in Cyprus (Smith 2002) and during the Libyan uprising in 2011, the Cypriots do not often agree with the continuing colonization of their island and the use of its territory in the imperial war games of today. However, the use of the bases in the strikes against third parties and the fear of a possible retaliation by the enemies of Britain and the US is not the only reason the presence of English soldiers in Cyprus is often frowned upon by the formerly colonized nation. Another reason – that has its clear counterpart in *Small Wars* – is the misbehaviour of the English soldiers on the island as well as in Afghanistan, Iraq, and in other places where they make headlines together with their American peers.

In many ways, the colonial forces of today seem to be no different from the colonial forces half a century ago. As recently as February 2008 – the year after two British soldiers had attacked a Cypriot taxi driver – a group of English Soldiers on a night out, celebrating the end of their duties in Iraq and Afghanistan, attacked the staff and customers of a bar in Ayia Napa, Cyprus (Gillan 2008, 7, Bowcott 2008, 19). Remarkably, as Williams (2008, 13) reports in *The Guardian*, the soldiers were cleared of charges due to lack of evidence. Much like in the case of the double rape and murder in *Small Wars*, it was clear that the crimes had been committed by English

soldiers, but the lack of evidence on the particular suspects freed the entire British Army from responsibility.

Even though the brawl in Ayia Napa might be far from the brutality of the atrocities described in Jones's novel, another widely reported incident that took place fourteen years earlier – and gained publicity again during the brawl because the culprits of this hideous crime had recently been released from prison (Gillan and Daugbjerg 2006, 12) – does not fall short in brutality. In 1994, three British soldiers kidnapped, raped and brutally murdered Louise Jensen, a Danish tour guide in Cyprus. As usually is the case with atrocities caused by imperialist actions and occupying forces, Price (2006, 2) states how, in connection with Louise Jensen's murder, the British officials were quick to stress that (once again) it was merely a work of a few misbehaving individuals who were "cooped up" (Price 2006, 2) in Cyprus. It is hard not to notice the similarities between this incident and the crimes of Grieves, France and Miller, the "rotten apples" who "forgot themselves" in the service of the British Empire. Whether the victims are Danish or Cypriot does not seem to matter: the Englishness that celebrates masculinity and conquest finds ways to excuse the atrocities executed under its guise, disregarding the well-being of individuals in the process.[33]

Thus, by weaving the threads of colonial Cyprus and the present-day phenomena together into one continuous narrative of imperialism *Small Wars* thoroughly invalidates Colonel Burroughs's words "As long as lessons are learned, there's no need for the public beating of breasts" (251). It becomes obvious that, as long as the English nation continues to build its narrative on the framework of imperialism, lessons will never be learned. The imperialist machinery will go on exploiting and mal-treating other people, and deny their access to justice and human rights, while it turns bullies into murderers and mentally destroys even the good-hearted men within its own ranks.

[33] Even as I write this paper, the reports of atrocities performed by the Anglo-American coalition who "lose themselves" in the service of modern imperialism are anything but rare. On Sunday 11 March 2012, an American army sergeant "just snapped", went out, and shot 16 civilians (*The New York Times*, New York edition 16 March 2012, A1).

The anti-imperialist reading of *Small Wars* suggests that "the public beating of breasts" is indeed needed, and its goal must be to sever the ties that the English nation and Englishness have to imperialism, because "History doesn't end. Places that are fought over are always fought over, and will always be fought over, and there will never be an end to it, and each conflict is just adding to the heap of conflicts that no one can remember starting and no one will ever, ever finish" (Jones 104). It is this vicious circle of imperialism that has caught the English soldiers and the whole nation inside it, and as long as Englishness is constructed within the imperial framework, there is no way out.

I began this chapter with an introduction to the world of interconnectedness between the British Empire, the imperial mission and Englishness – particularly in the military framework – as represented in *Small* Wars. I studied how masculinity, justice, discipline and honour were constructed as English values for the purposes of the empire. However, in 3.2, I emphasized that the novel does not bring these connections up to justify them, but to make them visible and thus render them susceptible to criticism. I also argued that, due to its exploitative and selfish nature, imperialism is in fundamental disparity with justice and other ideals in *Small Wars*, while I included 3.3. to demonstrate how the novel expands it criticism on imperialism to the twenty-first century, "the war on terror", and ongoing colonization of Cyprus. In Chapter 4, then, I will discuss in more detail how imperial Englishness swallows not only soldiers, but the English nation as a whole into the harmful network of imperialism in *Small Wars.*

4. The Empire Invading English Homes

In the following, I will continue the analysis of *Small Wars* and the ways the novel portrays the relationship between the empire and Englishness, turning my attention to the domestic sphere. I will approach the idea of domesticity from two perspectives, as Blunt and Dowling (2006, 143) have done: domestic as related to home and household on one hand, and domestic as opposed to foreignness in the arena of nations and politics – i.e. the domestic space of a nation – on the other. Furthermore, as Blunt and Dowling (2006, 142) maintain, home and family are often used as metaphors for the nation, and thus the way the empire invades homes and threatens families can be seen as a comment on its influence on the English nation. I will begin my discussion with a subchapter that addresses the ways in which the British Empire affects the life in English homes both in England and in a colony (which in the case of Jones's novel is Cyprus, of course). I will analyse how Jones depicts the homes of the characters as profoundly influenced and infiltrated by imperial Englishness and the role of England as a colonizing nation. In the second subchapter, I will discuss how the empire, through the duties it requires and the qualities it promotes, places Hal and Clara's marriage under a tremendous pressure that nearly breaks it apart. Finally, in the last subchapter, I will turn my attention to homecoming, England as home, and a form of Englishness less grounded on imperialism, which in *Small Wars* arises mainly from the English landscape and emphasizes a turn away from the imperialist mindset and martial masculinity.

4.1. The British Empire, Imperial Englishness and the Home Front

So far, I have discussed how the Englishness constructed within the framework and for the purposes of the British Empire is harmful to the English men in the military service of the nation. In this chapter, I will turn my attention to the ways in which the empire infiltrates the domestic sphere and affects the lives of the English people close to these soldiers – and throughout the entire nation – in

Small Wars. As MacKenzie (1999, 212-213) notes, despite the opposite claims put forward by the proponents of the minimal impact thesis, the empire affected, the lives of all English people regardless of their social class[34] through professional, personal, religious and cultural experiences. I will discuss how the novel portrays this profound influence through its characters, their families scattered around the vast empire, and the homes in which they try to live their daily lives.

In relation to the previous chapter, it is also worth remembering that the influence of the British Empire and the legacy of imperialism continue to be significant factors in the lives of present-day English people as well. Even if the characters of Jones's novel live in a time when colonization was more tangibly real, and the British Empire as a vast political unit still existed, the English people are to this day scattered around the globe as a legacy of the empire. As a result of the imperial history, there are still thousands of English soldiers serving abroad, and even more English expatriates (pensioners, telecommuters, officials, tourist guides, small business owners, missionaries...) have made their homes in the formerly colonized countries.

Since Hal is a soldier, and it is the military service that takes him and his family to Cyprus, it is first and foremost the issues related to the armed forces that affect the English homes in *Small Wars*. In addition, the setting of a family whose life is determined by the career of the male breadwinner is typical of the 1950s' England – a society organized around the ideals of nuclear family and strict gender roles. However, it is not only the lives of the nuclear families relocated in the colony whose lives the empire infiltrates, but when it whisks sons and daughters, fiancés, friends, cousins, and colleagues around the world, the homes in England become deeply interwoven in the imperial web as well. As I have mentioned earlier, Hal's family had for several decades been active in the service of the British Empire around the world, but it was not only the "young men of old families" taught to feel deep pride in "ancient patriotism" (Bratton 1986, 73-75) whose homes were invaded and families stretched around the globe. A great proportion of the soldiers posted in

[34] As far as the present study is concerned, I will not offer any deeper discussion on social class in the British society and its relation to the empire, but for explicit references on social classes in *Small Wars*, see pages 88, 209.

Cyprus in Jones's novel are conscripted National Service men from across the spectrum of social classes[35] – many of them reluctantly separated from their lives and homes in England and "simply counting days till demob" (318) while in the colony.

In addition to the case of reluctant National Service men, another good example of the empire invading the domestic sphere regardless of the reluctance of an individual is the situation of George, Clara's father, a civil servant who is towards the end of the novel described as "the patriarch despite himself" (454).[36] George, whose brief participation in the battles of the First World War is described as "the unequalled crisis of his life" (7), is "sharply aware that the greater part of his wish for continued peace in the world was so that his sons would not have to do the things he had done, and that his daughter would not have to be a soldier's wife" (7). Yet, this is exactly what happens in the book. Although there is "peace in the world" in a large scale, George's son James responds to the call of imperial patriotism and the "small wars" carry him across the empire through Eritrea, Malaya and Egypt to do what his father had done in the First World War (though for different, and much more controversial reasons). At the same time George's daughter indeed becomes a soldier's wife who first calls Germany her home for six years, and then moves to Cyprus with her husband in the middle of a heightening conflict. George is powerless in front of the empire that has assumed control of his family and taken his children away from him under the pretext of the service to their native land.

The fact that families are scattered around the empire is a colonial reality and the characters of *Small Wars* have to try to cope with it. Surely, this is not only George's problem, but influences the English people across the board in the novel. In addition to the National Service men – and perhaps Hal as well, even though he has been prepared for the role since his birth – a good example is the case of Gracie, an Englishwoman whom Clara befriends in Nicosia. Gracie manifests what Stoler (2010, xxiii) calls "parent-child bonds strained by dislocation" in connection with the

[35] See for example 20-21, 41, 62.
[36] On the radical differences between Clara's and Hal's childhood homes, see Jones 4-6.

colonial conditions: not only is Gracie separated from her parents and other extended family members, but even two of her children attend a school in England while she lives in Nicosia with her three and five-year-old sons. Furthermore, she barely ever sees her husband who is stationed in Troodos Mountains (a major mountain range in Cyprus, west of Nicosia), and only rarely gets a long enough leave to visit her in Nicosia.

When the imperial mission forces the English people in long-distance relationships with their loved ones, face-to-face contact becomes impossible and people have to resort to other, in many ways secondary, means of communication. Since *Small Wars* takes place in the 1950s, it is understandable that the main form of communication across great distances is that of letters and postal packages.[37] Telephone is only used in severe matters such as calling home to England when Clara is seriously injured. Mrs Burroughs also brings up the modern miracle of telephone as a proof of the backwardness of Cyprus in face of the civilized and developed England, when she complains to Clara that "Not having a telephone puts one right back in the nineteenth century" (58). Be how it may, long distance relationships are considered to be notoriously difficult to maintain even in the twenty-first century despite the presence of mobile phones, text messages, chats, and video-calls; no mode of communication has managed to replace physical presence as of yet.

As Clara exchanges letters with her mother, they write about everyday matters, such as shopping, weather, flowers, and trips to London, whereas letters from Hal's mother are described as "brief and tedious" (84). The topics are superficial and, even though it is mentioned that they are what Clara "wanted to hear about" (83), it is clear that the physical space forced between Clara and her family by the empire silences the things that would really be worth saying and pushes deeper feelings to the background. When Clara's mother's thoughts are voiced, it is stressed how, as much as she would have wanted to, she does not "write of missing the children, or her own and George's constant anxiety for Clara and her brother" (84). Similarly, Clara does not share her fears and

[37] Jones 83-84, 152, 216, 276, 359-360, 314.

anxieties with her mother – or with anyone else for that matter. In Stoler's (2010, xxiii) words, intimate relationships are thoroughly affected by the empire and "family ties warped by resettlement".

Instead of functioning as a means to maintain interpersonal relationships, the communication with the family members in England is reduced to the role of a temporary relief to home sickness in *Small Wars*. As the novel explains: even though some things – such as ice-cream, beaches and the weather[38] – are much better in Cyprus, Clara misses her home, and when her mother sends her packages, she opens them "meticulously, absorbing the faint traces of England" (152). Because physical presence is made impossible and deep feelings are not sufficiently conveyed through the means available, the physical things sent from England are assigned a heightened value. If it is impossible to feel the touch of the loved ones, the things that they send and "the faint traces of England" in them serve as a feeble replacement.

Meanwhile, just like the people who try to make their homes abroad seek the traces of England they can grasp, the people in England continuously try to make sense of the empire their lives are woven into; as Hall (2001, 35-36) argues, private correspondence with the people in the colonies was a major connection point between many English people and the British Empire during its heyday. Although, as in the case of a woman who moved to New Zealand mentioned by Hall (*ibid.*), the private letters were often circulated by the receiver and thus constructed the view of the colonized natives as barbaric savages (in this particular case), the private correspondence certainly was not the only source of information for the people back in England – less and less so as the twilight of the empire approached. In the relatively modern post-Second World War world of Jones's novel, private letters are of significance, but other forms of written word, radio, and documentary newsreels also deliver information from the periphery to the colonial centre.

[38] See for example 60, 90, 152, 191.

Interestingly, private correspondence also interacts with other media in *Small Wars*. When Clara is injured and lies in the hospital, she receives a great number of postcards out of which "Many are from England, not just people in the services" (359), but from the "general public" (360) as well. In addition to the people who know Clara, the public in England learns what has happened to her via the rapid communication methods, which enable the English papers to publish the story soon after the incident (*Small Wars* 351, 399). Thus, in Jones's novel, the media is not just something "out there", something that exists separately of the English people, but it is an interactive tool that brings about reactions and makes people act. Even though people in England base their understanding of the British Empire and its colonies mostly on second-hand information, they are not simply passive receivers, but also react to the news; not only by sending postcards, but also by taking to the streets to demonstrate against the British operation in the Suez Canal area.[39]

Faithful to its genre, as an anti-imperialist historical novel, *Small Wars* shows that while colonial imperialism is not a thing of the past, the interactive role of the media is not something radically new either. Even if the modes of participation may have evolved from postcards to Facebook-groups, and the news come from Afghanistan and Iraq instead of Cyprus and Egypt, the English homes are still infiltrated by the imperialist imagery in which the nation is steeped in. Furthermore, in a similar way as the media in *Small Wars* depicts imperialism as safeguarding the world, with triumphant music accompanying the masculine English heroes into the battle, as is the case in a newsreel played in a London cinema (447), a great deal of the modern media is, according to Drayton (2011, 674, 684), controlled by the supporters of British imperialism and the promoters of imperial Englishness. On the other hand, also the idea of resistance and discontent with imperialist politics connects the two eras. According to Randle (1987, 133), the massive Trafalgar Square demonstrations against the British actions in Suez had an important role in the development of public protest movements and anti-imperialist sentiments in Britain. The

[39] See 447-448, 453.

twenty-first century protests against the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq – expressed through demonstrations and (social) media – are built on the legacy of these 1950s' movements.

But whatever agenda rules the media, it brings the empire to English homes in *Small Wars* – together with private correspondence, cultural products, and produce from the colonies, exemplified through matters such as the prominence of gin and tonic and tea (Jones 8, 153). However, while the imperial experience is shared by the entire nation, the homes in England are inevitably affected by it in a different manner than the homes in the colonies. The world looks significantly different when viewed from the periphery towards the centre than the other way round. Whereas the domestic life in England is invaded by news and products from the colonies (see also Blunt and Dowling 2006, 145), the English people in Cyprus try their best to make their homes as English as possible to ease home sickness in a far-off place which, despite its obvious foreign characteristics, to their mind is "still English" (Jones 9), because it is under their rule.

In the case of Episkopi garrison, where Hal and Clara live, the aim to create a miniature England under the Mediterranean sun is discernible in the entire infrastructure of the place, not only inside the individual homes. The English settlement is adorned with stables, polo fields, front lawns, gardens and recreational grounds, while the mess bar is decorated in an English manner with its "floor carpeted like a golf club" (27-28). In addition, Clara's and Hal's home is located in a plot called "Lionheart" (60, 88), the very name of it evoking English history and emphasizing the view of Cyprus as an "English" place via the obvious reference to the first English occupation of the island nearly a millennium earlier. Lionheart Estate is described as a "miniature suburb, with front gardens . . . and a brand new road through it" (60-61) – a miniature English suburb in a miniature England.

Regardless of the efforts to make the freshly-built garrison feel like England, however, the people who have settled in Episkopi cannot escape the "general shabbiness" (26) of the place that has "a hasty, brand-new feeling, like stage set" (28, see also 91). Indeed, it may not be possible

to build perfect replicas of English suburbs in Cyprus, but even if it were, mere appearances cannot transform a place in a colony into an English location. Also the English way of life is brought to the island in the form of hymns, clothes and books from which Clara read to her daughters "about England" (19-20), while the English food culture is represented by sandwiches, cakes and afternoon teas "laid out on long tables" (152) in the garden.[40]

Another, and considerably better, remedy for home sickness in *Small Wars* is the presence of other English people and interaction among them. For example, when Clara opens the door to Mrs Burroughs who comes to pick her up, the "big and beaming" presence of this most English of ladies "briefly transform[s] all of Cyprus to England" (58). Also, in Nicosia where Union flags are flying from the rooftops of modern colonial buildings, and you can even "post your letter in the red boxes . . . [and] buy talcum powder, chocolate, gloves" (329), it is particularly the community of "diplomats' wives, army wives, all kinds of other English people" (329) that makes Clara's life in Nicosia considerably more pleasant.

This domestic world that Englishwomen run in Cyprus also emphasizes the importance of women in the ranks of the colonizer as well as the way in which the domestic is closely connected to the imperial. As Blunt and Dowling (2006, 150-151) and Kaplan (2009, 23) argue, women play an important – even if complementary – role in the imperial machinery. For example, when the Englishwomen strive to transform the colony into an English domestic sphere in *Small Wars*, they contribute to the overall domination and subjugation of the invaded land. It is also worth mentioning that the English sphere of life is constructed separately from that of the Cypriot: the spaces of clubs, garrisons, hotels, and restaurants that the protagonists frequent are exclusively English and social interaction between "us" and "them" is kept to the minimum. The boundaries between the spaces of the colonizer and the colonized remain clear-cut in all aspects of life, which,

[40] See also 15, 52-53, 81-82, 153, 200, 292.

according to Blunt and Dowling (2006, 150), is prone to create antagonisms between the two groups.

Although the expatriates in Jones's novel do all they can in order to make themselves feel "at home" in Cyprus – loyal to the role of the colonizer, not by getting to know the locals and the environment, but by imposing England all over the place – the goal is never achieved. Constantly surrounded by "pointless bushes and hills . . . not pastures for playing in or grass for sitting on, just this hot-place landscape that you couldn't properly walk in, or lie on, that seemed to stare" (192-193), Clara and the other expatriates cannot fool themselves: Cyprus is not England. Even if a walk on the beach might "remind you of Cornwall in summer" (60), as some of the army wives try to convince Clara, it is not Cornwall; the soft sand makes it perfect for EOKA to hide a bomb that later explodes and kills an English soldier and wounds another. Cyprus is hostile, because despite all the imperial rhetoric about spreading civilization and safeguarding the world, the English are invaders in a land that is not theirs.

No matter how hard Clara tries to fulfil the ideal of a brave Englishwoman and to represent the "indomitable spirit" (191) of her nation, bestowed upon her by Englishness that demands these qualities of a "real army wife" (83), fear and anxiety start to get the best of her, and she cannot feel safe even in her own home.[41] Instead, her house seems an evil place that offers no protection and Clara is scared "all the time" (225). Before long she starts to look for tripwires and bombs inside her very home[42] and constantly feels "imaginary Cypriot eyes upon her" (193). The colonial situation has reordered Clara's intimate domestic life to the extent that "no place is safe . . . familiar is treacherous and no place is home", as Stoler (2010, xxiii) describes the situation where the colonial experience has reordered the intimate domestic space.

Even though Clara has lived six years in a foreign country and called a place there "home" (21), Cyprus is another thing altogether. As she explains to Davis: "it's not being *away*. It's

[41] For other narratives on colonial wars where Englishwomen were expected to be brave and defend their homes under the fear of attacks from the locals, see Webster (2005, 133-134) and Blunt and Dowling (2006, 140-143).
[42] See for example 49-52, 122, 160, 193, 218, 225-226, 254-255.

being here" (226, italics original). Clara did not have significant troubles in building a home in the post-Second World War Germany and she had even felt a "sense of belonging" (20) there, because the setting had been clear: she had been in a foreign (another "civilized" European) country, with whom her own nation had fought a war, was now at peace with, and whose cities now shared the "ragged bombed greyness" (20) with England. Cyprus, as any colony, on the other hand, is an ambiguous place which, as a part of the British Empire, is supposed to belong to England, but is still a hostile territory invaded against the will of the locals, and nothing like home.

Clara's inability to feel at home in Cyprus is arguably a reflection of what Anderson has called "the incompatibility of nation and empire" (2006, 93) that haunts English nationalism: while Englishness is constructed within the framework of the empire, the colonial realities do not adhere to the idealistic picture of the nation as a benevolent and essentially good leader of the imperial family. In spite of the "stubbornly frivolous" (Jones 264) attempts to maintain an illusion of normality, the English homes neither in England nor in the colonies can escape the realities of the empire that constantly invade the lives of the English people and disturb the ideals their national identities are built upon. The domestic life in Cyprus continues, thoroughly infested by the imperial mission and colonial circumstances that leave their mark on the people. At the same time, the people "at home" in England are surrounded by the empire in all its forms, and constantly haunted by the fear of seeing the names of their loved ones in the news that report the casualties of the colonial wars.

In *Small Wars,* even when Hal's and Clara's family returns to England, the colonial experiences continue to overshadow their lives, and they realise how the service of the empire has alienated them from the England they thought they knew. Not only does Hal not feel at home in his parents' house after the identity-shattering colonial experiences, but when he looks for a job in London it occurs to him that the capital is for him "a foreign country more absolute than any peasant village in southern Cyprus or grim suburb of Berlin had ever been" (433). Furthermore,

their small children Meg and Lottie, for whom Cyprus had truly become a home during their stay there, have difficulties in getting used to the English weather, whereas their grandmother is "out of practice" (388) with her grandchildren due to the long separation.

Thus, the domestic order, which according to Webster (2005, 133-135) and Nyman (2005, 44) is "a central image of Englishness" (Webster 2005, 133) often used to represent the nation and promote its values, is seriously disturbed by the empire no matter where the homes are located. Home, a cornerstone of the nation, is threatened. Even if, as Webster (2005, 134-135) argues, some texts may portray England as "a domestic sanctuary" where the empire does not reach, in Jones's novel the English people cannot be protected from the detrimental reality as long as the nation continues to be infested with the doctrines of imperialism. But it is not only through the fear of bombs and physical separation from the distant loved ones that threaten the domestic sphere in *Small Wars*. The imperial mission also puts Hal and Clara's a relationship under a tremendous strain and drives a wedge between the couple that appears to be very much in love before the colonial realities of Cyprus start to erode their marriage. In the following subchapter, I will discuss how imperialism, and Englishness harnessed for its purposes, causes the emotional, as well as physical, separation of Hal and Clara.

4.2. Relationships under Imperial Strain

"Cyprus. It had been encased around and above in hard blue sea and sky. They had made their small home on it, been taken in by it, and she had lost him. Such a small place to lose a person, she thought, and now, released, they were both alone" (432). This passage from *Small Wars* describes Clara's thoughts when she is back in England recovering from her injuries and Hal has just been released from his military duties as unfit for service due to mental problems. Indeed, the change is drastic compared to the situation where "They easily made a world to inhabit when they were

together" (46), as their blooming relationship is described a few days after Clara arrives in Cyprus and the married couple is reunited. However, I argue that it is not Cyprus *per se*, but the colonial reality there and the imperial Englishness which "take them in" and drive them apart in the novel. In this subchapter, I will focus on the strain that the colonial situation puts on a relationship in *Small Wars* and discuss how the patriotic masculine Englishness in which Hal has been steeped in since childhood offers him nothing but wrong solutions to manage his marriage, while the empire takes over the personal lives of the people.

Because of his upbringing, Hal's impression of Clara and their relationship is from the outset described as shrouded in colonial imagery. Hal calls Clara his "red, white and blue girl" (6), and despite the fact that the tricolour supposedly refers to the colours of her hair, skin and eyes, it is not hard to realise that the colour scheme has been made famous across the former British colonies by the Union Jack.[43] But when it comes to how Hal places himself and his relationship to Clara within the framework of the empire, even more revealing is the moment where he prepares for his Sovereign's Ball and thinks about her: "She was a foreign country to him, but one he felt he'd always known, like the countries coloured pink on the atlas, that he had been familiar with through his childhood. Like a far-off place of treasures and spices that was still English, in his mind she waited for visit; she was India" (9), familiar and foreign at the same time.

According to MacKenzie (1999, 230), the young men who grew up in the inter-war Britain were immersed in the official English nationalism that promoted the colonies as essentially English possessions and familiar parts of the British Empire that the proud nation leads. In *Small Wars*, Hal is one of these young men. In other words, Hal sees Clara as a colony and himself as a colonizer, but it is worth noticing that his idea of the colonial relationship is the one falsely promoted by the ideas of England as a well-intentioned head of the patriarchal imperial family who

[43] In relation to the colours of the union Jack and postcolonial discussions on race, the title of Paul Gilroy's *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation* (1987) is worth remembering perhaps also in the context of Hal calling Clara according to the colours of the flag that flew across the world as the sign of the power of the British Empire.

looks after, serves and protects a colony from its enemies. When he thinks of Clara as India, it is the glittering image of a welcoming and friendly place of "treasures and spices" with which he wants to unite his destinies with; it is not the real post-Second World War India where the British are retreating and leaving behind a country ravaged by disastrous communal violence and massive forced migration (Brown 1999, 437). The last words of the prologue describe how Hal's feelings for Clara were pure, well-intended, and as passionate as his patriotism: "Hal saw nothing but the girl he was with and the service he was promised to, and in the deep silence at the centre of himself he made an absolute commitment to each" (14).

In Jones's colonial reality of Cyprus, however, things start to change. It is remarkable how there is not a single happy and loving couple in the repertoire of English characters positioned in the colony in *Small Wars*: Mr and Mrs Burroughs's relationship might be functional, but cold, whereas Mark and Deirdre Innes's is a complete wreck with Mark convinced that his wife hates him and Deirdre aggressively flirting with other men and constantly cheating her husband with Tony Grieves – and later with Davis. The only ones who seem to have a warm relationship are Gracie and David Bundle, but they barely see each other and soon after the couple is introduced to the reader, Gracie dies in the shooting that also wounds Clara. The stage is set for Hal and Clara – the couple who have survived the challenges of long separations and Hal's military duties and kept the fire of their love burning bright[44] – to try their luck against the odds of the empire. When they silently and passionately make love, with Deirdre and Mark having yet another vicious argument next door, everything seems to be all right, but the invisible forces of imperialism are already working for their destruction. The way the dirty imperial warfare contaminates the relationship is at times even described through physical hints such as soot transferring from Hal to Clara (55) and the lingering smell of burning bodies in the house (147).

[44] See 45-47, 88-90.

The first signs of the colonial reality that pushes the lovers apart emerge when they are lying close to each other on the bed in a house in Limassol (where they lived for a short while before their house at the Lionheart estate was ready) with the narrator recapping the events of their wedding night, and a bomb goes off in a nearby police station. When Hal is called to the scene he dismisses Clara's fears and "close[s] himself off from her" (50), while Clara closes herself in the house, drags a table to block the back door, but because she "didn't want him to think she wasn't coping" (52) hides it all from Hal. Thus, the demands that the colonial situation places on people start to slowly tear their relationship apart: Hal is required to take distance from his wife when the duties of the empire call, and Clara is expected to keep up the appearances of a brave army wife no matter what is going on inside her. Just like the empire they serve, Clara has a facade to maintain.

After they move into the garrison, Hal thinks that, in spite of the colonial dangers, Clara is genuinely happy, "not just pretending for his sake" (83), but as it turns out, she is not happy and her fears have not disappeared, albeit perhaps temporarily eased. Meanwhile, the empire continues to work against them, and the incompatibility of colonial warfare and domestic life becomes more and more pronounced. Secrets and the lack of communication that erode the relationship do not arise only from their own actions, but secrecy is also imposed between them from above. Hal feels "helpless and clumsy" (111) with Clara, because the men are allowed to tell their wives only bits and pieces of what they do during the day, and when the men prepare to go on a campaign in the mountains, it is stressed how "[s]ecrecy was very important . . . even the wives weren't told exactly when they'd be on the move" (106). During the campaigns, Hal is fully focused on the mission, and whereas Clara thinks about him constantly, he often closes himself off from the domestic life to the extent that "if he'd heard her name he wouldn't have recognised it" (120).

It is upon returning from one of these campaigns – and a successful one at that – that the bond between Clara and Hal is completely broken. As I have mentioned earlier, when Hal is on duty, he epitomises the English martial masculinity and behaves in a calculated and self-assured

way, which, according to Nyman (2005, 44-45, 57), is typical for the imperial ideals of Englishness. When the British Empire constructs Englishness for its own purposes, it understandably encourages men to be self-confident invaders and occupiers. The problem arises when Hal comes home, fails to give up the role of the entitled occupier, and takes the colonizer-colonized relationship between himself and Clara from the world of innocent boyhood ideals to the brutal reality of imperialism. He feels a "sharp need" going through him "like rage", forgets "about being careful with her" (145), and rapes his wife.

In the successful operation that Hal has just led, his troops ravaged a cave – used as a hideout by EOKA members – by pouring gasoline into it, burning alive the people inside and capturing the survivors. It is not hard to notice the similarities when Hal returns home and ravages his wife's body. Exactly as an imperialist conqueror who sees himself as superior and, convinced of the justification of his actions, ignores the well-being of the people whose territory he invades, Hal ignores Clara's objections, does not listen what she has to say and denies her sovereign control over her own body, but simply goes and takes what he believes to be "his". When Hal realises that Clara is crying, he hesitates for a moment, but then the false sense of ownership overcomes him and justifies his actions in his mind: he felt "her breath on his fingers, her clean skin, all the other parts of her that were his, and he lost it there" (145). Nevertheless, Hal's behaviour is ultimately a selfish colonial invasion into the most private space of his wife, fuelled by the egocentric feeling of superiority: "His own self was overwhelming him and everything else was far distant" (143). As Shohat and Stam (1994, 142-143) argue, the colonial discourse encourages men to be aggressive masculine conquerors and entitles[45] them to control and dominate the invaded land as they wish; what is more, the occupied territory is often seen as feminine (Shohat and Stam 1994, 141-143). Thus, when Hal rapes his wife, he reverses this thinking: he applies the colonialist behaviour in his marriage and treats Clara as a colonized land.

[45] Cf. the rape of Cypriot women and how the fact that they smelled like the prostitutes "they were entitled to anyway" (180) made it easy for the English soldiers to abuse them.

Thus, in his own marriage, at least for a brief moment, Hal has become the kind of brutal imperialist whose actions in the raids he despises and whom he accuses of crimes against England and God. When Hal rapes Clara and thus colonizes her body, he manifests what Stoler (2010, 42) refers to as defining the categories of colonizer and colonized through sexual control and actions. Significantly, during the rape scene when Clara is described through Hal's eyes, she is attributed with the "feminine" qualities of being silly and obscure, which according to Easthope (1999, 90) and Nyman (2005, 44) are often used in colonial discourse to separate the colonial other from the masculine, objective and entitled Englishness. Clara "looked vague" (143) and "sounded so far away from him" (144) with "her body seemed to go away underneath him" (145), and when Clara tries to tell Hal that it has been awful alone at home with the girls down with measles and that she has not been able to sleep, Hal dismisses her by calling her "silly" (142).

The domestic rape scene solidifies the dichotomy of the colonizer and the colonized between Hal and Clara for a long time. From that moment on "There were no more slow mornings stretched out on sheets that were lit up like landscapes" (151), "Clara turned away from him that morning and other mornings – nights too" (165), and the cold co-existence, reminiscent of the one described between the English colonizers and the colonized Cypriots (for example in the interactions between the army officers and the chairmen of rural villages),[46] replaces the cosy closeness they used to feel. In the relationship with Clara, Hal has abandoned the role of the benevolent head of the family that looks after, serves and protects his wife against the "terrorists" and other wrong-doers of the world. Although Hal does not have a violent personality, the pressures of imperialism have turned him into a marital equivalent of the brutal real-life imperial power that subjugates Clara to pursue his own ends without consulting her in the matter.

Clara's understanding of Hal's transformation is hinted at in an intertextual scene where she reads *The Story of the Fierce Bad Rabbit* (1906) by Beatrix Potter to her children. Despite the

[46] See the exchange between Hal and a *mukhtar* (a Cypriot village elder) on pages 36-37.

fact that she is certainly aware of the developments of Potter's short story while she reads it, she is utterly taken aback and shaken by the words "He doesn't say 'please', he *takes* it" (156, italics original), and forgets about Deirdre who waits for her downstairs. *The Story of the Fierce Bad Rabbit* – which narrates a tale of a bad rabbit who attacks a good rabbit and steals the carrot that a good rabbit's mother has given him – is evoked to demonstrate Hal's behaviour as a "Bad Rabbit" towards his wife, but arguably the implications of the reference extend further than this. According to Nyman (2001, 207), the stories such as Potter's construct the English rabbit "as an emblem of nationalism", and since Hal has grown up immersed in the officially sanctioned imperial nationalism, the juxtaposition between Hal and the Bad Rabbit draws attention to the consequences of Englishness that encourages the Englishmen to be conquerors and invaders: the colonizer cannot afford to say "please", they have to go ruthlessly and take what is not theirs, with a complete disregard for others.

Remarkably, while Clara sees her husband turned into a brute, Hal does not realise his transformation or the forces that are working through him. For a long time, despite the rapidly deteriorating domestic situation, he continues the desperate fight for his "schoolboy land of just hierarchies" (286) in the frontline of the colonial conflict of Cyprus. This is not to say, however, that Hal would not notice the change of atmosphere in his home and in the relationship between himself and Clara. In fact, Hal feels uncomfortable at home, unable to address or approach Clara in any way, starts to be haunted by nightmares (but does not let Clara comfort him), and notices how his own mental well-being is gradually eroded by forces that he does not understand. For example, the smell of burned bodies starts to haunt his dreams, disturbs him even when he is awake, and eventually he finds it impossible to rest.[47]

At home, lying in his own bed surrounded by soft pillows and clean, cool sheets, Hal feels uncomfortable, "like a snail torn out of its shell" (189). Similarly, even when he is on duty,

[47] See 161-162, 201, 233, 315.

Clara fills "his mind with obscure shame" (165), and he feels "her presence, ghostly, pushing him away in mysterious rage, although she had never so much as reproached him" (165). Even the line of his wife's body when she lies in bed – one that had always been familiar to him "like an English landscape" (189) where soft hills and valleys alternate – suddenly loses its familiar qualities and starts to look strange to him: "A coastline at the end of the bed? A cliff. Deep water. Not a home landscape then, an island. He felt a lurching disintegration and struggled for control" (189-190).[48] Just like the gilded benevolent image of the British Empire that wins the hearts and minds of the cooperative colonized is slipping away from him, Hal is also losing control in his private life. Ultimately, Hal starts to avoid spending time at home with his family as much as possible because, in spite of his contempt for office work and repulsiveness of schoolgirl riots, "either one was preferable to going home to Clara's quietly examining face, the impossibility of relaxation and the intolerable sweetness of his daughters" (275-276). When one morning Hal thinks of his family, it reminds him of a film[49] with "a silly story" (296) that he saw long time ago while in Germany, and his family appears to resemble the characters of the movie who

> were being taken over by creatures from another world, which inhabited their bodies so that even those closest to them didn't realise they had changed. They would walk and talk and do all the normal things, but they were unfeeling. Their very wholesomeness was an unnerving deceit because they hid monsters within themselves and didn't know it. (296)

What Hal does not realise is that the deteriorated state of his marriage and Clara's "mysterious rage" with him is not the work of creatures from outer space, but a result of the colonizing mission and his own imperialist behaviour. Because of his upbringing that aimed to mould him into an English military hero and an epitome of martial masculinity, nothing has "equipped Hal to fathom the more intimate aspects of human interaction" (11). In other words, the

[48] "An island" as a defining feature of a foreign landscape that for Hal is radically different from the hills and valleys of home is somewhat surprising, since, as we are familiar with, Great Britain is an island as well, and as Gikandi (1996, 4) argues, after the collapse of the empire, Great Britain has strived to represent its geography as first and foremost insular. Perhaps this again highlights the focus on England rather than Britain, since the English share the island of Great Britain with other nationalities (i.e. the Scots and the Welsh).

[49] Sounds remarkably like *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (1956), although Jones seems to have taken liberties with the chronology, since the film was only launched in the year the events in Cyprus took place and thus it would have been impossible for Hal to see the film long time ago in Germany.

Englishness harnessed for the uses of the British imperialism potentially denies English men many vital interpersonal skills and makes them emotional cripples unable to cope with the situations that arise from their own actions[50] – leaving their bodies merely as tools for the imperial machinery. Frustrated with their inability to address the problems in their personal lives, they resort to violence to maintain control – or at least an illusion of it. In Hal's case this is illustrated when Clara, stretched to the limit by the life in Cyprus, looks for bombs around their house and Hal grabs her "viciously by the arms" (256) and shakes her violently to make her stop.

Soon afterwards, Clara reveals that, as a result of the other "night for which she must forgive Hal" (259), she is pregnant. If the moment when this baby was conceived is considered to be fundamentally a violent act of colonization, the exchange that takes place when Clara breaks the news to Hal resonates as an example of the falsity of the colonial world. Their conversation is perfectly "normal": all the right words are said and Hal calls the news "wonderful" and "marvellous" (265), but the moment lacks feeling and everything is "as if they had studied the words earlier and knew them quite well" (265). As it later turns out, neither of them actually wants the baby, and similarly to the entire colonial project, the moral superiority of Englishness, and all the talk about "hearts and minds", their "civilized" communication on the matter is merely keeping up appearances. As Clara feels the baby move, it sickens her and she thinks that if it even has "a brain the size of a mouse's brain it would know it was unwelcome, had been unwelcome from its conception" (293). Hal, in a similar vein, declares to himself that "He didn't care about the fucking baby" (341), when he hears that Clara has been shot and the foetus is dead. Thus, just like the British Empire that is falling apart around them, another child of a violently forced union, the result of Hal's colonial conquest over his wife's body is doomed not to survive.

It is only during another vicious argument, which flares up when Hal tells Clara that he wants her and the girls to move to Nicosia to be safe, "better off" and closer to "better doctors"

[50] As postcolonial critics have mainly focused on the effects on the colonized, the possible harmful psychological effects on the colonizer have not gained as much attention – even if the psychological effects on both the colonizer and the colonized are, according to Nayar (2010, 4), important issues in the scope of postcolonial theory.

(303) for the unwanted baby, that Clara finally lets it all out. When her pent-up fury is released, Hal starts to realise what the colonial world has done to their relationship: “She turned suddenly and her face was furious; anger he had never seen in her – that he hadn’t known she had but, as she spoke, he realised he had felt for a long time” (303). As Clara lists Hal’s crimes against her and their relationship and says things such as “The only time you’re with me, you hurt me” (304), and “You want me safe, but you hurt me” (305), the truth of the matter slowly dawns on him: “The vast realisation of her feelings, and of his failure, engulfed him . . . He was her enemy. He hadn’t known it” (305). Since the day he arrived in Cyprus, he has been ravaging the country and participating in the abuse and mal-treatment of the colonized, whom he was supposed to be serving and safeguarding. He has also extended the imperialism of the British Empire to his own home, subjugated Clara, and abused her in a similar manner – hurting instead of helping. The English are the enemies of Cyprus; Hal has become the enemy of Clara.

However, in spite of the “vast realisation”, Hal, still immersed in imperial Englishness, fails to distance himself from the position of the colonizer. As long as the forces of colonialism control the marriage and Hal clings on to the remnants of the Englishness he used to know, their relationship is beyond saving. For Clara and Hal to be able to live with each other again, they have to severe the ties to the colonial reality. Clara does indeed move to Nicosia, and it takes her near-death by an assassin for Hal to finally start his retreat from the imperialist project, imposed upon him by the nationalism he has grown into. When he sits by Clara’s hospital bed and recaps their marriage, he understand how the promises he had made to Clara had held until he was assigned to the service in the colony; but when he took her to Cyprus, he broke his promises and ultimately deserted her.

With the English values Hal set to promote trodden in Cypriot dust, and the solemn promises made to Clara broken, Hal spends the night-time hours “in dishonour” (350) by the side of his barely breathing wife. Imperialism has made Hal a brute and a mental wreck, nearly killed

Clara, killed their unborn baby, and destroyed their marriage. There is nothing left to fight for. When Hal takes Clara and the girls to the airport for a flight to England, he uses the power of his rank to be able to join them on the flight. He becomes a deserter, and the scarred family begins the journey "home", where they have to try to find their place in the world where the familiar framework of Englishness has been seriously undermined. In the next subchapter, I will discuss the ideas of homecoming and England as the home of the English characters in *Small Wars*.

4.3. The Homecoming

In *Small Wars*, England is home. But as I have demonstrated above, England is not isolated from the rest of the world, and the destinies of English people are inevitably intertwined with the events of the wide world around it. It is the manner in which the surrounding world is encountered that matters and, as an anti-imperialist novel, Jones's book demonstrates that the Englishness constructed within the imperialist framework for exploitative purposes is not only based on false assumptions of racial superiority, but is also fundamentally harmful for the English people. In this subchapter, I will address the manner in which *Small Wars* distances Englishness from the imperial narrative by focusing on the local constituents of national identity that arise from the landscape, climate and softer aspects of English domesticity. Although English domesticity is constructed as "different" from what is "foreign" (in this case colonial Cyprus), and thus can never escape its colonial past, Jones's novel suggests that the attitudes of mastery and superiority related to it can be abandoned as a step away from imperial Englishness. I will also discuss how Hal and Clara's marriage starts to heal and they slowly find each other again after Hal abandons his imperial mindset, gives up martial masculinity that celebrates control and dominance, and starts to imbibe softer values and emotions that the empire has thus far denied him. However, all this does not

happen automatically upon returning to England. Finding one's place in the postcolonial world is not easy for a nation, and it is not easy for the characters of *Small Wars* either.

When Hal lands with his wife and daughters in southern England and they start a drive across Salisbury Plain, he feels "the English night and his own soul greeting it with quiet recognition of return" (384), but the joy of homecoming is mingled with the harrowing fact that he has "stolen home uninvited" (384). Later, when they are in Clara's parents' home, Hal opens a window and feels the cool and sharp English night-air welcoming him with the homely smell of woodsmoke, slow whisper of the trees, mist on the ground as well as in the air, quietness of the woods and owls hooting in the distance. For Hal, the English night is distinctly more real, more genuine, and friendlier than the air in Cyprus had ever been – not because this is objectively the case, but because he "belongs" there and not in a colony, where he always was an unwelcome intruder in someone else's home. It is explicitly mentioned, for example, how Hal separates the smell of woodsmoke of the bonfires in the autumn from "the other burning smell, which wasn't real" (386), referring to the smell of burned bodies and petrol that haunted him in Cyprus ever since the successful raid of the Cypriot cave mentioned earlier.

It is significant how the English air offers Hal an all-encompassing welcome, while on the other hand his childhood home, in which he had always felt comfortable, "gave him no welcome" (433) at all. His mother cannot meet his eye and his father is obviously disappointed with his son who, after a promising start, failed to live up to the expectations of the family's military history. Furthermore, the very childhood home, the massive Victorian stone building of gloomy halls, cold tiles and chilly corridors, adorned with the tributes to English martial masculinity, has become alien to him. When he arrives there, it does not feel like a home to him anymore, because it is so strongly connected to the image of England he has held throughout his life, but which has now been destroyed. He realises he does not belong to the imperial world built around the Victorian notion of England as a superior nation that rules the waves and whose mighty Empire is a proof of

the nobility of the English "race". He is not the martial masculine hero he was brought up to be, because he has realised the falsity of that world and seen the brutality of colonial reality: the world of imperial heroes "was not for him, not for him any more [sic]; he was not one of them and he could not serve" (436).

The England Hal thought he knew has proven out to be a little more than a fictional narrative constructed for the purposes of the imperial mission, and Hal abandons it. In Baucom's (1999, 5) terms, Hal experiences a sharp turn from the racially and imperialistically defined Englishness towards a more localist and spatially defined national narrative of England. While everything else he ever thought England to be has fallen apart, the place, the spatial England located in the island of Great Britain remains. The hills, meadows, downs, fences, fields, owls, rain and the smell of woodsmoke are still there, and they still welcome him home "with quiet recognition".

For the English people, wounded, changed and suffered inside the grinding imperial machinery, the English landscape is clearly a good and comfortable place to come home to, because it is "legitimately theirs".[51] In fact, if we are to understand "pastoral" as a literary text that describes nature and landscape in celebratory terms (Gifford 1999, 2), the portrayal of English landscape in *Small Wars* has obvious pastoral overtones to it. Nothing negative is ever said about the English rural space: even the infamous English weather is celebrated and the "surprisingly drenching" (394) English rain is welcomed as a refreshing change after the glaring Cypriot sun. Unlike the confusion and contradictions of the spaces in a colony, the idealised English rural space offers stability and clarity. As opposed to the falsity of imperialism and the artificial nature of the colonial spaces such as the garrison in Episkopi, the English countryside offers a place that is first and foremost "real".[52]

[51] Surely England and the island of Great Britain have their own violent histories of conquest, competing rulers and empires that date at least as far back as the Roman invasion, but this is not touched upon in *Small Wars* and the topic is well beyond the scope of the present study.

[52] Here, again, it has to be kept in mind that it is not Cyprus that is artificial, but the colonial space imposed on it. For Cypriots, the hot rocky soil is home – and equally real as England is for the English – and they are ready to defend it against imperialism with their lives, as the actions of EOKA in the novel show.

Furthermore, particularly in Hal's case, the influence of the English countryside reaches beyond the physical experiences of soothing rain after the hot sun and pure and natural smell of woodsmoke after the clinging smell of destruction and invasion, as a strong religious meaning is attached to it as well. As I have explained before, Hal has always seen God and country in synonymous terms and thought that as he served England and its empire, he simultaneously served God. The experiences in Cyprus have broken these connections, and Hal sees Clara's near-death as a celestial revenge for the things he has done in the name of the British Empire. Now back in England, he walks away from the crowd of Remembrance Sunday, rushes across a pasture in a disoriented state and feels how "the universe turned round him blankly and he, within it, earthbound and empty too" (464). There, in the middle of English countryside, he calls for God and has a strong spiritual experience. He hears a whisper, feels a breeze moving around him, and experiences redemption "in the damp winter garden with the small oak tree" (465) which is springing back to life with "almost invisible beginnings of new leaves" and fresh-looking small acorns – and the place "might have been Eden" (465). Because Hal has abandoned the false god of imperialism, God has forgiven him and offers him a fresh start in the garden of rural England, where he can look for a healthier basis for his national identity.

It is worth remembering though, that the strong emphasis on the English landscape as the stable, real, and tangible foundation of Englishness is by no means unique to *Small Wars*, and certainly nothing new. As Baucom (1999, 16, 32) reminds us, such authors as William Wordsworth have sought to define Englishness through the (particularly rural) English spaces. However, while Nyman (2005, 43) stresses that the countryside as the core of Englishness has been a prominent idea throughout the past centuries, Baucom (1999, 5) argues that its position as the first principle of Englishness has been constantly challenged by the racial definition of the nation. What is more, the racial definitions of national identity and racial nationalism – inherently linked to the British Empire and imperial Englishness – have according to Baucom (1999, 5) gained ground in England again

during the last decades of the twentieth century, and as Drayton (2011, 681-682) suggests, gathered further momentum in the post 9/11 world.

Baucom (1999, 3, 5-6, 23-24) argues that defining Englishness through "race" feeds imperialistic attitudes, and it also excludes all but white Anglo-Saxons from the "family" of English nation. Thus, in a time when the English society is becoming extensively multiethnic,[53] the rise of the idea of "English race", and its superior qualities, in public discourse is deeply troubling. In response to the heightened emphasis on "race" in search of the constituents of Englishness in recent years, *Small Wars* travels to the opposite direction and makes a pronounced turn from "race" to place. In portraying the lives of its protagonists seriously harmed by Englishness grounded on the racial definition of the nation, it urges the reader to reconsider the virtues of nationalism based on racial superiority, colonization, and (neo-) imperialism. Typically for a historical novel, Jones's book is at least as much a reaction to the conditions at the time of its writing as it is a narration about the past; the manner in which *Small Wars* simultaneously addresses the atrocities of the colonial past of the British Empire and criticises present-day English imperialism lends strong support to the anti-imperialist reading of the novel.

The mere glorification of the rural landscape of England and the turn from the celebration of "race" to the celebration of place, however, is not alone enough to rescue English people from the grind of the imperial machinery. As Nyman (2005, 42-43) notes, the English countryside has been utilized throughout the nation's history as a breeding ground of imperial Englishness and patriotic embodiments of martial masculinity as well. In its versatility, the countryside can be understood as an alternative to the racial understanding of England, but it can be equally well treated as the "real England" (Nyman 2005, 42), where the racially superior, courageous and patriotic Englishmen are created. In *Small Wars*, Hal is indeed a son of this reading of the English countryside, but it is remarkable how the cruelty of the empire has not only alienated

[53] As mentioned in 2.1, however, the novel does not directly address the matter of immigration and the increasing multiethnicity of Britain from the 1950s onwards in any way.

him from his childhood home, but it has also broken the connection between the all encompassing masculine patriotism and the English countryside. For him, it is no longer a practice field for the English cavalry ready to take over the world, shaped by King Arthur and other heroes from the military history of England. Rather, while it remains solid and trustworthy, it is also something, soft, fresh and welcoming.

As Hal starts to see the natural spaces of England in a new light distanced from imperialism, he also starts to familiarize himself with the softer aspects of the English domestic space. Since the cold, silent, Victorian house of his parents fails to provide a home to him now, he slowly learns to appreciate the soft and cosy things such as soft beds, carpeted floors, narrow hallways and flannel pyjamas.[54] In all his self-pity, Hal feels that he has let everybody down, but at least he has finally brought Clara home safely, and she is now "surrounded by pillows and quilts, all the different soft things that make up an English bed" (387).

Hal's changed perspectives on the English natural and domestic spaces are a part of a larger process in which he seeks to redefine himself and re-envision his place in the world after he has severed the ties with the imperial mission as the foundation of his identity. The emphasis on soft, cosy, and homey things is in stark opposition with the stiff, practical, and cold nature of martial masculinity, which is in many ways a major driving force behind the ideas of legitimized invasion and the urge to conquer. Thus, Hal's new-found focus on the softer matters is a crucial part of the process of turning away from the position of the colonizer and the mindset of imperial Englishness, and this brings along changes to his role as a man as well. To use Webster's (2005, 183) terminology, Hal begins to transform from the pronouncedly masculine "high-minded hero" of the empire into a "new man", a domestic character who represents quiet, more "inward-looking Englishness", much like Clara's father who functions as the voice of anti-imperialist understanding of the national character throughout the novel. This turn does not necessarily mean that Hal isolates

[54] Hal's newfound appreciation of domestic issues can be also interpreted in a more political sense: *Small Wars* can be seen to implicitly suggest that more attention should be paid to the domestic issues in the UK than to the imperialist ventures overseas.

himself from the world, but he becomes more of an observer – he is turning into "a member of the public" (453) for the first time in his life.

Obviously, the transformation is not easy. Like the post-imperial England (Baucom 1999, 3-4), Hal is puzzled and insecure about his place in the new world order. He has to renegotiate his position in the society and working life, but especially in his family life and in his relationship with Clara. It is in the sphere of family where the most notable battles of Hal's transformation from the epitome of martial masculinity into a more domestically orientated "new man" of softer values are fought. As the head of his family, Hal has never been good at expressing his feelings, and has always tried to fulfil his role as the "overbearing patriarch", as Webster (2005, 184) describes the domestic role of the high-minded hero type. But all his attempts to perform the task have merely distanced him from his wife and brought their family at the brink of destruction, and now he cannot imagine Clara would "want anything to do with him" (437). Eventually Clara does stay by his side, but in order to win back his wife and to save their relationship, he must start navigating the uncharted waters of companionate marriage[55] without the facade of dominating masculinity.

When Clara comes to visit Hal in the barracks where he is detained for the hearing about deserting his post, she notices the change in her husband and their relationship starts to heal: "she hadn't expected to feel so much love so quickly. She was disarmed for a moment. He was different. No, he was the same . . . he was shy – and something else" (405). The encounter has a strange atmosphere, where the married couple is perfectly aware of their common history and everything they have been through together, but still it is as if they need to learn to know each other again. The mask of martial masculinity has fallen off and Clara recognises the person whom she has

[55] According to Finch and Summerfield (1991, 6-9, 25), "companionate marriage" is a concept that emerged during the late 1950s, but it is worth noting that this referred to the ideas of "teamwork" and companionship, not to all-encompassing equality between partners, which is a considerably more recent idea. However, in introducing the greater equality between man and wife as a road to a brighter future, *Small Wars* can be seen to speak for the benefits of greater equality between genders (and between the former colonizers and colonized) in the twenty-first century world as well.

always known behind it, but has not encountered face to face, while Hal studies Clara's hand that is described as "familiar as his own hand, as foreign as it could have been to him" (406).

Although the situation is a strange one for both Hal and Clara, a major difference is that while Hal is confused and does not know what to do, Clara feels "quite strong" (409) and senses clarity in the moment. As Hal has abandoned the role of the high-minded masculine hero, Clara has similarly abandoned the role of the obedient and subdued army wife, who only exists to support the patriarch of the family in his important tasks of spreading civilization and order across the world. While Hal is insecure about himself and the future, Clara takes the lead in their marriage. For example, later in London when, sheltering from the rain, they accidentally end up in a cinema where the newsreels from the Suez Crisis and the Middle East are played, Hal is paralyzed by the colonial imagery and the protesting audience, but Clara kisses him and leads him out of the room. Throughout the final chapters of the book, Clara is constantly the more active partner, approaches Hal, and generally helps him to find his feet again.

This, of course, further undermines the prominence of martial masculinity, and suggests that in the post-imperial world, where military discipline and orderly command chains do not work, the softer, more feminine qualities are of greater value than the hard masculine ideals, which only serve the purposes of invading imperialism and domination. At the same time, however, it is worth noticing that manly strength is not entirely disavowed in *Small Wars*. Rather, it is disconnected from the service of the empire and directed to the service of the family, where it creates a balance with feminine qualities. As a case in point, after Clara comforts Hal and guides him out of the cinema in London, Hal picks Clara and her suitcase up lightly, and carries her all the way to the motel to protect her from the rain while Clara tucks her face comfortably into him and puts her arms around his neck.

While Hal learns to love and respect his wife as an equal – not as a colonial subject under his control – he also starts to become closer to his children and learn fatherhood, another

important family role he has thus far shied away from. As I have mentioned before, while in the service of the empire in Cyprus, Hal avoided "the intolerable sweetness of his daughters" (276) and generally took no interest in his offspring, but now, in an obvious attempt to become a proper father to his children, he asks Clara to tell him "anything" (450) about the girls. Although he still needs to "square up" (454) to greet his daughters and is not fully confident as to how to behave as a father, the last page of the book suggests that the children have really received their father back from the empire: when standing in a church, Meg leans against his father's leg "thoughtlessly confident of him" (466).

Hal, Clara and the girls are escaping the grind of the empire. The colonial mission has nearly destroyed them – both as individuals and as a family – but standing together in an English church on Remembrance Sunday, the family is alive and together. Their colonial losses, injuries and pains can never be forgotten or undone, and they have to learn to live with them, but they are offered a new beginning. They have abandoned the colonial project and imperialism that have wounded them and pushed them apart, and now there is "no barrier, no sea, no act committed, not so much as a pane of glass between them; not even air" (466). They have come home to the English soil, but also home to each other. The future may not be trouble-free and it may not always be easy, but at least it is in their own hands, since Hal and Clara have not only abandoned the colonial project overseas, but also abandoned the imperialist mindset. Now, half a century later, as I have argued, *Small Wars* suggests that it is high time for the English nation to do the same.

In this chapter, I have sought to complete my analysis of Englishness and empire in *Small Wars* by turning my focus from the front line to the home front. I have addressed the idea of "domesticity" as referring to the sphere of family and home, but also more politically as the idea of domestic in opposition to foreign, including the idea of nation as well. In 4.1. I discussed the ways in which the English households both in a colony as well as in England are thoroughly influenced by the empire, how imperialism is a pervasive force in the domestic sphere, and how distancing the

domestic from the imperial is in practice impossible. In 4.2. I then turned my attention to the intimate relationships, exemplified in *Small Wars* by Hal and Clara's marriage, which is nearly destroyed by the forces of imperialism beyond their control. The last subchapter, on the other hand, focused on analyzing what kind of solutions Jones's novel offers as alternatives to imperial Englishness. Here, the main strategies seem to be to abandon the militant patriotism, racial definitions of Englishness and martial masculinity in favour of cosy domesticity, more equal gender roles, and the English landscape as the building blocks of national identity.

5. Conclusion

Throughout this study, I have attempted to reveal the ways in which *Small Wars* as an anti-imperialist historical novel participates in the discussions on colonialism and imperialism by emphasizing the influence they have had, and still have, on the construction of Englishness. The novel challenges both the minimal impact thesis and the view that the empire was merely a stage for England to play out its national greatness and fulfil its destiny in leading the "civilized world". Rather, it re-envisions the relationship between the empire and Englishness as an uneven structure where the former entirely controls and dictates the latter and uses it for its own exploitative purposes with a complete disregard for the well-being of English people.

Despite the exclusively English perspective of *Small Wars*, I have hoped to show that it is indeed a postcolonial novel with postcolonial problematics. It discusses the issues of identity, nation and nationalism in relation to colonial and postcolonial developments, and reveals that the problems that arise from the unequal and oppressive nature of colonialism and imperialism do not concern only the oppressed, but the oppressor as well. Colonialism does have a profound influence on both parties, and despite the economic and political benefits, the other effects on the imperial centre are not positive: English men are turned into brutes and learn to hate themselves, families suffer and relationships are torn apart. While imperial Englishness encourages English people to be colonial masters, the high ideals of justice and honesty it supposedly serves prove to be in irreconcilable contradiction with the realities of imperialism.

The novel addresses these postcolonial problematics with the help of its genre, the historical novel. As a historical novel, *Small Wars* reconstructs the past and shows it in a different light from the official English history that tends to downplay the negative effects of colonialism and the atrocities executed by the English colonizers. It reveals history's quieted atrocities such as torture, rape and murder in order to undermine the legitimation of colonialism, but through these and other means it also participates in the discussion of contemporary issues and the presence of

imperialism in the twenty-first century world. As I have explained, these atrocities are not merely a thing of a bygone colonial era, but are a prevailing feature of modern-day imperialism as well. Imperial Englishness is alive and well – or even on the rise – especially in the rhetorics used to legitimize the British military ventures overseas and its participation in the "global war on terror" as the closest ally of the United States of America.

An important entry point to this discussion that operates on two temporal levels, the 1950s and the post 9/11, is the choice of Cyprus as the location of the main body of events in *Small Wars*. As a special kind of historical colony that to this day has its place in the developments of Anglo-American imperialism, Cyprus allows the criticism of imperialism as an ongoing process that has merely changed its form and its rhetorics since the times when the British Empire as a political unit spanned the globe. Throughout its colonial history Cyprus was an anomaly within the British Empire, which rendered it prone to criticism and thus questioned the legitimation of colonialism. Furthermore, the events in the novel take place in the 1950s, which was also the era of rising anti-colonialism not only in the colonies and in the international politics, but in the UK as well. Cyprus featured in discussion extensively due to its peculiar situation and its strategic location close to the Suez Canal and the role the bases on the island had in the controversial events of the Suez Crisis. To this day, the situation of Cyprus remains a politically debated issue: the country is still strictly divided between its Greek and Turkish populations who accuse each other of internal colonization, and even the British colonization of Cyprus is still not entirely over due to the fact that two large military bases still function on the island. These military bases form a continuum from the colonial period to the present day and tie the destinies of England and Cyprus into the complex web of present-day imperialism, since they are used in Anglo-American imperialist ventures and cause friction in the otherwise amicable relationship between the Cypriots and the English.

However, as I have further argued in the course of this study, the effects of colonialism and British imperialism are not limited to the colonized, international politics and the

military, but the personal and domestic spheres of home and family are affected as well. No matter where they are located, the English homes and families in *Small Wars* are profoundly interwoven with the empire that sets parameters to what it means to be English. Homes fail to be safe heavens against the tumults of the world because the empire invades them via economy, media, personal experiences, and fear (either for one's own safety or that of the loved ones). Similarly, the interpersonal relationships are under tremendous strain, exemplified first and foremost through the destiny of Hal and Clara. The empire drives a wedge between them especially by emphasizing patriarchal martial masculinity that encourages men to be invaders and conquerors and entitles them to domination of both the land and the woman. They lose control over their marriage and become strangers to themselves, which nearly destroys their relationship and jeopardizes their mental health.

In addition to introducing the interrelatedness between Englishness and the empire and portraying it as harmful to the English people, *Small Wars* also seems to suggest that a turn away from imperial Englishness is both desirable and possible. England and its people are encouraged to abandon imperialism and assume a position of an observer as well as an equal member in the family of nations. In the novel, this transformation begins as Hal and Clara abandon the colonial mission in Cyprus and return to England, where they have to come in terms with the traumatic experiences of the colonial past and start rebuilding their lives on some other foundation than the imperial service. The constituents of less imperialistically defined Englishness are in the novel drawn from the English landscape as well as from softer values which emphasize the abandoning of racial and patriarchal mindset together with martial masculinity in favour of more equal gender roles and focus on home.

It has to be said that there is nothing strikingly radical or revolutionary about what is being suggested as a replacement for the imperialism-motivated constituents of Englishness, and at times these suggestions might be problematized. For example, even though it is not that directly linked to imperialism and encapsulates the variety of English people better than the racial

definitions, the pastoral admiration of English landscape and nature as a foundation of Englishness to a large extent ignores people such as urban immigrants who form a significant part of the current English population. In addition, postcolonial criticism might wish to question the exclusive focus on the English characters and the way in which the perspective of the colonized is ignored in the novel.

On the other hand, the exclusive focus on the destinies and emotions of the English characters can be seen as a tool to emphasize the negative effects of colonialism and imperialism particularly on the English people and their identities. This also makes *Small Wars* stand out from the main body of postcolonial novels: it is clearly anti-colonialist despite its disregard for the viewpoint of the colonized. In the field of fiction that aims to undermine the legitimacy of colonialism and imperialism, it adds to the charges against these practises by suggesting that ultimately no-one at all benefits from them – not even the people in the ranks of the oppressor.

Thus, despite shortcomings such as the exclusion of the effects and visibility of immigration from the image of England and Englishness portrayed in *Small Wars*, the novel is a fruitful source of discussion and critique as an anti-imperialist text. As such, it could certainly be approached from other perspectives than the one chosen in the present study, and many of the issues touched upon here could be elaborated upon. For example, the novel could be approached more directly and extensively from the point of view of gender relations in English society and Jones's representation of Cyprus, and how it relates to the English tradition of representing the island, might deserve a study of its own as well. Furthermore, the discussion on the interconnected relationship between the domestic and the imperial might deserve much more attention than the mere scratch of the surface that was possible within the scope of the present study.

Even if Jones's novel does have potential for extensive further studies, I believe that the present reading of *Small Wars* as an anti-imperialist historical novel that portrays the British Empire and its imperialist legacy as harmful to English people is both valid and necessary. Several decades after the collapse of the British Empire, we live in a world where imperialism continues to

thrive in Cyprus, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere. As long as Great Britain is an active participant in these processes and the history of its bygone empire is glorified, Englishness continues to be defined within the imperialist framework. Novels such as *Small Wars* form an important platform where the complex repercussions of colonialism and imperialism can be made visible, addressed and questioned. Only by asking these questions can we dream of a world where England – and all other nations – will turn away from imperial oppression that hurts everyone involved.

Works Cited

Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. 1989. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge.

Balfour-Paul, Glen. 1999. "Britain's Informal Empire in the Middle East." *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume IV The Twentieth Century,* ed. Judith M. Brown and Wm. Roger Louis, 490-514. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barker, Chris. 2008. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: SAGE.

Baucom, Ian. 1999. *Out of Place: Englishness, Empire, and the Locations of Identity.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1990. "Introduction: Narrating the Nation." *Nation and Narration*, ed. Homi K. Bhabha. 1-7. London: Routledge.

Bhabha, Homi K. 2004. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Bilgin, Mustafa. 2007. *Britain and Turkey in the Middle East.* London: I. B. Tauris.

Blake, Andrew. 2001. "Writing on the Edge: Britishness and Its European Other." *Text and Nation: Essays on Post-Colonial Cultural Politics*, ed. Andrew Blake and Jopi Nyman, 14-28. Joensuu: Joensuun Yliopistopaino.

Blunt, Alison and Robyn Dowling. 2006. *Home*. London: Routledge.

Bowcott, Owen. 2008. "Nine British Soldiers in Court Accused of Ayia Napa Rampage." *The Guardian* 5 July 2008: 19.

Bowsher, Kerstin. 2005. "(De-)constructing Post-Colonial Identities: A Reading of Novels by Carlos Fuentes and Abel Posse." *Hispanic Research Journal*, 6, 2: 131-145.

Bratton, J. S. 1986. "Of England, Home and Duty: The Image of England in Victorian and Edwardian Juvenile Fiction." *Imperialism and Popular Culture*, ed. John M. MacKenzie, 73-93. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Brendon, Piers. 2007. *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire: 1781-1997*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Brown, Judith M. 1999. "India." *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume IV The Twentieth Century*, ed. Judith M. Brown and Wm. Roger Louis, 421-446. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cain, P.J. and A.G. Hopkins. 1993. *British Imperialism: Crisis and Deconstruction 1914-1990*. London: Longman.

Carr, Rosalind. 2008. “The Gentleman and the Soldier: Patriotic Masculinities in Eighteenth-Century Scotland.” *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 20, 2: 101-121.

Chapman, James. 2005. *Past and Present: National Identity and the British Historical Film*. London: I. B. Tauris.

Chew, Shirley. 2010. “Introduction.” *A Concise Companion to Postcolonial Literature*, ed. Shirley Chew and David Richards, 1-8. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Childs, Peter and R.J. Patrick Williams. 1997. *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*. London: Prentice Hall.

Chippindale, Christopher. 1993 “Putting the ‘H’ in Stonehenge.” *History Today*, 42, 4: 5-8.

Chrisman, Laura. 2004. “Nationalism and Postcolonial Studies.” *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies,* ed. Neil Lazarus, 183-198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clarke, Eric O. 2000. *Virtuous Vice: Homoerotism and the Public Sphere.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Clayton, Anthony. 1999. “‘Deceptive might’: Imperial Defence and Security, 1900-1968.” *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume IV The Twentieth Century,* ed. Judith M. Brown and Wm. Roger Louis, 280-305. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Connery, Christopher and Vanita Seth. 2006. “Forward: Thinking with Cyprus.” *Postcolonial Studies*, 9, 3: 227-229.

De Groot, Jerome. 2010. *The Historical Novel*. London: Routledge.

Demetirou, Chares. 2007. “Political Violence and Legitimation: The Episode of Colonial Cyprus.” *Qualitative Sociology*, 30, 2: 171-193.

Drayton, Richard. 2011. “Where Does the World Historian Write From? Objectivity, Moral Conscience and the Past and Present of Imperialism.” *Journal of Contemporary History*, 46, 3: 671-685.

Easthope, Anthony. 1999. *Englishness and National Culture*. London: Routledge.

Fanon, Frantz. 1968. *The Wretched of the Earth* [1961]. Trans. Constance Farrington. New York: Grove Press.

Featherstone, Simon. 2009. *Englishness: Twentieth Century Popular Culture and Forming of English Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Finch, Janet and Penny Summerfield. 1991. “Social Reconstruction and the Emergence of Companionate Marriage, 1949-1959.” *Marriage, Domestic Life and Social Change: Writings for Jacqueline Burgoyne 1944-88,* ed. David Clark, 6-27. London: Routledge.

Giddens, Anthony. 2001. *Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity.

Gifford, Terry. 1999. *Pastoral*. London: Routledge.

Gikandi, Simon. 1996. *Maps of Englishness: Writing Identity in the Culture of Colonialism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gillan, Audrey and Signe Daugbjerg. 2006. "Parents Vent Fury at Early Release of Daughter's Killers." *The Guardian* 19 August 2006: 12.

Gillan, Audrey. 2008. "Nine British Soldiers Charged after Bar Brawl in Cyprus." *The Guardian* 4 February 2008: 7.

Green, Michael. 1991. "Social History, Literary History, and Historical Fiction in South Africa." *Journal of African Cultural Studies*, 12, 2: 121-136.

Gregory, Derek. 2004. "The Angel of Iraq." *Environment & Planning D: Society and Space*, 22, 3: 317-324.

Hall, Catherine. 2001. "British Cultural Identities and the Legacy of the Empire." *British Cultural Studies: Geography, Nationality, and Identity*, ed. David Morley and Kevin Robins, 27-39. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hall, Stuart. 1992. "The Question of Cultural Identity." *Modernity and Its Futures*, ed. Stuart Hall, David Held and Tony McGrew, 273-325. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hall, Stuart. 1996. "Ethnicity: Identity and Difference." *Becoming National: A Reader*, ed. Geoff Geoff and Ronald Grigor Suny, 339-349. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hobsbawm, E. J. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holland, Robert and Diana Markides. 2006. *Britain and the Hellenes: Struggles for Mastery in the Eastern Mediterranean 1850-1960*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holroyd, Stuart. 1969. *The English Imagination*. London: Longmans.

The Holy Bible, English Standard Version. 2007. Wheaton: Crossway Bibles.

Husemann, Harald. 1970. *Britain's Political and Military Position in the Commonwealth and in the Western Alliance since 1945.* Kiel: der Christian-Albrechts-Universität.

Jokinen, Arto. 2000. *Panssaroitu Maskuliinisuus*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Jones, Sadie. 2010. *Small Wars*. London: Vintage.

Kaplan, Amy. 2009. "Manifest Domesticity." *American Studies: An Anthology*, ed. Janice A. Radway, Kevin K. Gaines, Barry Shank and Penny Von Eschen, 17-25. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kumar, Krishan. 2001. "'Englishness' and English National Identity." *British Cultural Studies: Geography, Nationality, and Identity*, ed. David Morley and Kevin Robins, 41-55. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lazarus, Neil. 2004a. "Introducing Postcolonial Studies." *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies,* ed. Neil Lazarus, 1-16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lazarus, Neil. 2004b. "The Global Dispensation since 1945." *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies,* ed. Neil Lazarus, 19-40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, Yoon Sun. 1997. "A Divided Inheritance: Scott's Antiquarian Novel and the British Nation." *ELH*, 64, 2: 537-367.

Loomba, Ania. 1998. *Colonialism – Postcolonialism.* London: Routledge.

Louis, Roger Wm. 1999. "Foreword." *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume III, The Nineteenth Century,* ed. Andrew Porter, vi-iii. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lukács, Georg. 1981. *The Historical Novel,* trans. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Luke, Harry. 1957. *Cyprus: A Portrait and an Appreciation*. New York: Roy Publishers.

MacKenzie, John M. 1999. "The Popular Culture of Empire in Britain." *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume IV The Twentieth Century*, ed. Judith M. Brown and Wm. Roger Louis, 212-231. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McLeod, John. 2000. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

McLeod, John. 2010. "Nation and Nationalisms." *A Concise Companion to Postcolonial Literature*, ed. Shirley Chew and David Richards, 97-119. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Mezey, Jason Howard. 2006. "Neocolonial Narcissism and Postcolonial Paranoia: *Midnight's Children* and the 'Psychoanalysis' of the State." *Interventions: The International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, 8, 2: 178-192.

Michaels, Walter Benn. 2003. "Empires of the Senseless: (The Response to) Terror and (the End of) History." *Radical History Review*, 85: 105-113.

Morgan, Tabitha. 2010. *Sweet and Bitter Island: A History of the British in Cyprus*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Nayar, Pramond K. 2010. *Postcolonialism: A Guide for the Perplexed*. London: Continuum.

Niederhoff, Burkhard. 2009. "Focalization." *Handbook of Narratology*, ed. Peter Hühn, John Pier, Wolf Schmid and Jörg Schönert, 115-123. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Nyman, Jopi. 2001. "Re-Reading Rudyard Kipling's 'English' Heroism: Narrating Nation in *The Jungle Book*." *Orbis Litteratum*, 56, 3:205-220.

Nyman, Jopi. 2005. *Imagining Englishness: Essays on the Representation of National Identity in Modern British Culture*. Joensuu: Joensuun yliopistopaino.

Philiposse, Liz. 2007. "The Politics of Pain and the End of Empire." *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 9, 1: 60-81.

Porter, Andrew. 1999a. "Preface." *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume III, The Nineteenth Century*, ed. Andrew Porter, ix-xi. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Porter, Andrew. 1999b. "Introduction: Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth Century." *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume III, The Nineteenth Century*, ed. Andrew Porter, 1-28. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Price, Christopher. 1996. "Cyprus Rape and Killing Case: Why is the Army There Anyway?" *New Statesman & Society* 9, 394: 8.

Randle, Michael. 1987. "Non-Violent Direct Action in the 1950s and 1960s." *Campaigns for Peace: British Peace Movements in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Richard Taylor and Nigel Young, 131-161. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Renan, Ernst. 1990. "What is a Nation?" Trans. Martin Thorn. *Nation and Narration*, ed. Homi K. Bhabha, 8-22. London: Routledge.

Said, Edward W. 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.

Shohat, Ella and Robert Stam. 1994. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. London: Routledge.

Simpson, Michael. 2005. "Wavering on Europe: Walter Scott and the Equilibrium of the Empires." *Romanticism*, 11, 2: 127-142.

Sivanandan, Tamara. 2004. "Anticolonialism, National liberation, and Postcolonial Nation Formation." *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*, ed. Neil Lazarus, 41-65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Slemon, Stephen. 1991. "Modernism's Last Post." *Past the Last Post: Theorizing Post-Colonialism and Post-Modernism*, ed. Ian Adam and Helen Tiffin, 1-12. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Smith, Helena. 2002. "Greek Cypriots Turn against British Bases." *The Guardian online*. 30 September 2002. [Internet] Guardian News and Media Limited. Available from http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2002/sep/30/military.cyprus [Accessed 13 March 2012]

Stavros Stavrou, Karayanni. 2004. *Dancing Fear and Desire: Race, Sexuality, and Imperialism in Middle Eastern Dance.* Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Stoler, Ann Laura. 2010. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Upstone, Sara. 2009. *Spatial Politics in the Postcolonial Novel*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Webster, Wendy. 2005. *Englishness and Empire 1939-1965*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weedon, Chris. 2004. *Identity and Culture*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Williams, Rachel. 2008. "Armed Forces: Jury Clears Soldiers of Cyprus Bar Brawl." *The Guardian* 2 August 2008: 13.

Wiseman, Eva. 2009. "Even when we do talk, we often lie." *The Observer* 29 August 2009: 21.

Young, Robert J.C. 2001. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Young, Robert J.C. 2003. *Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zarakol, Ayse. 2011. "What Makes Terrorism Modern? Terrorism, Legitimacy, and the International System." *Review of International Studies*, 37, 5: 2311-2336.