



This translation was created for the purposes of archiving and does not originate from the original creators of the text.

80 Years on the Right's Tail: AKEL according to Andreas Ziartides (Online Article)

Historical Note

This online article was published on the [group 1917](#) website on 07/10/22.

Content

80 Years on the Right's Tail: AKEL according to Andreas Ziartides

"The Communists are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole." - Marx and Engels, Manifesto of the Communist Party

"[T]he Social-Democrat's ideal should not be the trade union secretary, but the tribune of the people, who is able to react to every manifestation of tyranny and oppression, no matter where it appears, no matter what stratum or class of the people it affects; who is able to generalise all these manifestations and produce a single picture of police violence and capitalist exploitation; who is able to take advantage of every event, however small, in order to set forth before all his socialist convictions and his democratic demands, in order to clarify for all and everyone the world-historic significance of the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat." - Lenin, What Is to be Done

"[T]he final goal of socialism constitutes the only decisive factor distinguishing the Social-Democratic movement from bourgeois democracy and from bourgeois radicalism, the only factor transforming the entire labour movement from a vain effort to repair the capitalist order into a class struggle against this order, for the suppression of this order." - Luxemburg, Reform or Revolution

This text is a peculiar critical approach to AKEL as a political force in Cyprus, based on Andreas Ziartides' autobiography *Without Fear and Passion* (1995).[1] It is a selective book review which aims to highlight that the main characteristic of AKEL, since its foundation in 1941, is that it is the tail of the Cypriot nationalist right. Contrary to the popular narrative that AKEL was a communist party that eroded and decayed over time betraying its history, I argue that AKEL was from its inception a bourgeois party whose main concern was to be accepted by the nationalist right rather than to lead a class struggle on the island.

Of course, the fact that the text is based on a single source and the author's experience of the AKEL in the present, is a disadvantage. On the other hand, however, the testimony of Andreas Ziartides is of particular weight since Ziartides was one of the founders and leaders of AKEL for 50 years, as well as the leader of the trade union movement of PEO from its foundation until 1990. It also stands out for the fact that it was written after Ziartides' expulsion from AKEL, which allows him to speak more freely and critically about the party. Finally, many of the facts that Ziartides recounts about the activities of PEO and AKEL are documented and cannot be disputed. So, yes, more study of AKEL's history is needed to support the conclusion of the text, but I believe that Ziartides' testimony is important evidence in favour of the text's conclusion. If anything, the text tells us what AKEL was if we believe one of its leaders, Andreas Ziartides.

The thread that runs through Ziartides' autobiography *Without Fear and Passion* is the cowardice of AKEL and its acting as a tail in the face of the Cypriot nationalist right. This characteristic of AKEL is evident in almost all the chapters of the book, forming their connecting link and ultimately showing that in its essence AKEL was a bourgeois party of the right. The autobiography does not deal at all with left communist ideology and has not a single reference to the Marxist goal of the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism. This is indicative of the fact that the policy of AKEL and PEO did not follow any communist ideology nor did it have a revolutionary objective. The paper briefly reviews the various important milestones in AKEL's history to highlight AKEL's acting as a tail of the right and its tragic consequences.

1. The opportunist nationalism of AKEL

As Ziartides tells us, AKEL was founded in 1941 by members of the Communist Party of Cyprus (CPC) and progressive bourgeois of the time. (16-7) There was already a small trade union movement from the 1930s, which, according to Ziartides, was then composed of 3-4 thousand people. (18) This was a tense period as the trade union movement wavered around the demand of the nationalist right for union with Greece [enosis]. As Ziartides tells us, within the working class "there were two tendencies with regard to the national problem and in particular with regard to the enosis demand which was then being cultivated among the masses of the people. The Communists viewed the demand for enosis in a negative way. They were influenced by the old slogan of the Communists of Cyprus, the pre-1931 Communists. The second tendency was the nationalist tendency, which was influenced by bourgeois nationalist propaganda, and I would say that this tendency was supported at that time by the great majority of the workers." (17-8) Although in the small trade union movement of the time the pro-enosis nationalist workers were not a majority, they were the great majority in the working class of Cyprus as a whole.

The first major issue on which AKEL was called upon to take a stand was therefore the national one. Before the founding of AKEL, the CPC was against the demand of Enosis: for example, it did not participate in the fundraising in solidarity with Greece after the torpedoing of the warship 'Elli' by the Italians in 1940. According to Ziartides, this policy was sectarian and wrong in that it removed the majority of nationalist workers from the trade union movement. (18-9) With its emergence, AKEL abandoned the anti-enosis attitude of the CPC and adopted the demand of enosis: "With its emergence, the legal one, AKEL succeeded in reducing the suspicion that existed in the people against the Communists. By adopting the policy of the national restoration of Cyprus, we as Communists finally abandoned our refusal of Enosis because we explained that national restoration is nothing else than Enosis and this helped the trade union movement to become a mass movement." (23)

As can be seen from Ziartides' words, AKEL's main concern at that time was to avoid "the stigma of being anti-national", in order to become a mass party. There was the notion of reducing the suspicion

that existed in the world about communists. So, for mainly opportunist reasons, AKEL adopted the nationalist demand of enosis. (46) Instead of attempting to elevate the nationalist consciousness of the working class into a class anti-capitalist consciousness, AKEL bowed to the existing consciousness in order to win supporters. This choice goes against the very basics of the Marxist ideology that AKEL was supposedly espousing at the time. As Lenin points out, the working class alone can only acquire a workers', trade unionist consciousness, i.e., the conviction that it must fight the employers for its own immediate daily interests and demand workers' legislation from the government. The task of a socialist/communist party is to raise the consciousness of the proletariat to a class consciousness, i.e., a consciousness of the necessity of overcoming capitalism. For this, according to Lenin, "we must take up actively the political education of the working class and the development of its political consciousness." [2]

AKEL's pro-enosis nationalism is clear in the 1940s. In 1944 Sir Cosmo Parkinson visited Cyprus in order to negotiate with representatives of the Cypriot people the future of Cyprus after the Second World War. AKEL was strong at the time, controlling two municipalities and the rising trade union movement, so it could take the lead in the talks. According to Ziartides, however, AKEL was the most fanatical supporter of the position that there should be no contact with Sir Kosmos: "AKEL organised mass militant demonstrations at the time under the slogan 'Down with Sir Cosmo', 'Long live national restoration and the Union [Enosis] of Cyprus with Greece'. (57) In 1947, AKEL changed its stance and dared to participate in the Diaskeptiki, the only political force in the country to do so. As Ziartides testifies, the right wing waged a fierce struggle against Diaskeptiki, "charged with anti-AKEL and anti-leftist propaganda, [...] charged with epithets against the participants, as traitors, as people who undermine the basic desire of the Cypriot people for Enosis." (59) AKEL could not withstand this demagogic attack by the right and withdrew from the Conference: "The weight of this demagoguery and the attack we suffered resulted in our yielding." (60) The need for acceptance by the nationalist right and the nationalist working class proved stronger than any ideological, theoretical and strategic positions of the party on the national question.

Ziartides regretted in retrospect the uncompromising pro-enosis stance of AKEL towards both Sir Cosmos and during the Diaskeptiki, as it undermined the relations between the two communities in Cyprus. (65) It is important to note, however, that he regretted it for tactical, rather than ideological anti-nationalist reasons. Until his death, Ziartides considered the goal of enosis to be a correct position on the part of AKEL; the mistake for him was that AKEL and the Greek Cypriot side in general misjudged and underestimated the reactions of the Turkish factor in Cyprus and ignored the existence of the Turkish Cypriots on the island. (217-9) He believes that AKEL and the Greek Cypriot side should have been more pragmatic and focused on demands for political and democratic rights that would gradually lead to self-government and eventually to Enosis. (218) The only mistake was AKEL's maximalism: "We made the mistake of insisting on the maximum of our demand, which was enosis, and closed our eyes to the possibilities that existed for democratic developments in our country." And: "We continued to push for enosis and found ourselves in the position of being powerless to control the spontaneity of the popular masses, whose spontaneity we cultivated." (218)

Another negative result of AKEL's pro-enosis stance was the withdrawal of the Turkish Cypriots from the Greek Cypriot trade unions and the creation of new Turkish Cypriot trade unions. Initially, PEO's trade unions were Cypriot and bi-communal, not Greek Cypriot, with the participation of many Turkish Cypriot workers. (49) The first Turkish Cypriot unions appeared in 1942 and their emergence, as Ziartides points out, coincided with the organisation of AKEL and the rise of the enosis frenzy on the island. This frenzy increased the suspicion between the two communities and many Turkish Cypriot members of PEO disagreed with the demand of enosis and left, leading to the creation of Turkish Cypriot unions. (50) According to Ziartides, the split of the trade union movement along national lines

was a regrettable but inevitable development since PGC[ΠΣΕ]-PEO supported the demand for enosis: "The trade union movement of PEO faced the following dilemma: To follow a path of indifference and abstention from the National Political Struggle in order not to displease the Turkish Cypriot workers and lose them from its membership, or not. I believe that we could not, could not be allowed to stay away from the National Political Struggle." (52)

In other words, AKEL and PEO considered the demand of Enosis and its acceptance by the nationalist right more important than not splitting the working class of Cyprus along ethnic lines. While Marx stressed in the Communist Manifesto that "working men have no country" and that the task of communists in "the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, [is to] point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality", AKEL did the exact opposite: it put the national demand of the Greek Cypriot working class for enosis above the common class interests of the multi-communal Cypriot proletariat. Ziartides also mentions other nationalist mistakes of AKEL, such as the inequality in its treatment of Turkish Cypriot workers. Most trade union constitutions and leaflets were written only in Greek, and most discussions were also held in Greek, with no meaningful participation of Turkish Cypriot workers. AKEL took some measures and improved this situation with the creation of the Turkish office of PEO, but eventually, in 1958, PEO instructed the remaining Turkish Cypriot workers in its ranks to transfer to the Turkish Cypriot trade unions as they were beginning to be murdered by Turkish Cypriot nationalists. The game was long lost.

AKEL's nationalism continued after the independence of Cyprus in 1960. AKEL rejected the Zurich-London agreements because of its pro-enosis stance, which it held despite the fact that Greece had been a member state of imperialist NATO since 1952. AKEL then supported Makarios and began to move away from the idea of Enosis, but this change was again for opportunistic reasons: as Ziartides says, "AKEL realised after the [1960] elections that Makarios was the man supported by the vast majority of the people. Two-thirds of the people and that it was a mistake to oppose him in a sterile way. So it took the position that we would support Makarios where we agreed with him and criticize him where we disagreed with his policies." (94-5) In other words, AKEL's criterion for its critical support for Makarios was that he was popular with the people. Ziartides praises Makarios at several points in his autobiography, avoiding talking about the latter's paramilitary organizations and claiming that he was not an authoritarian despite much historical evidence to the contrary. (92) Nor is there any critical reference to the events of '63 that led to the ghettoisation of the Turkish Cypriots, which AKEL, together with the rest of the right, called a 'Turkish mutiny'.

During the Greek Junta period, while EDEK was organising demonstrations against it, "AKEL was 'careful' not to push Makarios into any confrontation with the Junta", fearing a possible conflict, which eventually came. (79-80) As Ziartides says tellingly, "it is typical of our fears and reservations about clashing with the Junta that the party leadership of the OMONOIA Association gave its consent for the Association, through Aslanides, to accept a financial grant from the Junta and to have the photo of the Junta officer displayed in the central hall of the Association." (80) After Makarios' death, AKEL supported and twice elected the adamant nationalist and opponent of rapprochement Spyros Kyprianou to the presidency of the country. According to Ziartides, "as far as the Cyprus problem was concerned, AKEL's views at the time did not differ much from those of Spyros Kyprianou" (111). Although AKEL understood the need for compromise in order to achieve the rapprochement of the two communities and the reunification of the island, it supported Kyprianou out of anti-DISY sentiment. (171) As for the more recent history, it is well known: AKEL cowardly rejected the Annan plan, as the Christofias government it did not dare to make much progress in the talks, and in 2022 it has as its presidential candidate the Anastasiades government negotiator who led the BBF talks to a definitive wreck. AKEL's responsibilities for the ethnic division of Cyprus are many and great.

2. Interclass unionism and 'progressive' Cypriot employers

Needs Turkish Translation, Online Articles, 1917 (Group), Decade 2020-2029, 2022, AKEL, Undefined Location

From:

<https://movementsarchive.org/> - Κυπριακό Κινηματικό Αρχείο

Cyprus Movements Archive

Kıbrıs Sosyal Hareket Arşivi

Permanent link:

https://movementsarchive.org/doku.php?id=en:digital:1917:akel_ziartides&rev=1733433726

Last update: 2025/04/20 19:44

