

This article is the **second** part of a two-part article. The first part appeared in [Issue 39](#) of [Entos ton Teihon](#).



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

## the "self-evident truths" of social patriotism (part b) (dialogue)

publishing group [workers' democracy](#)

---

*This article was received by "Within the Walls" in November '88, and [the first part](#) was published (without mentioning who the authors were, because of lack of editorial oversight) in March '89. Thus dates mentioned at the end of the article, belonged to the future when the article was received, while now they belong to the past. However, since then, important events have occurred that strengthen the politics of the article.*

---

The "incompetent" Greek Cypriot bourgeoisie became self-sufficient very quickly after 1960. From '64 onwards, the development of the Greek Cypriot bourgeoisie was such that it allowed it to take over the "neo-colonial" state of Zurich and turn it into its own independent centre of control of capitalist accumulation in the Cypriot region and a base for economic infiltration in the "underdeveloped" surrounding region, neutralising the "restrictions" imposed on it by the Turkish Cypriots and the Zurich agreements. Even the British bases that remained were never an obstacle to its development, on the contrary, they ensured "peace" and "tranquility" in the same areas of the Middle East where it was also extending its small but imperialist hands to grab what it could.

What else was left to do to realize "national independence" so that Eliades and others would not consider it "incompetent"? The union of "all of Cyprus" with Greece? The forced "reunification" of Cyprus against the will of the Turkish Cypriots? Or being able to "look after" its own interests in the region with its own, "independent" bases and not with those of the British or with accommodations to the Americans?

However, the myth that it is "imperialist dependence that nurtured and created the conditions of intercommunal bloodshed, chauvinism and intolerance" as Eliades writes, prevails. But no one has a convincing explanation why American and NATO imperialism would want to create a split in its south-eastern wing. Instead, this convenient patriotic insistence on blaming everything on "foreign" imperialism prevents them from seeing something much more fundamental. That ethnic conflicts like the one in Cyprus are the result of **capitalism**, of the factionalism and competition that lies at the heart of the system itself at all levels, in all its individual parts, and appears wherever it finds the opportunity. The "foreign thumbs" may shape them in one way or another, but to believe that they are the ones causing them is at best patriotic naivety and complacency, if not racism in reverse ("WE wouldn't have been fooled if we were left alone").

### **Analysis of the particular” 3: Were the French colonialists in Algeria “cheap labour”?**

Where Ch. Eliades gives a great example of how not to avoid “ ahistorical generalisation” is by equating the Turkish settlers, the vast majority of whom are migrant workers, with the French colonialists in Algeria before '62:

*“But apart from the Cypriot “social patriots” and the Palestinians, the Algerian revolutionaries showed similar “racist” feelings towards the French settlers whose removal they sought and achieved with the independence of Algeria (1962). ... the French revolutionary workers' organisations not only did not consider the removal of the French settlers as 'barbarism' but considered their removal as an expression of the implementation of the principle of self-determination of the Algerian people!”*

What relationship can French landowners, senior state officials, oil company executives and privileged French workers of colonial Algeria have with the Turkish “settlers” whom they all accuse of causing problems for Turkish Cypriots as “cheap labour”, working even below the legal minimum wage?

For the “marxism” of Ch. Eliades, it is not the actual economic and social situation that determines the character of the Turkish settlers and separates them from the French in Algeria, and thus the attitude we should take towards them, but the common factor that they are both foreigners. And this seems to be the only thing that Ch. Eliades considers. Both the French colonialists and the Turkish settlers, after all, crossed the sea from the north to come here. Since it was progressive that the local Algerians sent the French northwards, it would be equally progressive for us to send the Turkish settlers in the same direction. The fact that Algerians were the “cheap labour” in Algeria is of no importance to Ch. Eliades.

To the extent that Ch. Eliades understands that this contradiction exists, he solves it by baptizing the Turks as “settlers”, instruments of Turkish imperialism, and gets rid of the issue. That the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot bourgeoisie are trying to use the “settlers” for their own purposes (one of which is to use them as cheap labour) there is no doubt. God forbid if the only thing determining the Marxists' attitude towards a section of the working class was the goals the bourgeoisie wants to serve by using this section, unless we are told that the “settlers” are organised fascists and cops posing as cheap labour. But then how do you explain that in Davlos the “Turkish Cypriots and the Turkish settlers living in the area” took on the big businessman Asil Nadir and his multinational company “Polly Peck” and clashed with the police to resist their plans to “develop” the area? (“NEA” 22/12/88). Such would be the attitude of the settlers if they were “instruments” of Denktaş and the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot bourgeoisie?

After all, if the settlers and Turkish Cypriot bourgeoisie want to use the settlers to serve the goal of demographic change that will further their reactionary national interests, their expulsion would serve the reactionary goal of violent demographic reversion that will serve the equally reactionary national interests of the Greek and Greek Cypriot bourgeoisie. What should determine our attitude is the economic and social reality, the class position of the settlers as one of the most oppressed sections of the working class in northern Cyprus. The solidarity of the workers of the different ethnicities is not a “Christian” feeling, as Ch. Eliades wants to describe it. It is the essence of workers' internationalism.

### **Analysis of the particular 4: The State of Israel is similar to the TRNC**

In this “specific analysis”, of course, Ch. Eliades has not been a pioneer at all. The hypocritical propagandistic exploitation of the Palestinian struggle by Greek Cypriot patriots is on the agenda, especially in the last year with the heroic “intifada”. The catchphrase of the campaign is 'Cyprus Palestine common struggle'. And Eliades' corresponding words are:

*"It would be extremely interesting if Workers' Democracy could enlighten us as to whether **by the same reasoning** it recognizes the right of the Zionist state of Israel (1947) to exist, which under the pretext of securing the democratic rights of the Jewish people.... placed the whole of Palestine under Zionist occupation."*

Of course we are on the side of the Palestinians and against the existence of the Zionist state of Israel. But here in Cyprus, who were the real Palestinians? Slums like the ones we see on TV where the Palestinians live only the Turkish Cypriots had in Cyprus. And as for sieges of camps, levelings and demolitions, does anyone remember what happened from '63 to '67 in Cyprus? What happened in Omorfita in 1963? In Kofinou in 1967, about the events of which even Papandreou said:

*"It was indeed a great provocation to Turkey. There were also **slaughters and looting**" (Speech of Papandreou in the Parliament on the "opening of the Cyprus file" 21/2/86).*

Nobody remembers? If we all do not accept the "right" of the Israelis to oppress the Palestinians and recognize the latter's right to self-determination, then why not recognize the right of self-determination for the Turkish Cypriots? Because they do not have, as Ch. Eliades, a "compact national-geographical" space? It may not be "historical", but this is something that might be of concern to bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalists, not Marxists.

But Eliades, along with all the other social patriots or mere patriots, parties, the church, etc., has an "irrefutable" argument: "We don't accept the finality of violence". As he puts it:

*"this state (TRNC) has now materialized under specific conditions of barbarism and is the product of the displacement of the indigenous inhabitants, of military occupation and of mass colonization."*

And he thinks he has settled the issue so well that he asks us to quote him "even one (only one) specific Leninist quote stating that the right to create a state implies the seizure and occupation of the territories of others, the displacement of the legitimate indigenous inhabitants of those territories..." etc. Of course Lenin didn't write such bullshit, just as we never said that the Turkish invasion was "necessary" or "justified". It's just that Eliades, as a patriot, believes that anyone who is not with him is a friend of his enemy.

We had answered all this long before Eliades put this "irrefutable" challenge to us. In the relevant section of the book ["The Cyprus problem"](#) we wrote:

Before '74 the populations were indeed mixed and there was of course no way the Greek Cypriot revolutionaries could ask for separation of populations as a solution to the problem of ethnic oppression of Turkish Cypriots. However, they could and should have fought against the ethnic oppression of the Turkish Cypriots by the Greek Cypriot bourgeoisie within the state that existed at the time, and to uphold their basic democratic rights....

But all this ceased to apply after '74. There are no more mixed populations in Cyprus. But the hypocritical response of the bourgeoisie to this is the "fait accompli of the invasion" and the "human rights" of the refugees in Cyprus.

That is, they say that the populations are no longer mixed because of **war violence** and that this "fait accompli" must and can be changed. What is our response to this argument?

First, it's good to remember that separation of populations and refugees as "the fait accompli of

violence" existed before '74, and the Greek Cypriot bourgeoisie and politicians who are nowadays busting their asses over the "fait accompli of violence" achieved by their enemy, were responsible for it then.

Second, what should be the attitude of revolutionaries towards the various "fait accompli" for which the working class is **not responsible**? The Marxist tradition treats the results of historical processes without moralising and independently of the aims and intentions of those who made them. What is of interest is what the new situation that has taken shape is and what it leads or can lead to.

*"The bourgeoisie makes it its business to promote trusts, drive women and children into the factories, subject them to corruption and suffering, condemn them to extreme poverty. **We do not "demand" such development, we do not "support" it. We fight it. But how do we fight? We explain that trusts and the employment of women in industry are progressive. We do not want a return to the handicraft system, pre-monopoly capitalism, domestic drudgery for women. Forward through the trusts, etc., and beyond them to socialism!** (Lenin, English Collected Works, vol. 23 p. 81)."*

*"England, it is true, in causing a social revolution in Hindostan, was **actuated only by the vilest interests**, and was stupid in her manner of enforcing them. But that is not the question. The question is, can mankind fulfil its destiny without a fundamental revolution in the social state of Asia? If not, whatever may have been the crimes of England she was the unconscious tool of history in bringing about that revolution. (K. Marx "The British Rule in India" from "Marx Surveys from Exile", Pelican, p. 306)."*

*"All the English bourgeoisie may be forced to do will neither emancipate nor materially mend the social condition of the mass of the people, depending not only on the development of the productive powers, but on their appropriation by the people. But what they will not fail to do is to lay down the material premises for both. **Has the bourgeoisie ever done more? Has it ever effected a progress without dragging individuals and people through blood and dirt, through misery and degradation?**" (K. Marx: The Future Results of the British Rule in India, Ibid, p. 323).*

So the fact that the situation after '74 was shaped by the "force of arms", that it is a "fait accompli of the invasion", does not mean that we have any duty to support "our" bourgeoisie to return to the period of Greek Cypriot rule and racist oppression of Turkish Cypriots, to persecute settlers and the like. The fact that the current situation is the result of the "fait accompli" cannot be decisive for the revolutionaries. After all, the vast majority of the world's current borders are the result, in one way or another, of some "acts of violence", sometimes distant in time and sometimes quite recent...

Separation is now an event which the revolutionaries and workers neither wished for nor have any responsibility for; it is a **reality**, a "fait accompli" created by capitalism by force and with terrible consequences for the workers and peasants, such as the change by British colonialism of Indian society by force and so much more. The revolutionaries, unlike the hypocritical bourgeois, "recognise the fait accompli", i.e. the present reality, and are looking for how to move forward, starting from this reality.

The entrenchment of Turkish Cypriots and Turkish settlers in a separate region is by now an indisputable fact. The integration of the refugees in the South, i.e. their transformation into proletarians, petty bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie is also a fact; today there are no refugees as a

separate social category. It would of course have been our duty, before these things happened, to fight against the war and its results, the barbaric population movements through the fault of both the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot bourgeoisie from '63 to '74, although it was never our duty to fight against the migration of Turks from Turkey to Cyprus in order to preserve the "Greekness of Cyprus". But now our duty is to fight to move forward starting from what presently exists: the geographical separation, the "sympathies" and will of the Turkish Cypriots, and the settlement of poor settlers from Turkey in the North. ("[CYPRUS and the Internationalist Duties of the Greek Cypriot Revolutionaries](#)" pp. 178-181.)

From:

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

Cyprus Movements Archive

Kıbrıs Sosyal Hareket Arşivi

Permanent link:

[https://movementsarchive.org/doku.php?id=en:magazines:entostonteixon:no\\_41:ergatiki&rev=1737116377](https://movementsarchive.org/doku.php?id=en:magazines:entostonteixon:no_41:ergatiki&rev=1737116377)

Last update: 2025/04/20 19:47

