



The translation below was created for the purposes of archiving and does not originate from the original creator of the text.

Neither Davos not non-Davos (Text)

Historical Note

This text was written by [Anarchist Group Anafentos](#) in 1988 in Limassol.

It was located in the [fourth issue](#) of [Traino stin Poli](#), from which this PDF file originates. It remains unknown whether the text was published outside the magazine.

Content



- The text contains missing parts, due to the poor quality of the photocopy we found. They have been noted in the typing below through the use of [brackets].

NEITHER DAVOS NOR NON-DAVOS

Or Why we are indifferent to the schemes of all kinds of clowns of power

AN ANTI-AUTHORITARIAN PROPOSAL

THE NATION-STATE, NATIONALISM, AND THE COMPETING RULING CLASSES

1.

If there is a problem today that can be defined as the “Cyprus problem”, it certainly cannot be confined within the territorial framework of Cyprus, nor within the time frame of the period after '74, '60 or even '50. The problem has its roots much deeper in history and stems from the competition between the two imperialist - and therefore expansionist - states of Greece and Turkey for economic, political and military dominance in the region.

2.

The antagonism between the various ruling classes is one of the most intense contradictions of capitalism and which often leads to military conflicts between them, dragging into them the exploited classes on both sides - who are the “raw material” in these conflicts, “the cannon fodder”. The existence of an ideology that justifies in the eyes of the exploited such massacres and everything

related to their preparation and conduct (taxes for armaments, militarization of society, uncontrolled centres of power, etc.) is necessary.

3.

The Nation-State is the ideological extension of capitalism-statism (Western and Eastern) in society and nationalism is the point where it touches people's consciences. We will not deal here with the nature of nationalism, its extensions in the patriarchal society and how it is planted in the consciences of the oppressed (religion, education, etc.). We will suffice only to say that the basic function of nationalism in the social imaginary is the identification of the state with the 'great and powerful' father and of the homeland with the 'sweet and loving' mother: an extension of the model of the patriarchal family - on which every class-industrial society is based - to the whole of society.

4.

It goes without saying that the big winners of these intra-imperialist conflicts, which since the Second World War have usually taken place on the periphery of capitalism and rarely in the metropolis, are the arms manufacturers. The ruling classes of the militarily victorious state are still the winners, while the ruling classes of the defeated state will not take long to get back on their feet. The big losers, however, are the exploited classes on both sides who have borne the main, if not the entire burden of the war (dead, disabled, hunger, refugees, hardship, etc.) and who are in no better position than before.

5.

By simultaneously projecting the threat of the evil other, the external imaginary (or sometimes 'real') 'enemy nation', nationalist ideology manages to unite people who have nothing in common with each other except their common allegiance to this ideology and to divide people who have every common interest in turning against this ideology as well as against those whose interests are in one way or another served by it.

6.

The consolidation of nationalist ideology, which sometimes appears as far-right racism, invoking the "roots" of the "race" and sometimes appears as "left-wing patriotism", invoking various Stalinist-Maoist theories and Neo-Orthodox nonsense, results in class cooperation (see national unity) and the defusing of social conflicts. And all this in the name of the "national economy", the "non-shrinking of the nation" and a bunch of other crap. This of course does not serve the cause of people's liberation at all.

7.

[Possibly missing part of the text] The only beneficiary of this collaboration is the exploitative society (and the classes whose interests it serves) that perpetuates the domination of the economy over itself on the one hand and the domination of its ideology over the people on the other. Thus in times of peace the exploited are called upon to throw themselves into production, while in times of war they find themselves, whether they like it or not, on the front line.

THE COMPETITION BETWEEN GREECE AND TURKEY

8.

Greece and Turkey, even the small "South" Cyprus have long ceased to be colonies or third world feudal states and have entered the camp of imperialism, without this meaning that they too are not dependent on the metropolis (here a West Germany has not managed to escape the imperialist dependence of the USA, even though it is a first class imperialist power in its own right). It is on the basis of this position that we shall then examine what can be defined as the "Problem" or the "National Issue" trying to avoid as much as possible whining.

9.

Apart from the "Great" spheres of influence which are competing for political, military and economic control with the two main poles of capital accumulation and ideology, there are also the "smaller" spheres of influence which are competing for their sub-control with other smaller, but nonetheless imperialist states.

10.

One such sphere of influence is the Eastern Mediterranean. Since Israel, the most developed capitalist state in the region, cannot exercise effective control (though it will never cease to pursue it) mainly because of its poor neighbourliness with the Arab states, this role is left to Greece and Turkey (and secondly or thirdly to "Southern" Cyprus) which are engaged in a competitive race at all levels.

11.

This is of course nothing new. It is the Greek "Megali Idea" on the one hand and the dreams of the former Ottoman Empire on the other -expressed today in the modern Neo-Turkish expansionism- that have led the two countries sometimes to successive massacres and wars and sometimes to agreements akin to "Davos", depending on the political circumstances.

[Missing subtitle text]

12.

During the years of the Ottoman period, and especially after the Greek bourgeois-democratic revolution, nationalism was naturally transplanted to Cyprus within the Christian and Muslim communities from the metropolises of nationalism: Greece and Turkey, which suited the various ruling classes of Cyprus. From the Greek side, the Orthodox Church played a key role in this, as it was practically co-opted by the Turks and with the privileges granted to it by them (for their own political reasons, of course) managed to convince the majority of Christians of the Greekness of their origin. It is worth noting that the Orthodox community at that time was indeed the largest community but it was far from being the absolute majority.

The Greek language invaded all the popular strata, intervening precisely at the stage where a common Cypriot language was being formed. A typical example is that of the Linobambaki, a minority who believed in both Mohammedanism and Christianity and who spoke a language-mixture of Greek and Turkish. The minority was eventually absorbed into the Muslim community as the "counter" result of the Orthodox Church's insistence on Hellenizing them. The reaction of the Muslim popular strata was to further adhere to their own religion as their only refuge.

13.

The polarisation and the separation of the exploited classes into Greeks and Turks, into "good" and "bad", into perennial "enemies" of one or the other nation, was slowly but surely taking place. And all

this at a time when there was a significant “common” revolutionary tradition and the common uprisings of Christians and Muslims against the centres of power were not few (although theoretically Muslims were in a somewhat better situation since they did not pay tribute. But this differentiation, whose purpose was precisely to separate the oppressed, was of little importance, since impoverishment was a general phenomenon).

14.

Of course, during all these years there have been settling of scores both internally and between the various elites (Greek and Turkish). For example, during the period of the Greek bourgeois-democratic revolution, the Ottomans purged the leadership of the church in order to prevent the spread of the Greek revolution to Cyprus, although it was later proved that the Church had no such intention, not wanting to lose its privileges. This was the first great nationalist uprising.

15.

There followed a period (in the last years of the Ottoman period and during the period of English rule) when the common struggles between Greeks and Turks (and no longer between Christians and Muslims) became less and less frequent and the distrust between the two communities continued to grow. The first population movements took place and separate education was slowly imposed. The other communities, especially the Latin community, virtually disappeared. From the early years of English rule, the Greek community already constituted the largest section of the population.

During and after the First Imperialist World War the Greek nationalist upsurge reached a new peak, which the English colonialists exploited and by applying the well-known “divide and rule” they managed to perpetuate the separation of communities. Since the 1950s (Enosis referendum) and afterwards Turkish far-right nationalism appears as a response to the Greek one.

From:
<https://movementsarchive.org/> - Κυπριακό Κινηματικό Αρχείο
Cyprus Movements Archive
Kıbrıs Sosyal Hareket Arşivi

Permanent link:
<https://movementsarchive.org/doku.php?id=en:other:anafentos:cyprob&rev=1736765881>

Last update: **2025/04/20 19:44**

