

Miners and class struggle in interwar Cyprus

Nikos Christofis and Christos Mais

Abstract This article outlines the nature of Cypriot mines and mine owners between 1914, when the British directly annexed Cyprus, and the Second World War, and the terms on which the British allowed foreign companies to function on the island, at the expense of the people. It then turns to discuss the emergence of the first communist cells on the island, the establishment of the Communist Party of Cyprus (CPC) and the party's labour policies. Finally, it analyses the strikes undertaken by the miners from the 1920s to 1940, and the connection between Cypriot communists and the miners' struggles under the conditions of British colonialism. It also problematises colonial anti-communist policies towards local political agents, which sought to suppress the emerging joint class consciousness across the island. To do this, we draw extensively on press and news reports of the period, documents from the UK national archives, and the memoirs of leftists who were involved with and bore witness to the strikes, as well as secondary literature.

Keywords British colonialism, Cyprus Communist Party (CPC), mines, miners' strikes, class consciousness

Cyprus, a relatively isolated island in the Eastern Mediterranean on Europe's south-eastern periphery, has a long history of labour politics, originating during the British colonial period. These roots can be specifically traced to the formation of the Worker's Party of Cyprus (WPC) in the early 1920s. The party adopted the communist label and was officially founded in 1926 as the Communist Party of Cyprus (Kommounistiko Komma Kyprou, CPC), thus becoming one

of the oldest political parties in Cyprus. The CPC called for a joint anti-imperialist and anti-colonial front of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communists and workers as the only way for Cyprus to gain its independence.¹ This front would fight against the British colonial government and its collaborators, both local (namely the bourgeoisie of Cyprus) and foreign.² In the latter case, the focus was the foreign companies that were allowed to exploit both the land and the peoples of the island, like the Los Angeles-based Cyprus Mines Corporation (CMC), established in 1916, which operated several mines on the island.³ The mining sector was the largest employer and most significant contributor to the local economy after the colonial administration itself. This meant mining outfits like the CMC influenced the shaping of colonial policy to their benefit. By the same token, the CMC and its influence made ready targets to mobilise against for the communist-led workers.

As far as Cypriot communists' relations with the mining sector are concerned, the solid organisation of the party also provided a major avenue for influencing the overall direction of the Cypriot labour movement. Against this background, the mining sector provided an ideal base for empowering and radicalising the labour movement. This was a common pattern for communist movements worldwide, and could be seen in a western capitalist context, as in the United States, Western Europe or Britain;⁴ in both international solidarity and the intensification of anti-communist activities,⁵ and, in colonised regions such as Africa, where communist ideas penetrated from the coastal areas – as ports enabled the influx of radical ideas from other parts of the world – and gained a foothold in areas of European settlement.⁶

Against this backdrop, we outline the status of the mines under British colonial rule in the interwar period, and the terms under which the British allowed foreign companies to function on the island, at the expense of the people. We then turn to a discussion of the emergence of the first communist cells on the island, the establishment of the CPC and the party's labour policies. Finally, we analyse the strikes undertaken by the miners from the 1920s to 1940, and the connection between Cypriot communists and the miners' struggles under the conditions of British colonialism.

The British colonial administration and the mines in Cyprus

On 4 June 1878, Great Britain and the Ottoman sultan, Abdülhamid II, secretly signed the Cyprus Convention, whereby the administration and occupation of Cyprus was transferred to Great Britain. Contrary to the dominant view that British imperial policy toward the island was based primarily or exclusively on strategic-military considerations, and in spite of the island being labelled an ‘inconsequential possession’, as it turned out the economic value of Cyprus, at least during the early decades of colonialism, seems to have been more salient than its strategic importance.⁷

Apart from a tribute paid by Britain to the sultan – an ‘annual fixed payment’ agreed upon in the Cyprus Convention – the existing tax system on the island remained intact, and the tax burden on the people changed little as compared to Ottoman rule. The only difference was that the new colonial administration centralised the collection of taxes in an effort to minimise leakage; this had been substantial under the old Ottoman system of tax farming (*iltizām*), which was now abolished.⁸ However, the greater effectiveness of the colonial administration’s centralised collection forced many farmers to borrow heavily to cover their tax liabilities. Also, vexatious tithes remained in place, which were a heavy burden for farmers until they were finally abolished in 1927; before this date, one-tenth of all the crops produced was collected every year, despite the periodic harvest failures.⁹

The lack of a modern banking system worsened the situation, especially for peasants, who were forced to turn to usurers to cover their liabilities.¹⁰ This group of moneylenders was a particular drain on the rural economy. By the end of the First World War, peasants found themselves in massive debt to usurers, more often than not having to cede their properties as collateral.¹¹ As a result, the local population lived in dire conditions, and many were forced to move to the towns and seek permanent or seasonal work in the newly founded mines.

The coming of the British, with their reforms to local administration, taxation, internal communications (namely roads), public health and the judicial system, signified the passage of Cyprus into modernity and into the orbit of capitalism, albeit at a slow pace. The British reforms may have increased the population, but they did little to emancipate

the people or decrease the influence of the dominant political elite.¹² Modernity was most keenly felt in the support of Greek Cypriot elites for *enosis* (the political union of Cyprus and Greece); this support alarmed British officials, since it posed a significant threat to the status of the island. However, after 1925, when Cyprus became a Crown Colony, nationalist aspirations and hopes of *enosis* were put to an end, at least for the time being;¹³ they revived again from the 1930s onwards.¹⁴

The British administration pursued the usual imperialist pattern of economic penetration and exploitation, and the reforms imposed on the island were part of its efforts to develop its resources for exploitation – which, in turn, was seen as justifying the colonial presence.¹⁵ Britain complemented its formal territorial empire with an ‘informal empire’ of commercial influence, based on trade and investment, in the interests of capital accumulation in the metropole.¹⁶

Against this background, exploiting the mineral wealth in its colonial possessions became a central endeavour within the British imperial project. The progress of capitalism, which was profoundly changing the world of production, led to the setting up of extractive companies engaged in mining almost all the metal and nonmetal minerals in the regions of south and south-eastern Europe, Africa, Asia and South America.¹⁷ It was evident in the radical change in the structure of copper production and copper smelting worldwide during the 1840s and 1850s. For Britain, it meant the loss of primacy over coal production due to the resurgence of the Chilean copper smelting industry and newly created smelting works in the US, Australia and continental Europe.¹⁸ Perhaps more evidently than in any other sector, this was reflected in the colonial government’s direct engagement in coal mining endeavours. Cyprus, at least in the early years of the British administration, was a case in point. The colonial government benefited greatly, though indirectly, from the local coal mining industry, which boomed from the 1920s onwards and placed the small island on the global coal production map.¹⁹

Like all colonial administrations of the era, the administration in Cyprus sought to extract as much value as possible from the local economy (from agriculture to industry), at the least possible expense to the metropole.²⁰ Sir Ralph Oakden, a retired Indian Civil Service official and a former senior member of the Board of Revenue in Lucknow,

was sent to Cyprus in 1934 to suggest ways ‘to curb the colonial administration’s expenditure in every possible way while, at the same time, proposing the most cost-effective, government-sponsored financial, legislative and institutional incentives in order to stimulate the local economy’.²¹ In actuality, although it presented itself in these terms, the colonial administration did everything it could to exploit existing industrial capacity on the island, and to encourage foreign companies to build new factories, including, for example, a Coca-Cola bottler and an American cigarette factory, the latter despite the fact that there were already established local cigarette producers.²² As for mining, the British were in charge of most of the leases and permits, and decided which firms would secure access to the right to exploit the island’s mineral wealth. Since all of the mining companies were foreign, investments favoured foreign interests, and little public revenue was gleaned, given that most of the products and profits were exported to the metropolises.

In other words, the Cyprus periphery was made subservient to the imperial core, following a typical colonising pattern: the coloniser imposes a rupture within the colonised society’s historical line of development, and manipulates and eventually, transforms the dominated society according to the needs and interests of the colonial rulers, including through the shaping of the “ideological formation” of the colonised’.²³ What is more, the applied policies were actually opening up Cyprus for capitalist exploitation by all industrialised countries, first and foremost the United States.

The British and the status of the mines in Cyprus

The local mining industry had gained importance with the arrival of the British in 1878. However, this importance grew with the outbreak of the First World War. In November 1914, the British annexed Cyprus upon the Ottoman entry into the war on the side of the Central Powers; while the war meant increased demand for minerals and other raw materials needed to run the European war machines.²⁴ The failure to more fully exploit the island’s mining sector before this point had not been due to a failure by the British to recognise its value, but, instead, to the rather

weak and brittle legal framework, which had made the island a far less attractive prospect for overseas capital.²⁵

Once the colonial administration took steps to create a favourable investment climate, foreign investors, most notably English, Greek and American mining companies, saw the value of establishing operations in Cyprus. Four companies emerged to dominate the sector: the Cyprus Mines Corporation (CMC), which owned the Skouriotissa and Mavrovouni mines in the Nicosia District; the Cyprus Asbestos Company, also in the Nicosia District; the Sulfur and Copper Company in Polis Chrysochous in the Paphos District; and the Chromium and Calcium Company in the Troodos Mountains. Richter argues that '[T]he mining companies found ideal conditions in Cyprus', as 'the British administration granted them extraterritorial rights so that they had a free hand to exploit their workers at random'.²⁶ Richter's claim was borne out in 1928 by the exemption granted to the mining companies by the colonial authorities when they passed legislation for a six-day working week, with a compulsory day off on Sundays.²⁷ To add insult to injury, this exemption came on top of bumper profits, as indicated by the 40 per cent dividend that the Amiantos mines paid out in 1922.²⁸

The CMC, in particular, is important here, since most strikes after the 1920s took place in its mines. The company was established by Colonel Seeley W. Mudd and his son, Harvey S. Mudd, in 1916, following advice from the mining engineer Charles Godfrey Gunther, who had toured the Eastern Mediterranean in search of copper deposits. According to David Lavender, the CMC's official historian, mineral rights did not go with surface rights but were retained by the government, which issued prospecting permits to bona fide explorers. However, the owners of surface rights (i.e. Cypriot landowners) could refuse prospectors entry onto their land, and so, in effect, nullify government licence.²⁹ In navigating the issue, Gunther confronted a reluctant John Clauson, the British High Commissioner, who feared that any attempt to browbeat the landowners would produce widespread unrest and fuel the demand for *enosis*. However, the tensions were resolved when Gunther managed to come to an agreement with Archbishop Kyrillos II, a politically influential member of the Legislative Council, who had the ear of the landowners.³⁰

At the same time, Gunther's employment by British intelligence in the First World War shows how closely he was already networked into the colonial system, no doubt something that helped him ingratiate himself with the colonial authorities.³¹ Similarly, the CMC's president, Harvey S. Mudd, was close to the British Undersecretary for the Colonies at the time, Arthur Steel-Maitland. Indeed, Mudd was not shy in advising the British government on the importance of holding Cyprus close to the imperial bosom and tamping down moves to *enosis*, since the island was 'the only part of the British Empire that contained large deposits of pyrites'.³² A few years later, the CMC wrote to the Colonial Office emphasising the value of the island's mineral resources to Britain, and asking that the company's interests be safeguarded in the event that the British did move in the direction of autonomy for the island or agree to union with Greece.³³

The company's growth went hand in hand with post-war European restructuring and the increasing demand for copper, both from the construction industry and for the production of manure. The quarries exploited by the CMC turned out to be 'gold mines' (both figuratively and literally), and, within just a few years, the CMC had become the island's most important employer after the Cyprus government. Indeed, of the island's roughly 10,000 mine workers in 1926, CMC employed around 8000.³⁴ Moreover, the financial crash of 1929 saw many heavily indebted peasant farmers in Cyprus thrown off their land, providing another pool of desperate labour for the company to exploit.³⁵

The Greek Cypriot bourgeoisie greeted the CMC's swelling labour force as a great triumph for the island. Papers like *The Cyprus Mail*, the only English-language and pro-colonial daily on the island, functioned as part of the comprador bourgeoisie milieu. An extract from the paper in May 1935 indicates the way the bourgeoisie viewed the contribution of the mine:

[A] visit to the Cyprus Mines Corporation's property at Skouriotissa and Mavrovouni, soon reveals the fact that the mining industry in Cyprus is not only a valuable economic factor in the development of the Colony, but also that modern mining methods on an appreciable scale are being carried out by this enterprise.³⁶

Evidently, the colonial government shared the favourable opinion of local capital vis-à-vis the firm since, in 1934, it had again granted an exemption for the CMC, this time from the 'burden' of paying duties on imported construction and other materials. In justifying this exemption, which was enshrined in legislation, the colonial government argued that the CMC had 'spent a great amount of money for its mining sites', and 'the capital that it provided to the Colony [had] been beneficial given the fact that [it had] secured [a] great number of jobs during the economic crisis, which otherwise, would [have been] lost'.³⁷

Thus, the influx of foreign capital after the First World War fed the development of a significant mining industry in Cyprus, one that became increasingly profitable for the foreign firms that dominated it. At the same time, it lay the ground for the formation of a distinct and compact class of miners, who would protest, make demands, and claim better working conditions.³⁸

The emergence of the Communist Party of Cyprus and its labour policies

Having been shaped by four decades of British colonial rule, Cyprus was then reshaped – as was the rest of the political landscape in Europe – by the wrenching events of the First World War, and in particular the October Revolution.³⁹ A key development here was the founding of the Communist Party in Limassol in 1926. In contrast to many other communist groups in Europe and elsewhere, the party cultivated no links with the urban intellectual elite. Instead, it was established with the explicit aim of fostering and leading a pro-independence and anti-*enosis* workers' movement, and so remained entirely detached from the traditional bourgeois elite of the island, which was obsessed with *enosis*.

In the aftermath of the October Revolution, the wave of revolutionary ideas spreading across the globe lapped onto the shores of Cyprus. While everyday engagement with these ideas was limited, not least because of low literacy rates, their effects on working people were palpable. Yiannis Lefkis, a founding member of the party, wrote: 'Regardless of how geographically isolated Cyprus was, the impact of that great revolution was opening up the path for a new period in

history and life of the peoples, [and] reached also us [Cypriots] here'.⁴⁰ As early as 1919, the first signs of organised opposition to the exploitative colonial system were shown among the emerging working class in the actions of the construction workers of Limassol. A small group of these workers, mainly Greek Cypriots, gathered to discuss and publish on questions such as 'socialism', 'peace among the peoples', 'social justice', and 'marxism', forming the first communist cells on the island and eventually the WPC. In February 1924, tensions in the party between trade unionists and other communists led to a shakeup, and the party was renamed the CPC, although it was not until August 1926 that the party was officially registered.⁴¹ On the other hand, as far as the Turkish Cypriots are concerned, they were rather late in forming a communist party. The impact of the nation-building process in Turkey, led by the latter's founder, Mustafa Kemal and his close circle of trustees, was not only strongly felt by the mainland Turkish Communist Party (Türkiye Komünist Partisi, TKP): it also affected the Turkish Cypriot community, eventually taking over control of the community and thus dominating the political terrain.⁴²

From the beginning, the party's goal was to mobilise the population of Cyprus by awakening their emancipatory potential, enjoining workers to free themselves from the political and religious yoke of the bourgeoisie.⁴³ The party took aim at the movement for *enosis*, which was espoused and promoted by the Orthodox Church of Cyprus and the Greek Cypriot bourgeoisie. For the party, union with Greece was not in the interests of the working peoples of the island. For example, through *Pysos*, the party's first newspaper, it argued that:

[W]ith regard to the national question of Cyprus, that is union with Greece, which has been long regarded as the major claim of the bourgeoisie, we remain partially indifferent because they are united with the British capitalists against our movement and the struggle of the workers.⁴⁴

For the first time, a political formation was speaking on behalf of all the Cypriots, regardless of ethnic origin and religious creed;⁴⁵ it was openly calling for the establishment of a common, class-based, anti-

imperialist front that would unite both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot workers, thereby presenting a new perspective on the liberation of all the Cypriots.⁴⁶ The CPC's different approach can also be explained by the fact that the Turkish Cypriots opposed *enosis*: to support it would therefore mean jeopardising the workers' struggle.⁴⁷

Already in 1922, communist cadres had expressed their intentions to follow 'loyally the international socialist programmes and in particular, that of the British Labour Party';⁴⁸ while they had later declared 'that the welfare of Cyprus is inextricably linked with the independence of Cyprus under a government consisting of peasants and workers'.⁴⁹ Indeed, as the party's manifesto demonstrates, the exploitation of the poor peasants was the most pressing issue they faced, and it could only be addressed through the island's independence. Following the establishment of the CPC, *Neos Anthropos* (1925-1930), the party mouthpiece that replaced *Pyrros*, summarised the party's aims as follows:

- (i) the struggle for the organisation and economic improvement of the circumstances of the classes fettered by the present-day capitalists of Cyprus;
- (ii) the struggle for the political independence of Cyprus from the imperialistic yoke of the United Kingdom;
- (iii) the development in Cyprus of international solidarity with the labour movement and the unification of the struggle of the labourers and peasants of Cyprus with that of their colleagues in other countries.⁵⁰

From the time the earliest communist cells were formed among the construction workers of Limassol in 1919, the 'labour issue' was central to the party's political programme. The party's aim of making unionisation a key plank is borne out by the fact that party cadres focused their publishing and mobilising activities not in the most populous parts of the island (or its urban core), but instead in areas with the highest concentrations of industrial workers.⁵¹ Indeed, the party consistently and painstakingly attempted not only to partner with the trade union movement, but, in fact, to infiltrate and assume leadership of it.⁵² More

to the point, the relationship between the party and trade unions took on a wholly 'organic character' since most unions that arose were established on the initiative of the party.

The CPC was distinguished by its consistently inclusive approach to the Turkish Cypriots. Not only the party, but also its affiliated trade unions, made a point of welcoming Turkish Cypriot workers as members, underscoring its vision of an inclusive movement that would shape the future of the island through the collective efforts of the two communities. Nevertheless, contacts with the Turkish Cypriots were rather limited in the beginning, and there were no Turkish Cypriots among the founding members of the party. Still, several later joined the party, and they were actively involved in the strikes that took place during the 1920s.⁵³ Indeed, from 1920 onwards, Turkish Cypriot workers not only participated in the workers' strikes but were actively involved and registered in the trade unions that were controlled by party cadres.⁵⁴ This collaboration between Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot workers is also demonstrated by the close contact of their newspapers, which published articles translated into both languages.⁵⁵

Against this backdrop, *Neos Anthropos* published an article by a Turkish Cypriot named Ahmet Fethullah, which emphasised the need to establish a common organisation of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots.⁵⁶ However, according to police reports (Turkish Cypriot communists were under heavy surveillance, especially after the October 1931 riots against the British), this call had gone unheeded. The reports mentioned just one communist organisation with any sizeable Turkish Cypriot membership.⁵⁷ Moreover, it was not only the colonial government that maintained close surveillance of the Turkish Cypriot communists but also the Turkish Cypriot elite. For example, the Turkish Cypriot newspaper *Söz* expressed concern, anguish and bitterness towards Turkish Cypriots who had registered in the 'communist lists' and admonished them, saying: 'lambs that stray from the herd are bound to be devoured by wolves'.⁵⁸ Not long after, in 1933, amidst the anti-communist frenzy that was then dominating Cypriot society, two Turkish Cypriot workers were found guilty of having in their possession communist material written in Turkish, and for spreading communist propaganda.⁵⁹

However, anti-communist policies and measures, by both the British

and the Turkish Cypriot elite, failed to prevent Turkish Cypriot workers and communists from participating in demonstrations and strikes, most notably in the mines. Indeed, to the chagrin of capital, and despite the denial of the colonial authorities, by the 1930s the 'labour force' of Cyprus had developed into a distinct and organised 'labour class'. This elementary fact was acknowledged across the political spectrum, 'notwithstanding the ideological orientation of different newspapers'.⁶⁰

Cypriot communism and the miners

According to Yiannis Lefkis, the miners, often proletarianised peasants who had lost their land to usurers, worked under dire conditions and were heavily exploited. He claims that it was for this reason that the first communist cells were formed in the miners' regions of Amiantos and Skouriotissa.⁶¹ Lefkis notes that miners would often write to *Neos Anthropos* congratulating the newspaper and asking how they could become useful to the cause (p113). The CPC's aim was to spread its influence to all mines (p115). When a bourgeois reporter wrote that there was no labour question in Cyprus, the response in *Neos Anthropos* begged to differ: 'when thousands of miners are fading in the suffocating underground and wet mine shafts ... an honest journalist cannot claim that there is no labour question in Cyprus' (p129). Additional evidence of the interest the party took in the miners is the fact that one of the nine demands of the resolution of the first May Day celebration in Cyprus, which took place in Limassol in 1926, focused on the miners and called for special labour legislation to protect them. The resolution was referred to the colonial government (p153).

Less than a year later, there were two interesting reports in the newspaper *Chronos*. The first reads 'Communists forced out of Amiantos' and was part of the newspaper's 'Weekly Chronicle'. According to this short report:

It is known that our city's Communist Centre spread its propaganda to the Amiantos' mines long ago, acting upon it indeed with great zeal, trying to instigate insurgent and anarchist tendencies.

Although monitoring this dangerous mobilisation, the Amiantos Company has taken no drastic measures to erase it. A few days ago, however, some flyers of the Communists were found plastered across walls in various places calling for the workers to go on strike and destroy the company's facilities. After this took place, the Company was forced to immediately fire 94 workers suspected of being communists, and the police initiated questioning in order to discover the perpetrators.⁶²

Just a week after that report, a short news report on the same topic was published:

New publications of the Communists of Limassol were once again spread amongst the Amiantos workers. The Company was forced to undertake some further deportations and layoffs, especially of workers and employees from Limassol. The police intervened to assist the Company in the purges of the aforementioned workers. As we were informed, a great number of workers from the villages are waiting to start working.⁶³

It is evident that the CMC countered its apprehension about communist activity by holding over the heads of the workers the fear of being made unemployed or deported. Yiannis Lefkis also refers to these events, stating that the mining regions were run like feudal domains and that the only law in place was that of the mining companies, which were fiercely anti-communist.⁶⁴ Lavender mentions that there had been a brief strike a couple of years earlier in the Skouriotissa mine, in January 1925, driven by the workers' discontent with the mining engineer Charles F. Jackson.⁶⁵ He also states that in spring 1925, 'unruly gatherings filled the nearby coffee shops, where Bolshevik agitators were said to be passing out incendiary pamphlets and promoting the formation of unions' (p200). A statement by the archaeologist Einar Gjerstad – who led the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (September 1927-March 1931) – that the American director of the CMC forbade workers from reading the socialist newspaper of Limassol (most likely *Neos Anthropos*) is also revealing of the repressive, anti-communist policies of the company.⁶⁶

The CMC's reactionary approach is evidenced by the positions the CPC took at the time but also by press reports and testimonies of party members. At the CPC's first Congress in 1926, the party presented its view on the potential for working-class formation. The party believed that the rapid development of mining on the island would see rising numbers of mine workers and an expanding working class. At the same time, it set two clear goals to work towards in the coming years – forming trade unions and organising communist cells.⁶⁷ Christodoulos Artemiou, a miner, was a delegate at this congress, and he likely influenced the direct references to the miners in the written materials that came out of the congress. The congress's *Manifesto to the Workers and Peasants of Cyprus* explicitly referred to the mining sector (the only mention of a specific industry), noting how the miners were being exploited to fill 'the pockets of the Anglo-American capitalists' (p39).

According to Pantelis Varnava in 1925-1926, there were indeed sympathisers reading *Neos Anthropos*, as indicated by the sources above, and at least one member of CPC, Christodoulos Artemiou. According to Varnava, Artemiou was unaware of other CPC members.⁶⁸ Since the mining companies were repressing the workers and the colonial government was suppressing communism, CPC members were forced to work under conditions of secrecy and caution to avoid infiltration and block informants. The mining companies' informants would notify management of suspected CPC members in the workforce, who would then be fired or exiled from the mining regions.⁶⁹

Communist agitators and miners' strikes

While there are reports about communist agitation as early as 1923, the CPC was only able to acquire a leading and consistent role among the miners from the late 1920s onwards. Even so, they were unable to reach their goal of organising a trade union, as affirmed in the founding congress, until the mid-1930s.⁷⁰ In 1929 communists led the first mass strike of 6,000 miners in Amiantos.⁷¹ This was not the first miners' strike, since, apart from the reference made by Lavender to the Skouriotissa mine, we know that a strike took place in 1923, also in

Skouriotissa;⁷² then, in September 1927, there was a strike in Amiantos, demanding the reduction of the working day from 10 to 9 hours. The strike, involving 1,000 miners, was successful.⁷³

According to Varnava, both the strike of 1925 in Skouriotissa and that of July 1929 in Amiantos were instigated by the communist miners as well as *Neos Anthropos*.⁷⁴ It is more than likely that the party's miners were heavily involved in the 1925 strike, albeit not in an explicit leadership role.⁷⁵ After all, in 1925, there was no union, and the company's reactionary tactics limited the miners' ability to organise.⁷⁶ Nevertheless, in contributing to the mindset of the miners in the lead-up to the 1925 strike, party cadres were crucial in following Lenin's injunction that 'socialist consciousness is something introduced into the proletarian class struggle from without'.⁷⁷ More particularly, Kostas Kononas – a primary school teacher in the region and leading CPC member, who later served as the party's general secretary (1931-1933) – certainly played a role in introducing 'class struggle from without' during the 1925 strike by raising consciousness among the miners with the help of local engineers.⁷⁸

The strike of 1929 was different. CPC members were central to the strategy and leadership of the strike itself, shrewdly demanding a written response from management when the latter made verbal concessions to the miners, who continued to strike without any guarantees in writing. The strike then escalated into a riot, which colonial police forces from surrounding areas put down. The workers were fired and then put on trial and sentenced.⁷⁹ In the Amiantos mine, the CPC distributed flyers to the miners about their dreadful working and living conditions and the need to organise. The informants and the police tried to identify the perpetrators and destroy all the flyers. Although they were unsuccessful in identifying them, the management's informants gave them a list of 24 miners, who were then exiled by the management, and the police executed this 'sentence' within 24 hours.⁸⁰ In 1930, the CPC participated in legislative elections for the first time. The party's electoral programme sought, among other things, a 7-hour workday for miners working underground.⁸¹

This period of suppression must have been rather prolonged, since one of the CPC leaders at the time, Charalambos Vatiliotis, also known as Vatis, delivered a report to the Communist International stating that

in late 1931 the party was preparing a miners' strike in response to the firing of 15 CPC miners.⁸² According to Vatis, the mining workers were heavily involved in the 1931 revolt that broke out in October in Nicosia and spread throughout the island. Specifically, in their respective regions, they had taken the initiative to blow up bridges and dismantle train tracks; the unemployed miners who had returned to live in their villages at the time were equally involved (pp112, 176).

The CPC's decision to proceed to a party restructure in early 1931 focused closely on base organisations in mines.⁸³ It is possible to identify three factors underlying this decision. The first was the great concentration of workers in the mining areas.⁸⁴ The second was the militancy of this particular sector, as shown in the recent run of strikes in the sector at a time when strikes were seldom used as a method of industrial action, and the labour movement was unorganised as a whole. The final driver was organising potential, since, as we have shown, the party was active in the mining region from its very beginning.

During the 1930s, the miners initiated a struggle that bridged the economic demands and the right to unionise. The second trade union conference of the CPC-led union confederation PSE-PEO was held in 1941. PSE (Pangypria Syntehniaki Epitropi) was a CPC-led trade union confederation; PEO (Pangypria Ergatiki Omospondia/Tüm Kıbrıs İşçi Federasyonu/Pancyprian Federation of Labour) was an umbrella organisation for trade unions. The latter was closely associated with the successor to the CPC, the Progressive Party of the Working People (Anorthotiko Komma Ergazomenou Laou, AKEL).⁸⁵ Discussion at the 1941 conference focused on the 1936 miners' strike in Lefka, at the CMC's Mavrovouni mine, which had mobilised 'more than 3,000 workers', but which had in the end failed. Despite its lack of success, the conference held the strike up as one of the most significant actions of the 1930s since:

- (a) it mobilised a great number of workers, including unskilled ones; (b) the strike turned against a big company; and (c) the only weapon the strikers had was sheer numbers since the majority of them [being unskilled] had no technical specialisation and so an individual worker could easily be replaced.⁸⁶

According to the conference, the increasing numbers of unorganised and spontaneous strikes made the strikers aware of the need for a union to organise to fight from a better position. This led to the formation of several trade unions throughout the 1930s.⁸⁷ Efforts by the CPC intensified after the Trade Union Law was passed in 1932, which allowed trade unions to be registered.⁸⁸ The key objective of the communist forces within the mines at this time was to orientate the struggle towards the establishment of a trade union.

On Monday, 17 August 1936, a two-day strike broke out in Skouriotissa with the participation of 550 miners, including 150 contractors.⁸⁹ The demands were seemingly purely economic, such as bringing the daily wages of miners in the Skouriotissa mine to parity with those at the Mavrovouni mine (also owned by CMC), and reducing the bloated ranks of foremen who earned the most pay but did little work. However, the latter demand was equally political, in that the CMC management used the foremen to spy on the workers and block communist infiltration and unionising.⁹⁰ The miners gave the company until the following Saturday (payday) to accede to the demanded pay raise, or else they would again down tools.⁹¹ The miners halted the strike in the belief that their demands had been heard, but the company then claimed it had made no promises.⁹² Less than two weeks later, a new strike broke out in the Mavrovouni mine. On 30 August the miners assembled to elect a seven-member committee to draft a list of demands for submission to the CMC management.⁹³ This was one of the strongest ever joint strikes by Greek and Turkish mine workers against the CMC at Mavrovouni: 'Three thousand Greek and Turkish miners, in defiance of the police and the army, demanded an increase in wages, better working and living conditions and reduced working hours.'⁹⁴

The spontaneous strike was suppressed two days after it broke out.⁹⁵ Nine miners – six Greek Cypriots and three Turkish Cypriots – were identified as leaders. They were tried and the sentence reduced to a bond payment since they had already been detained for eight days, which was considered enough of a punishment.⁹⁶ Remarkably, the strike was well-received in all the Cypriot newspapers, regardless of their ideological or political position.⁹⁷

The miners' living and working conditions were a recurring issue in the Cypriot press for almost a year following the strike. Despite their

defeat in 1936, and the repression that followed, the ongoing wretched conditions under which the miners and their families lived made them persistent in their struggle;⁹⁸ and even bourgeois newspapers occasionally reported on the miners in a sympathetic light. In August 1938, almost two years after the first strike of 1936, the conservative establishment newspaper *Neos Kypriakos Fylax* published an article supporting the miners forming a trade union.⁹⁹

In March 1939, the miners handed a memorandum to the governor, requesting, among other things, a licence to organise.¹⁰⁰ Once again, miners' demands were widely supported, not just by the leftist newspaper *Anexartitos* and other trade unions of the island but also by bourgeois newspapers like *Esperini* and *Kypriakos Typos*.¹⁰¹ However, the colonial authorities took the view that the company should be allowed to weigh in first.¹⁰² *Anexartitos* countered this by stating that there was no precedent for a trade union needing to seek permission from an employer before organising.¹⁰³ Reading between the lines, it becomes evident that the reason for the colonial authorities' initial reticence in approving union organisation in the mining sector was that communists were leading the effort.¹⁰⁴

Indeed, this view was expressed in a meeting between mine managers and the Commissioner of Nicosia at the latter's office on 31 March 1939. All managers recorded that they were not opposed to the formation of trade unions, 'providing the initiative came from genuine [read: non-communist] miners'.¹⁰⁵ However, according to press reports, the Governor of Nicosia told the miners:

[i]n other countries professionals had a bitter experience until they recognised the danger, many real workers were misled and became victims of organisers by profession, persons that had the ability to talk in some way but in fact had no idea about the particular profession and had no other purpose than to acquire easy means of living through 'representing' workers and the last thing they wanted was to work themselves.¹⁰⁶

It was decided that in order for the miners to be allowed to organise, a certain number of supporting signatures from workers at each site

would need to be gathered, and if the required number was achieved a site-wide vote would then be held to decide on unionisation. The miners accused the company of using this process to intimidate the miners, something stressed even by a bourgeois journalist.¹⁰⁷ Despite intimidations, however, about 2,000 miners at the Mavrovouni mine (almost 90 per cent of the mining workforce) participated, the vast majority of whom voted in favour of unionisation.¹⁰⁸ A few days later, all 1,200 miners at the Skouriotissa mine followed suit, with the same result.¹⁰⁹ The trade union was explicitly welcoming to both Christian and Muslim members (the miners, much like all Cypriots in this period, did not identify as ‘Turkish’ or ‘Greek’ but instead in terms of the religious community to which they belonged). To elect the fifteen-member workers’ council, they voted in a ratio of 2 to 1, reflecting the approximate ratio of Christians to Muslims at the worksite.¹¹⁰ The miners insisted on a single trade union for all miners, while the colonial government wanted to divide miners (and thus the unions representing them) by specialisation.¹¹¹

Cypriot communists had aimed to organise the miners because they represented a numerous and significant part of the island’s working class. And the CPC did manage to attract membership from miners’ communities, and actively participated in organising or guiding workers’ struggles. Nevertheless, it took the party more than a decade to successfully unionise the miners.

Conclusions

Organising the miners and their struggles was a focal point for communist party cadres in Cyprus from the very beginning. The high concentration of workers in mining, which was the most lucrative private industry in colonial Cyprus, combined with the dire working and living conditions of the mining communities, drove this orientation. From the outset, the party sought to lead the workers’ movement and orient the struggle toward unionisation. Moreover, it adopted an explicitly inclusive approach to welcoming Turkish Cypriot workers as members (both of the party and its associated trade unions), reflecting

its vision of a cross-community movement that would shape the island's future collectively.

From the 1920s, the CPC tried to organise miners in terms of both party-building and trade union activity. While it initially started this attempt from the outside, it quickly shifted to facilitating the miners' organisation and unionisation, and the miners won a number of improvements to their working and living conditions. The joint struggle by the communist party and the miners against colonial policies and their British collaborators on the island, most notably the foreign mining companies, began around 1919, and intensified during the 1920s. Particularly after the economic crisis of 1929 and the three-year drought that followed, labour mobilisation grew ever stronger. These peasants-turned-miners 'had nothing to lose but their chains'. As a result, through joint strikes and declarations that grew stronger and more radical over time, the miners forced both the colonial authorities and the mining companies to accept some of their demands, though there was no diminution of their anti-communist agenda. This interwar action had a meaningful historical legacy that carries forward to the present day. The most important outcome of the interwar 'strike wave' in Cyprus was that the miners won the right to unionise.

Nikos Christofis is an associate professor of Turkish history and politics at the School of History and Civilisations and at the Centre for Turkish Studies at Shaanxi Normal University in Xi'an, China; adjunct lecturer at the Hellenic Open University; and affiliate researcher at the Netherlands Institute at Athens (NIA). He is a comparative political historian focusing on the Eastern Mediterranean, and in particular Turkey, Greece, Cyprus and the Middle East region.

Christos Mais is an adjunct lecturer at the University of Thessaly in Greece. He holds a Bachelor of Economics from the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki in Greece, a Master of Arts on Book & Digital Media from Leiden University and a PhD from the Leiden University Centre for Arts in Society in the Netherlands. He specialises in contemporary social and cultural history, the history of publishing, communism and social movements

Notes

- 1 The present article adopts the terms Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot instead of Greek Orthodox and Muslim.
- 2 Yiannos Katsourides, *The History of the Communist Party in Cyprus: Colonialism, Class and the Cypriot Left*, London, I.B. Tauris 2014.
- 3 David Lavender, *The Story of the Cyprus Mines Corporation*, California, The Huntington Library 1962.
- 4 Alan Singer, 'Communists and Coal Miners: Rank-and-File Organizing in the United Mine Workers of America during the 1920s', *Science & Society*, Vol 55, No 2, 1991, pp132-157; Ad Knotter, "'Little Moscows" in Western Europe: The Ecology of Small-Place Communism', *International Review of Social History*, Vol 56, 2011, pp475-510; Ray Hudson and Huw Beynon, *The Shadow of the Mine: Coal and the End of Industrial Britain*, London, Verso 2021.
- 5 *International Communism and Transnational Solidarity: Radical Networks, Mass Movements and Global Politics, 1919-1939*, Leiden, Brill 2017, pp168-190; Evan Smith, 'Policing Communism Across the "White Man's World": Anti-Communist Co-operation between Australia, South Africa and Britain in the Early Cold War', *Britain and the World*, Vol 10, No 2, pp170-196.
- 6 Stefano Bellucci, 'The Ascent of African Labour Internationalism: Trade Unions, Cold War Politics and the ILO, 1919-1960', in Stefano Belucci (ed.), *The Internationalisation of the Labour Question: Ideological Antagonism, Workers' Movements and the ILO since 1919*, Basingstoke, Palgrave 2020, pp351-381; Allison Drew, 'Comparing African Experiences of Communism', in Norman Naimark, Silvio Pons and Sophie Quinn-Judge (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Communism: The Socialist Camp and World Power 1941-1960s*, Vol 2, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press 2020, p519.
- 7 Andrekos Varnava, *British Imperialism in Cyprus, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*, Manchester, Manchester University Press 2009, p3.
- 8 Rolandos Katsiaounis, *Labour, Society, and Politics in Cyprus during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre 1996, p99.
- 9 There were also taxes on immovable property, trade and the professions, and, after the 1920s, on clubs, coffee houses and theatres, which continued to be paid until the end of the colonial period. By the time of independence in 1960, the island was hardly a drain on the imperial

- treasury. Local taxes had risen 700 per cent since 1939 and – while a heavy burden on the local population – entirely covered the cost of local administration. Sophia Argyriou, ‘The Imperialistic Foundations of British Colonial Rule in Cyprus’, *The Cyprus Review*, Vol 30, No 1, 2018, pp299-301.
- 10 Kate Phylaktis, ‘Banking in a British Colony: Cyprus 1878-1959’, *Business History*, Vol 30, No 4, 1988, pp416-431.
 - 11 Georgios S. Georghallides, *A Political and Administrative History of Cyprus, 1918-1926. With a Survey of the Foundations of British Rule*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre 1979, p317; Heinz A. Richter, ‘The Cypriot Communist Party and the Comintern’, *The Cyprus Review*, Vol 15, No 1, 2003, p101.
 - 12 Stefanos Papageorgiou, *I Proti Periodos tis ‘Agglokrotias’ stin Kypro (1878-1914): Politikos Eksyghronismos kai Koinonikes Adraneies*, Athens, Papazisis 1996, p20.
 - 13 Rebecca Bryant, *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*, London, I.B. Tauris 2004.
 - 14 Georgios S. Georghallides, *Cyprus and the Governorship of Sir Ronald Storrs: The Causes of the 1931 Crisis*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre 1985; Alexis Rappas, *Cyprus in the 1930s: British Colonial Rule and the Roots of the Cyprus Conflict*, London, I.B. Tauris 2014.
 - 15 See Nikos Christofis, ‘Aristera, Apoikiokratia kai Ethnikismos: I Kypriaki Periptosi’, in Nikos Christofis (ed.), *Metaksi Ethnous kai Taksis: Oi Aristeres kai to Kypriako, 1920-1974*, Thessaloniki, Psifides 2022, pp21-56.
 - 16 Alexander J. Motyl, *Revolutions, Nations, Empires: Conceptual Limits and Theoretical Possibilities*, Columbia, Columbia University Press 1999, p124.
 - 17 Stefan Berger and Peter Alexander (eds.), *Making Sense of Mining History: Themes and Agendas*, London and New York, Routledge 2020.
 - 18 Luis Valenzuela, ‘Challenges to the British Copper Smelting Industry in the World Market, 1840-1860’, *The Journal of European Economic History*, Vol 19, No 3, 1991, p657.
 - 19 Demetrios Christodoulou, *Inside the Cyprus Miracle: The Labours of an Embattled Mini-Economy*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota 1992, p81.
 - 20 Julian Go, *Patterns of Empire: The British and American Empires, 1688 to Present*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press 2011.
 - 21 Sir Ralph Oakden, *Report on the Finances and Economic Resources of Cyprus*, Government of Cyprus 1935, p10; Rappas, *Cyprus in the 1930s*, p27.

- 22 *Neos Dimokratias*, 1 January 1952.
- 23 Alexander J. Motyl, *Revolutions, Nations, Empires: Conceptual Limits and Theoretical Possibilities*, Columbia, Columbia University Press 1999, p124.
- 24 Andrekos Varnava, 'The Impact of the Cypriot Contribution during the Great War on Colonial Society and Loyalties/Disloyalties to the British Empire', *First World War Studies*, Vol 8, No 1, 2017, pp17-36.
- 25 *Kyprios*, 13 March 1904; *Foni tis Kyprou*, 23 April 1904.
- 26 Richter, p101.
- 27 Alexios Alecou, *Communism and Nationalism in Postwar Cyprus, 1945-1955: Politics and Ideologies under British Rule*, Basingstoke, Palgrave 2016, p19, n13.
- 28 Amiantos is the Greek word for Asbestos. The mines were indeed of asbestos, but the region, as well as two communities, are also named Amiantos, and it is unclear whether the author refers to the mineral or the region. Thus, we chose to use 'Amiantos' instead of asbestos.
- 29 Lavender, pp78-83.
- 30 Andrekos Varnava and Michalis N. Michael, 'Archbishop-Ethnarchs since 1767', in Andrekos Varnava and Michalis N. Michael (eds.), *The Archbishops of Cyprus in the Modern Age: The Changing Role of the Archbishop-Ethnarch, their Identities and Politics*, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing 2013, pp1-16; Andrekos Varnava and Irene Pophaides, 'Kyrillos II, 1909-16: The First Greek Nationalist and *Enosis*', in Varnava and Michael (eds.), pp148-176. The Legislative Council consisted of six official members appointed by the High Commissioner and twelve elected members, three of whom were Muslims and nine of whom were non-Muslims: Meltem Onurkan-Samani, 'The Legislative Council and its Historical/Political Implications in Cyprus (1882-1931)', in Thekla Kyritsi and Nikos Christofis (eds.), *Cypriot Nationalisms in Context; History, Identity and Politics*, Basingstoke, Palgrave 2018, pp75-91.
- 31 Andrekos Varnava, 'British Military Intelligence in Cyprus during the Great War', *War in History*, Vol 19, No 3, 2012, p371; Andrekos Varnava, *British Cyprus and the Long Great War, 1914-1925: Empire, Loyalties and Democratic Deficit*, London, Routledge 2019, p74.
- 32 The *enosis* demands and Greek Cypriot agitation was a recurring topic also in British correspondence after the 1890s. CO 67/79.
- 33 Georghallides, *A Political and Administrative History of Cyprus*, p129; Varnava, *British Cyprus*, pp167-68.
- 34 *Oi Aperiakioti Agones ton Metallorihon kai Amiantorihon tou 1948*,

- Nicosia, PEO 1979, p8; *Cyprus. Report for 1926*, London, His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1928, p42.
- 35 Colonial Report, *Report for Cyprus, 1933*, London, His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1934, p20; Alexis Rappas, 'The Labor Question in Colonial Cyprus, 1936-1941: Political Stakes in a Battle of Denominations', *International Labor and Working-Class History*, Vol 76, 2009, p197.
- 36 *The Cyprus Mail*, 28 May 1935.
- 37 *Proini*, 23 June 1934.
- 38 Andreas Fantis, *To Kypriako Syndikalistiko Kinima sta Hronia tis Agglokraτίας (1878-1960)*, Vol 1, Nicosia 2005, p34; Alecou, p11; *Istoria tis PSE-PEO, 1941-1991*, Nicosia, PEO 1991, pp31-33.
- 39 Yiannos Katsourides, 'The National Question in Cyprus and the Cypriot Communist Left in the Era of British Colonialism (1922-59)', *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, Vol 16, No 4, 2004, p478.
- 40 Yiannis Lefkis, *Rizes*, Limassol 1984, p4.
- 41 *Pyrso*, 21 February 1924.
- 42 Niyazi Kızılyürek, *Milliyetçilik Kaskacında Kıbrıs*, Istanbul, İletişim 2002, pp217-223. The TKP was founded in 1920 by a Turkish émigré group under the leadership of Mustafa Suphi. The party came to a tragic end in 1921 when the founder and many of its members were drowned on their way to Ankara to join the Turkish national liberation movement. This aside, a communist movement in Turkey had to compete with a massive nationalist movement led by Mustafa Kemal, leaving it no space to develop, either in Turkey, or among the Turkish Cypriots. Nikos Christofis, 'War, Revolution and Diplomacy: The October Revolution of 1917 and the Turkish Anatolian Resistance Movement, 1919-1922', in Dimitrios Stamatopoulos (ed.), *European Revolutions and the Ottoman Balkans: Nationalism, Violence and Empire in the Long Nineteenth Century*, London and New York, Bloomsbury 2019, pp243-262.
- 43 Michalis N. Michael, 'I Istoria, I Ideologiki tis Hrisis kai o Diaforetikos Antiapoikiakos Logos tis Aristeras', in Georgios Georgis and Yiannos Katsourides (ed.), *I Kypriaki Aristera stis Proti Periodo tis Vretanikis Apoikiokratias: Emfanisi, Sygkrotisi, Ekseliksi*, Athens, Taxideftis 2012, p111.
- 44 *Pyrso*, 21 February 1924.
- 45 Nicos Peristianis, 'The Rise of the Left and of the Intra-Ethnic Cleavage', in Hubert Faustmann and Nicos Peristianis (eds.), *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism, 1878-2006*, Mannheim, Bibliopolis 2006, p245.

- 46 *Neos Anthropos*, 1 October 1926, 15 June 1925 and 1 July 1925; *Neos Ergatis*, 9 September 1929.
- 47 *Neos Anthropos*, 18 September 1926; it had been evident that enosis would be a contentious issue since the early twentieth century. Ahmet An, *Kıbrıs Türk Liderliğinin Oluşması (1900-1942)*, Nicosia, Galeri Kültür Yayınları 1997, pp14-15.
- 48 *Pyrros*, 19 June 1922.
- 49 *Neos Anthropos*, 1 October 1926.
- 50 *Neos Anthropos*, 24 December 1926. According to Leventis, there was an additional point which was not mentioned to avoid reactions by the colonial authorities and local right-wing elite – ‘The struggle for the establishment of a Soviet Republic of workers and peasants in Cyprus’ – but this was omitted. Yiorghos Leventis, ‘The Politics of the Cypriot Left in the Inter-War Period’, *Synthesis: Review of Modern Greek Studies*, Vol 2, No 1, 1997, p7.
- 51 Yiannos Katsourides, ‘The Relation between the CPC with the Trade Unions and the Trade Union Movement’, in Georgis and Katsourides (eds.), p122.
- 52 *Neos Anthropos*, 1 March 1925. Analytically, see Katsourides, *I Kypriaki Aristera*, pp123-128.
- 53 *Söz*, 13 August 1931; Ahmet An, *Kıbrıslı Türklerin Siyasal Tarihi (1930-1960)*, Nicosia 2006, p6.
- 54 Ahmet Cavit An and Nikos Christofis, ‘I Tourkokypriaki Aristera kai ta Provlimata Synergias met in Ellinokypriaki Aristera’, in Christofis (ed.), pp118-119.
- 55 *Neos Anthropos*, 1 January 1925; *Birlik*, 30 January 1925.
- 56 *Neos Anthropos*, 13 June 1930.
- 57 Ahmet An, *İşçi Sınıfımızın İlk Öncüleri: 1958’e kadar Emek Hareketinde Kıbrıslı Türkler*, Nicosia, Khora 2011, p17.
- 58 *Söz*, 13 August 1931.
- 59 *Chronos*, 29 September 1933; *Chronos*, 4 October 1933. Analytically, An and Christofis, pp131-133.
- 60 Rappas, *Cyprus in the 1930s*, pp152-153.
- 61 Lefkis, p86.
- 62 *Chronos*, 18 June 1927.
- 63 *Chronos*, 2 July 1927.
- 64 Lefkis, p153-154.
- 65 Lavender states that the workers argued that the strike was called over disagreements about payment methods, but that he and other CMC officials believed it was due to Jackson. Lavender, p199.

- 66 Einar Gjerstad, *Ages and Days in Cyprus*, Göteborg, Paul Aströms Förlag 1980, p159.
- 67 AKEL, *Politikes Apofasis kai Psifismata Synedrion KKK-AKEL*, Nicosia, K.E. AKEL 2014, pp24, 31-32, and 37.
- 68 Pantelis Varnava, *Anamnisis (Mesa apo ton Typo)*, Nicosia 1999, p14.
- 69 Varnava, p107.
- 70 Andreas Panayiotou, *Island Radicals: The Emergence and Consolidation of the Cypriot Left, 1920-1960*, unpublished PhD dissertation, Santa Cruz, CA, University of California 1999, p207.
- 71 Katsourides, *The History of the Communist Party in Cyprus*, p147.
- 72 Panayiotou, pp172-173.
- 73 Michalis Michaelides, 'The Turkish Cypriot Working Class and the Cypriot Labour Movement', *Cyprus Review*, Vol 5, No 2, 1993, p38.
- 74 Pantelis Varnava, pp14-15; Michaelidis, p38.
- 75 Panayiotou, p230.
- 76 Spyros Sakellaropoulos and Manolis Houmerianos, *I Eksegersi tou 1931, I Stasi tou Kommounistikou Kommatos Kyprou kai I G' Diethnis Mesa apo ta Episima Eggrafa tis Kommounistikis Diethnous*, Athens, Topos 2021, p130.
- 77 Vladimir Lenin, *What Is To Be Done?*, 1902: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/download/what-itd.pdf>.
- 78 Sotiroula Moustaka, *To Ergatiko Kinima stin Kypro tin Periodo tis Agglokratias, 1878-1955*, unpublished PhD dissertation, Athens, Panteion University 2010, p116.
- 79 Michaelides, p38; *I Istoría tou KKK-AKEL*, pp108-110. Unpublished Manuscript.
- 80 Minos Perdios, *Dokimio Istorias tou KKK-AKEL*, Nicosia, 1968, part 1, Unpublished manuscript, p47.
- 81 Perdios, p39.
- 82 Sakellaropoulos and Houmerianos, p104.
- 83 Sakellaropoulos and Houmerianos, p198.
- 84 More than 6000 workers and 6.4 per cent of the economically active population in 1929. Panayiotou, p168.
- 85 This was set up in 1941.
- 86 PSE-PEO, *Praktika tou 2ou Pagkypriou Synedriou Syntechnion*, 16 November 1941, p8. Unpublished document.
- 87 Ibid, p9.
- 88 http://www.cylaw.org/nomoi/arith/1932_1_001.pdf, (accessed 18 June 2022).
- 89 *Eleftheria*, 19 August 1936.

- 90 Moustaka, p108, n213.
- 91 *Kypriakos Typos*, 20 August 1936.
- 92 *Eleftheria*, 20 August 1936.
- 93 Rappas, *Cyprus in the 1930s*, pp159-160.
- 94 Michaelides, p39.
- 95 Pantelis Varnava, *Enas Metallorihos Thymatai*, Nicosia, PEO 1989, pp36-39.
- 96 Rappas, *Cyprus in the 1930s*, p160.
- 97 See *Eleftheria*, 20 August 1936 and 21 August 1936; *Kypriakos Typos*, 20 and 21 August 1936; *Proini*, 20 and 21 August 1936.
- 98 PSE-PEO, p12.
- 99 *Neos Kypriakos Fylax*, 7 August 1938.
- 100 *Anexartitos*, 8 March 1939.
- 101 *Anexartitos*, 13 March 1939; 27 March 1939; 29 March 1939; *Esperini*, 27 March 1939; 28 March 1939; 29 March 1939; *Kypriakos Typos*, 31 March 1939; *Anexartitos*, 18 March 1939; 22 March 1939.
- 102 *Anexartitos*, 18 March 1939.
- 103 *Anexartitos*, 22 March 1939.
- 104 'As we realise, denying the miners to organise was based on the assumption that the mining workers were led by other purposes and these purposes – and not their desire to create better living conditions – were their motives to organise'. *Kypriakos Typos*, 30 March 1939. Also, *Esperini*, 6 April 1939; *Kypriakos Typos*, 2 May 1939.
- 105 FCO 141/2628.
- 106 *Neos Kypriakos Fylax*, 7 April 1939.
- 107 *Neos Kypriakos Fylax*, 19 May 1939.
- 108 *Neos Kypriakos Fylax*, 12 May 1939; *Esperini*, 12 May 1939.
- 109 *Anexartitos*, 16 May 1939.
- 110 *Anexartitos*, 19 May 1939.
- 111 *Esperini*, 6 June 1939; PSE-PEO, p12.