

Britain and Greece*

by N. ZACHARIADES

TO achieve peace and security, a square explanation of Greek relations with Britain is necessary. The mutual distrust existing now in Greece is the principal reason for the domestic problem. Mr. Eden's statement about Greek trade union elections and the toleration of an abnormal situation by British forces in Greece, accentuate this mistrust, which is fostered by home reactionaries. British officials seem to believe that democratic Greece opposes British strategic interests in the Mediterranean and particularly in Greece. Greece belongs economically, politically and geographically to the Balkans and continental Europe. Its trade needs export to the Balkans and the Continent, wherefrom it must also buy necessary goods and materials.

But Greece belongs also to the Mediterranean region, which fact must be considered. To avoid mistrust, any interference in our domestic affairs must cease, and then the question of British interests must be discussed on an equal footing between Britain and Greece. Agreement is certain, provided it does not affect national honour and independence and integrity. To be stable, agreement must be arrived at with a democratic and not an anti-popular government. If the Dodecanese and Cyprus are incorporated with Greece, this would constitute a sound basis for a Greek-British agreement in the Mediterranean. Such an agreement, while securing British in-

terests, would help Greece to return to democratic normality.

The Central Committee of E.A.M. defines its policy as follows. E.A.M. suggests an all-party conference to define national claims unanimously. It declares that the Dodecanese, being overwhelmingly Greek, must be united to Greece. Rectification of the northern frontier is necessary on security grounds, considering that Greece has suffered three attacks from Bulgaria within the last thirty years. Northern Epirus must be restored to Greece, but E.A.M. opposes military occupation before it is decided by the Peace Conference. Cyprus being indisputably Greek, E.A.M. trusts that Britain will satisfy the Pan-Hellenic claim for union. Concerning Eastern Thrace, E.A.M.'s parties will put the Republican-Radical party's proposal before all-party conference to decide.

Greece, having suffered terrible devastation, is entitled to demand indemnities from the three invaders. E.A.M. stresses the imperative need of elections for the Constituent Assembly as soon as possible, under the supervision of an Inter-Allied Commission guaranteeing genuine results. E.A.M. does not oppose the control of economy, but believes that as planned at present by the government, namely, without the participation of the people, it would only favour big bank capital.

Finally, E.A.M. urges union with all democratic forces and the formation of a representative government to face effectively the outstanding problems.

* From Rizospastis—5th June, 1945.

TO OUR READERS

THE EDITOR wishes to express his sincere appreciation and thanks for the friendly messages and support given him by many **LABOUR MONTHLY** readers during the Election Campaign.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Engels

by J. B. S. HALDANE, F.R.S.

FREDERICK ENGELS died fifty years ago. It is already clear that he was much more important for world history than most of his contemporaries who were regarded as great statesmen or great thinkers, such men as Gladstone and Disraeli; Cardinal Newman and Herbert Spencer. A few of those who were acknowledged in their own time, such as Darwin and Pasteur, have not lost in stature with the passage of time. Engels is one of the very few who have gained enormously.

This is due to a simple fact. His ideas were ahead of those of almost all his contemporaries. But they were not so far ahead that they failed to influence the course of history directly, as was the case, for example, with the socialistic ideas of the English Levelers. One might almost say that the most active period of Engels' life began twenty-two years after his death, when Lenin, as appears from *State and Revolution*, applied the theories of *The Origin of the Family* with a success whose full magnitude he did not live to see.

Engels was the friend and colleague of Marx. The history of their friendship can perhaps best be followed from their correspondence. They collaborated in the Communist Manifesto and many less important works. Marx's main writings were on economics and contemporary history: Engels applied Marxism to philosophy, the natural sciences, and anthropology as well. He always stressed that he owed his seminal ideas in these fields to Marx, but he certainly developed them very greatly. And if Marx had not lived it is clear that Engels would have been a great intellectual leader of socialism, though we cannot say at how many of Marx's ideas he would have arrived.

Engels was a man of astonishing energy and versatility. He earned his living—and incidentally he gave Marx much financial help—as a cotton broker in Manchester. He was secretary of the First International. Apart from politics and economics, he wrote on physics, chemistry, biology, anthropology, philosophy, and war. He was a fox hunter because he hoped to be a cavalry leader in the revolution, as he had been in 1848 in Germany. Unlike Marx, who was highly monogamous, he had a series of love affairs.

A college of specialists would be needed to appreciate all the activities of such a man. I can only write with any authority on his contributions to science. *The Origin of the Family*, based on a comparatively small body of anthropological data, requires some correction as the result of new knowledge, but substantially less so than, for example, the accounts of animal evolution given by his contemporaries, Huxley and Haeckel. It still provides a framework into which later studies can be fitted without much difficulty. The modern Soviet school of pre-history demonstrates the fruitfulness of his approach.

Since he wrote *Anti-Duhring*, *Feuerbach* and *Dialectics of Nature* physics and chemistry have been revolutionised, substantially along the lines which he predicted. He contended that the Daltonian elements were probably compounds and certainly not indestructible. He could not be expected to have foreseen nuclear physics. Writing of electrochemistry as the point of contact of chemistry and physics he wrote "it is precisely at this point that the biggest results are to be expected." The results have occurred. We cannot therefore go to Engels for a detailed discussion of modern physical problems, but we can and should see how